

## FRAMING, STANCE, AND AFFECT IN KOREAN METALINGUISTIC DISCOURSE

Joseph Sung-Yul Park

### Abstract

Studies on language and affect have identified displays of emotions and feelings as important means through which speakers negotiate their social relations and cultural positions. Extending the findings of those studies, this paper discusses how affect must be seen as an important building block for framing, a resource that allows participants to construct frames that have specific grounding in identifiable social meaning. I make this point by illustrating how interactional management of affect contributes to the constitution of frames via the work of stancetaking, based on a discussion of several examples from a specific discursive context - Koreans' metalinguistic talk about English. While Koreans are commonly known to show much 'anxiety' or 'uneasiness' about their own English language skills, I demonstrate that such display of affect may be understood as part of an interactional frame for speaking (about) English that allows speakers to position themselves in relation to English and to each other in a culturally and socially appropriate way. The analysis shows that the semiotic resources that speakers employ in their affective displays allow participants to negotiate specific stances that they should take, and to jointly construct a frame for interpreting the interactional import of the ongoing talk.

**Keywords:** Framing; Stance; Affect; Language ideology; Korean; English.

### 1. Introduction

Recent sociolinguistic and discourse analytic work on stance (Hunston and Thompson 2000; Englebretson 2007; Jaffe 2009) allows us to look at the notion of framing from a more dynamic perspective. If framing is a way through which participants in interaction negotiate their understanding of 'what it is that is going on' (Goffman 1974: 10), then it is also a way through which they intersubjectively achieve alignment on how they view or position themselves in relation to the interactional task at hand, thus an act of metadiscursive stancetaking. When speakers convey to other participants how an utterance or action should be interpreted, such discernible interpretations not only involve cues about the meaning of the utterance or action as an isolable unit, but also link the utterance or action with specific types of social situations or personae, which are in turn connected with contrasting social values (Agha 2007). Thus, speaking of a 'consultation frame,' 'examination frame,' or 'play frame,' for instance, all of which constitute different situational aspects of a pediatric examination (Tannen and Wallat 1987), requires shifting patterns of interactional alignment, as participants in those frames need to position themselves differently with respect to attitudinal and evaluative notions such as seriousness and playfulness. Similarly, a speaker's self-positioning as principal, author, or animator (Goffman 1974) carries varying implications for responsibility and evidential authority (Hill and Irvine 1992). Indeed, Goffman's notion

of footing (1981) is precisely about the nature of framing as an evaluative act of alignment or disalignment, therefore an early model for our current understanding of stancetaking.

The close affinity between framing and stancetaking draws our attention to another important dimension of the constitution of interactional frames - display of affect. A large body of work on language and affect points to how displays of emotions or feelings through language and other semiotic means are not mere reflections of one's inner psychological state, but important means through which speakers negotiate their social relations and cultural positions (Besnier 1990; Lutz and Abu-Lughod 1990; Lutz and White 1986; Ochs and Schieffelin 1989). Thus, a major part of interactional work deals with the expression, evocation, and interpretation of affect. In other words, affect is a fundamental dimension of stancetaking; as Kulick and Schieffelin note, 'the ability to display culturally intelligible affective stances is a crucial dimension of the process of becoming a recognizable subject in any social group' (2004: 352). Affect, then, must also be seen as an important building block for framing, a resource that allows participants to construct frames that have specific grounding in identifiable social meaning.

The link between framing and affect can be evidenced from the fact that interpreting interactional frames involves not only recognition of specific 'knowledge schemas' but also correctly inferring affect from the semiotic expressions used. In Bateson's (1972) classic example, in order to distinguish between a 'fight frame' from a 'play frame' monkeys must know how observable behavioral features should be understood in terms of aggression, anger, hostility, pleasure, or enjoyment. Likewise, human actors must also be able to interpret others' behaviors in terms of various types of feelings, sentiments, and emotions - thus in terms of affect (though perhaps not always in a direct way). Negotiation of participation frameworks also involves participants' attempts at alignment of epistemic, moral, and affective stances (Goodwin 2007); disalignment of affect, in this regard, can disrupt successful achievement of participation frameworks, leading to communication trouble.

In this way, display and negotiation of affect must be seen as a fundamental element of framing. This paper explores this connection in greater detail, specifying how interactional management of affect contributes to the constitution of frames via the work of stancetaking. It does so by focusing on one specific type of interactional context - the production of metalinguistic discourse about English by Korean speakers. Through a discussion of examples in which speakers frame their talk about English, the rest of this paper will explore how speakers construct interactional frames through various symbolic resources for displaying affect. Analysis of these examples will illustrate how stancetaking must be seen as a fundamental process through which frames in interaction are constructed, thereby highlighting the dynamic and contingent nature of framing. At the same time, the analysis will also point to how the recurrence of similar affective stances across different contexts may contribute to more enduring frames for interpreting talk.

## **2. Korean metalinguistic discourse about English**

One common observation about the way Koreans position themselves in relation to the English language is that they frequently seem to display much anxiety and uneasiness

about speaking English. A strong sense of discomfort can often be gleaned from their behavior as they repeatedly make embarrassed apologies about their incompetence, and this is commonly noted in many descriptions of Korean learners of English made by native English teachers who have worked with them. For instance, one such teacher quoted in Chin (2002) says:

Time and time again I hear students say, “I am sorry, I can’t speak English well.” ... When students begin to ask a question or tell me something, they examine the expression on my face and my quizzical expression often sends them into a series of apologies for the poor quality of their expression. They don’t understand that I’m not even listening to their errors. I am attempting to ascertain the meaning of what they’re saying. (p. 123)

In applied linguistics, there have been various efforts to understand this phenomenon by casting Koreans’ observable reactions towards English in terms of psychological anxiety. That is, the uneasiness that Koreans display towards English is understood as a reflection of individual and psychological feelings of tension or nervousness a language learner often experiences (Horwitz, Horwitz, and Cope 1986). Thus various studies have attempted to identify factors that may contribute to this psychological force, and to determine what strategies of learning and instruction may be used to minimize this debilitating anxiety (Truitt 1995; Park 1995; Kim 2002; Jang 2003). The framework of Willingness To Communicate (WTC) also treats language anxiety as one of the main components that shape a speaker’s self-confidence in a foreign language (MacIntyre et al. 1998), and this model has also been applied to the Korean context (Kim 2004).

However, attributing such displays of embarrassment entirely to some inner psychological reactions of anxiety may be problematic for several reasons. First of all, Koreans who have quite successful mastery of the English language frequently display a similar sense of embarrassment as well. Even though it is probable that a speaker may still experience anxiety after becoming a competent speaker in a language, the fact that such displays are prevalent across a wide range of speakers implies that this is not purely a matter of felt emotion, but one that has some shared *social* significance to the speakers as well. Moreover, equating displays of anxiety with mere outward reflections of “natural” inner psychological feelings of anxiety can be an overly simplistic view. Previous research has shown how affect may be understood as performative; that is, particular linguistic or non-linguistic signs associated with displays of emotion may be seen as invoking (or calling into being) that emotion in interactional context, rather than as a simple surface manifestation of an individual’s internal psychological state. In fact, this is precisely how affect and emotion is understood in many cultures, as it is often the case that “nobody cares much, or even considers, whether or not that doing [of a particular emotion] corresponds with some privately felt sensation” (Kulick and Schieffelin 2004: 352).

An alternative way of looking at Koreans’ display of embarrassment in their talk about English would be to consider it as part of a frame for speaking (or speaking about) English. In a previous publication (Park 2009), I have described Koreans’ practices of dealing with English in interaction as “disclaiming English.” Korean speakers commonly treat occasions for publicly displaying their ability in English as problematic, via various interactional resources such as delaying devices or explicit negative assessments. For instance, a speaker’s insertion of an English sentence into an otherwise

Korean conversation might be preceded by an apology, which sequentially delays the actual production of the English utterance, or followed by a negative assessment that denies the authenticity of the English just produced. Such practices can be analyzed as an interactional strategy for navigating through the complex ideologies of English that circulate in Korean society; because English in Korea is a highly valued linguistic capital and also a language associated with a cultural Other, denying a close connection with English by such self-problematizations can be a useful way of carefully avoiding risky social positions in interaction such as being seen as bragging about one's competence in English - a characteristic captured through the duality of the term "to disclaim" (i.e. 'to reject or deny' vs. 'to renounce or give up').

In this sense, disclaiming English can be seen as an interactional frame for speaking English, as it provides other participants in discourse with a specific orientation regarding how the ongoing (or upcoming) public display is to be interpreted. In other words, by invoking this frame the speaker indicates that his or her competence in English to be or already revealed should be understood as problematic - thus preempting charges of showing off one's ability in English or being pretentious.

Koreans' display of embarrassment, then, may be understood as part of this framing; that is, it may be seen as one of the interactional resources that problematize one's competence in English so as to achieve an intersubjective alignment in the metalinguistic talk about English at hand. What precisely is the role of affect in this work of framing, then? What is it about affect that makes display of embarrassment a useful resource to be exploited here? In this paper, I argue that it is the close affinity between affect and stance that plays an important role. That is, since such expressions of affect can be routinely interpreted as constituting an attitudinal position to a specific issue, they naturally become a useful resource for negotiating interactional stances towards the speech event and to other speakers. Koreans' practices of speaking about English, which are commonly accomplished through the mediation of affect, then, serve as a useful site for our exploration of the interrelationship between framing, stance, and affect. In the following section, we move onto a more detailed discussion of that relationship.

### **3. Affect in frames for speaking English**

Let us first look at what the practice of disclaiming English looks like, and how this can be understood as framing of performances in English - and then discuss the role of affect in the constitution of this frame.

One common context in which disclaiming English takes place is in the turns preceding an upcoming occasion for publicly displaying one's English skills. Example (1) below, for instance, is one such case. This example comes from a video recording of a group study session at an English speaking club at a university in Seoul - a group whose goal is to study and practice communication skills in English. The group members hold weekly meetings, and the particular subgroup that is shown here focuses on practicing presentation skills based on a collection of useful English expressions explained in a textbook. The study session typically begins by listening to a tape accompanying the textbook in which an American native speaker of English reads out the expressions, and then the members repeat them and memorize them together. The interaction shown below was engendered by the fact that, on the day of the recording,

the tape happened to be not available, so the leader of the group, Taejin, had to read out aloud the expressions to be studied. Taejin's reading out of the expressions, then, presents an occasion in which his English language skills come to be displayed publicly, as a model for the group to follow (as it is taking the place of the native speaker's recording).

- (1)  
 13 Taejin: ...*(2.1) oneul,*  
           today  
 14           ...*(1.5) application,*  
 15           *exercise,*  
 16           .. *i bubun-deul-eul,*  
           this part-PL-OBJ  
 17           .. *hae-bo-dolok ha-gess-seupni-da.*  
           do-see-INDUC do-PRESUM-HON-DECL  
           **'Today, we will try the part "Application Exercise".'**  
 18           ...*(0.7) sangdanghi minmang-ha-gi-n ha-jiman,*  
           quite embarrassing-do-NOML-TOP do-CONCESS  
           **'It's quite embarrassing, but,'**  
 19 Suhui: ... @  
 20 Taejin: *je-ga han beon ilk-eo* [*<@bo-do@>lok*] *ha-<@gess-*  
           1SG-SUB one CL read-CONN see-INDUC do-PRESUM-HON-DECL  
           *seup@>ni-da.*  
           **'I will try reading it out loud.'**  
 21 ?: [@@@]  
 22 Taejin: ...*(1.1) teipeu-ga eops-neun gwangye-lo,*  
           tape-SUB not:exist-ATTR relation-by  
           **'Since we don't have the tape.'**  
 23           ... *meonjeo wi-e-leul bo-myeon,*  
           first top-LOC-OBJ see-COND  
           **'First, on the top,'**  
 24           ...*(1.8) I have some visuals that I'd like to show you.*

Observing the way in which Taejin deals with this occasion for displaying his English language skills, one might be inclined to say that Taejin is noticeably "embarrassed" or "nervous" to be put into such a position; and since the occasion in question has to do with English, that this is an example of Koreans' "anxiety" about English manifested in interaction. But regardless of what Taejin actually feels - about which we can make no provable claim anyway - what is important to note here is that this impression of anxiety is constructed through various linguistic and non-linguistic resources employed by Taejin. Most obviously, there is the explicit assessment by Taejin, "it's quite embarrassing" (line 18), which evaluates the situation in psychological terms. There are also tokens of laughter interspersed in his utterance "I will try reading it aloud" (line 20) which seem to convey an air of awkwardness; Taejin is also visibly smiling throughout the production of his turn. In other words, various semiotic resources that can be interpreted as indicators of underlying affect are employed here, constructing the speaker as being "nervous" and thus constituting an affective stance.

We may argue that such semiotic resources are part of a set of more general practices which problematize the occasion for speaking English. One of those practices

is Taejin's sequential delaying of his actual reading of the expressions. After announcing what they will study in lines 13 through 17, Taejin first concessively states that "it is quite embarrassing" (line 18) and then goes on to say that he will read the text out aloud (line 20). He also adds a rationale for this reading (line 22), i.e., that they don't have the tape. Only after this does Taejin move on to the actual reading of the expressions in English (line 24). In interactional terms, this can be understood as delaying of a dispreferred action (Pomerantz 1984). Since such delaying commonly occurs with actions that are seen as interactionally problematic - that is, actions that require more work to accomplish, such as disagreements or rejections - the sequential structure of the turn here implicitly problematizes the occasion interactionally. On the rhetorical level, the fact that Taejin provides a justification of why his reading of the text is necessary (line 22) can also be seen as contributing to this problematization, as it implies that there is something problematic about the occasion that requires some explanation of why it nonetheless must proceed.

Together, such range of resources - the problematization through sequential delaying and provision of justification, laughter and explicit assessment - constitute an instance of the practice of disclaiming English. That is, the speaker in effect distances himself from English by problematizing his upcoming performance, presenting his reading of the text in English as unjustified and undesirable, possibly implying that his performance may not be that good to serve as a model (note the formulation "I will try reading it aloud" in line 20, suggesting that his competence in English does not guarantee a successful performance but he will try anyway). By doing so, he is able to position himself in relation to English and to other speakers in a subtle way; he avoids being seen as claiming good English skills for himself and thus being pretentious, while nonetheless accepting the role of the model speaker as demanded by the situation. We can note that, then, the act of disclaiming English here essentially serves as a metalinguistic frame for the speaker's upcoming usage of English; that is, Taejin's actions suggest to other participants a particular interpretation of the performance he will carry out in English - that it should not be seen as boasting of his English skills, that he is being appropriately sensitive to the complex implications of being able to speak English well in Korean society, etc.

If we revisit the display of affect involved in example (1) from this perspective, we can more clearly see the role affect plays in the constitution of this frame. While all of the resources discussed above contribute to the frame for speaking English, their roles in specifying the particular meaning invoked by the frame differ. For instance, resources such as sequential delaying, while central in the problematization of the upcoming performance, are quite unspecific in their meaning; as a more general interactional resource for organizing the sequential unfolding of actions, they do not exactly specify the nature of that problematization. But those that involve a display of affect - in this case the explicit assessment "it's quite embarrassing" and laughter - more directly specify the meaning of the frame; they constrain the interpretation of the frame so that the problematization is understood as relating specifically to the embarrassing and awkward nature of performing in English in front of others. In other words, display of affect becomes a useful resource for the construction of interactional frames because they point to specific evaluative stances, while other types of resources may not.

This interrelation between display of affect and stancetaking can also be illustrated with example (2). This example involves a group of college students studying together for TOEFL (Test Of English as a Foreign Language, which tests competence in

American English for college-level academic purposes) at an English language school in Seoul. This group works together on the comprehension section of the exam, trying to solve sample questions by parsing and translating texts together. Usually the group members take turns in translating sentences of the text under study. At the beginning of this example, one of the participants, Mihyeon, has been attempting to translate a sentence. Then, she suddenly asks the next participant, Sangeun, to take on the translation of the sentence instead of her. As in example (1), then, an occasion in which Sangeun should display her English language skills is engendered.

- (2)
- 51 Mihyeon: ...*(2.6) a eonni dasi ha-e-jwo yeogi.*  
 ah older:sister again do-CONN-give:IE here  
**‘Oh sister, do this one again for me.’**
- 52 Sangeun: .. *eo?*  
 huh  
**‘Huh?’**
- 53 Mihyeon: ... *eonni-ga dasi ha-e-jwo-yo.*  
 older:sister-SUB again do-CONN-give:IE-POL  
**‘Do it again for me.’**
- 54 Sangeun: ... *nae-ga?*  
 1SG-SUB  
**‘Me?’**
- 55 @ [ @ @ @ ]
- 56 Mihyeon: [*eo*].  
 Uhuh  
**‘Yeah.’**
- 57 <@jal moleu-gess-eo.@>[@]  
 well not:know-PRESUM-IE  
**‘I don’t understand this.’**
- 58 Sangeun: [ @ ]
- 59 ... *geu,*  
 that
- 60 .. *maseukeu-na,*  
 mask-or  
**‘Those masks or ...’**

As in (1) above, we see similar resources used to construct the upcoming performance as problematic. First, there is again the sequential delaying of the performance; through a series of repair initiators (Schegloff, Jefferson, and Sacks 1977) in lines 52 and 54, Sangeun delays her actual translation of the sentence. The specific form of these repair initiators also adds to this sense of problematization. While line 52 is more or less a generic next turn repair initiator, *eo* with rising intonation, which potentially could indicate a simple mishearing, line 54 has a much sharper rising intonation contour, conveying a strong sense of surprise and unexpectedness. In line 55 and 58 Sangeun also produces awkward laughter, again marking her position as embarrassed. Again, we can see these as resources Sangeun adopts to indicate how her upcoming performance (starting from line 60), or the act of accepting Mihyeon’s request for help, is to be interpreted. That is, Sangeun treats as problematic Mihyeon’s positioning of her as a person who can provide a better translation than she can, and thus as a person with better competence in English; through this framing, for instance,

Sangeun leads other participants to not see her as pretentiously accepting the position of a more competent speaker of English, for she indicates through her framing that she considers Mihyeon's positioning of her to be surprising, unexpected, and absurd, and that she feels awkward and embarrassed for that reason.

That this framing aims to achieve such an interpretation can be evidenced from the fact that Sangeun interactionally pursues an alignment of stance from Mihyeon. As noted above, though Sangeun's first repair initiator in line 52 delays a response to Mihyeon's initial request, thus opening up an interactional space for problematizing the occasion for speaking English, it does not contain any explicit indication of stance, as the form of the repair initiator is a generic one; for instance, it is potentially hearable as motivated by a simple mishearing of the prior utterance. Indeed, Mihyeon's response to this is a simple reproduction of her earlier request, not indicating any recognition of the problematizing stance. But Sangeun's second repair initiator, line 54, becomes more specific with respect to what it targets; it specifies as the problem the fact that Sangeun is treated as a person more knowledgeable in English (thus the focus on the subject, 'me'). This sense of problematization is further strengthened by the sharp rising intonation contour in line 54 and laughter in line 55. This more explicit problematization indeed leads Mihyeon to take up the same stance; when she confirms that she wants Sangeun to take up the translation for her and explains that this is due to her own incompetence, she adds laughter to her own turn (line 57), intersubjectively agreeing that her request puts Sangeun into an interactionally awkward position. What is significant here is the fact that Sangeun moves on to begin her performance of English (in this case, translation of the English text: line 59-60) once this alignment of stance is achieved - that is, the intersubjective agreement regarding the interpretation of the frame is treated as necessary before Sangeun can move on to her performance. In this sense, the construction of the frame is an interactional achievement.

This underlines our earlier point that the affective elements used in framing are not simply outward manifestations of inner psychological feelings such as "anxiety" or "embarrassment". The semiotic forms such as sharp rising intonation or laughter in this example are used as resources for conveying stances to which participants in interaction must mutually orient. Again, affect plays an important part in constituting the interactional frame, by functioning as a semiotic resource for speakers to negotiate and achieve alignment of stance. This example also underlines the dynamic nature of interactional frames. Focusing on the way display of affect allows participants to manage the frames for interpreting ongoing talk, we can see how such frames cannot be seen as prefabricated interpretive structures that can simply be imposed upon the interaction, as speakers actively engage in interactional work to make sure those frames are recognized correctly and alignment of stance has indeed been achieved.

#### **4. Affect in frames for speaking about English**

In the previous section I have shown how display of affect allows Korean speakers to frame upcoming performances of English as embarrassing and use this problematization to negotiate alignments of stance so that speakers may achieve intersubjective agreements on how those performances should be interpreted. However, display of affect is not only relevant to framing actual performances of English, but also to other types of metalinguistic discourse about English. Such cases differ from the examples



presented above in that what is being framed is not the use of English per se, but some meatdiscursive element *about* the use of English. However, as we will see below, even in such cases similar types of affective stance towards English can be found - that is, speakers adopt various semiotic resources to take an affective stance of problematizing their competence in English. In this section, we look at a couple of examples that illustrate this, in order to consider how specific constructions of affect may be used in framing across a wide range of contexts, potentially contributing to more enduring interactional frames.

Example (3), which comes from a casual conversation between two male friends, demonstrates how speakers may adopt display of affect in the course of a narrative about the speaker's competence in English. What is shown in (3) is the climax of a story that Minu is telling about his experience of meeting with three of his younger cousins who were visiting from London and New York. The crux of the narrative is that when the cousins, being fluent speakers of English, started to converse among themselves in English, Minu was not able to understand a word of what they were saying. When his interlocutor, Suho, prompts him for what happened when he was having dinner with his cousins (line 4), Minu first states that he was unable to understand their English (line 6-7), and then elaborates how this was the case even though the English they used must have been plain and simple (rather than dealing with some sophisticated topic) (line 9-10). Finally, he sums up his narrative by contrasting this with his situation four years ago (line 14) when he was able to at least understand basic conversational English when he was working at a different job.

- (3)
- 1 Minu: *geuleon ae-deul-i,*  
such kid-PL-SUB  
**'Such kids,'**
- 2 .. *ap-e --*  
front-at
- 3 *dongsaeng-deul-i iss-eunikka.*  
younger:sibling-PL-SUB exist-REASON  
**'My cousins were in front of me.'**
- 4 Suho: *geulaeseo eotteohge hae-ss-nya?*  
so how do-PST-IR  
**'So what did you do?'**
- 5 @@
- 6 Minu: *na-n geu yeop-eseo inje,*  
1SG-TOP that side-at now  
**'Sitting right next to them,'**
- 7 <IEMP ha IEMP>*na-do mos al-a-deud-gess-eo.*  
one-also NEG know-CONN-hear-PRESUM-IE  
**'I couldn't understand a bit (of what they were saying).'**
- 8 Suho: @
- 9 Minu: *gyaene-deul yaegi-ha-neun ge ppeon-ha-l geo ani-ya*  
they-PL talk-do-ATTR thing:SUB obvious-do-ATTR thing  
NEG-IR  
*mwo.*  
what  
**'What they are saying must be straightforward, right?'**



puts two ideas, X and Y, in stark contrast, upholding X as self-evident truth and denouncing Y as extremely unlikely and almost absurd. All of these resources jointly contribute to a sense of embarrassed surprise; this is a feeling that is probably best captured with the Korean expression *giga makhida* (literally, breath, or *Qi*, is blocked), which refers to a state of being at a loss due to some unexpected revelation that is completely against one's estimations.

Together, then, these semiotic resources convey a feeling of shock and devastation, but with an air of exaggeration that adds a tinge of humor. That is, it recounts the strong feeling that Minu purportedly experienced when he realized he was not able to understand what his cousins were saying and humorously underlines that in the course of the narrative as it reaches its climax. Thus, we may argue that these semiotic resources jointly serve a particular function in Minu's narrative; by humorously conveying the feeling of surprise and devastation, they indicate the main point of the narrative that the recipient should orient to, roughly carrying out the function of evaluation as identified by Labov's narrative analysis (1972). More specifically, since they indicate how the recipient is to align himself to the ongoing story with respect to affective stance, this is also a work of framing. In this sense, the resources of affective display work to set up a frame according to which the recipient may interpret and make sense of the narrative.

The next example involves a case where a metalinguistic statement about one's competence in English is used to carry out a specific social action - responding to a compliment directed towards oneself (Pomerantz 1978). In example (4), Jeonga, who has been living in the U.S. with her husband for several years, has briefly returned to Korea, and is having a casual conversation with two of her friends, Miyeong and Seoin. Before the beginning of the extract below, Jeonga has been talking about some of the Korean books she read while overseas, and in lines 1-6, her friends praise her for having the passion for reading books. Upon this sudden praise, Jeonga produces brief laughter in line 4, and then, in line 8, shifts the topic to what she has *not* been doing well - studying English. This is an interesting interactional move, for there has not been any talk about English prior to this point, and even though the topic of English relates to the fact that Jeonga has been living in the U.S., there is no obvious reason why English should become a topic here. Yet Jeonga raises the topic of English as part of her compliment response, as if it is a readily available topic that can safely defuse any compliment directed towards oneself.

(4)

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| 1 | Miyeong: <i>chaek-do ilg-neun-guna.</i><br>book-also read-IMPF-UNASSIM<br><b>'(So) you even read books.'</b> |
| 2 | Seoin: .. <i>geuleoge.</i><br>indeed<br><b>'Indeed.'</b>   |
| 3 | <i>uaha-da ya.</i><br>elegant-DECL hey<br><b>'You're so elegant.'</b>  |
| 4 | Jeonga: [@@]   |
| 5 | Seoin: [ <i>jinjja</i> ].<br>really.<br><b>'Really.'</b>   |

- 6            *uaha-da jinja.*  
elegant-DECL really  
**'Really elegant.'**
- 7    Miyeong: [*maj-eo*].  
correct-DECL  
**'Right.'**
- 8    Jeonga: [*yeongeo-yeong]eo gongbu-leul hae-ya ha-l pan-e*  
English English study-OBJ do-NECESS do-ATTR situation-  
LOC  
*jinja,*  
really  
**'I should be studying English, gosh.'**
- 9            ((sigh))
- 10   Miyeong: ... *neo yeongeo jom neul-eoss-ni neo?*  
you English little increase-PST-IR you  
**'Did your English improve?'**
- 11   Jeonga: *yeongeo mwo-l neul-gi-n mwo-ga neu-ni.*  
English what-OBJ increase-NOML-TOP what-SUB increase-IR  
**'Why in the world should my English improve?'**
- 12            @@[@]
- 13   Miyeong: <X[*geu*] *jeonhyeo-neunX*> *ani-l geo ani-ya.*  
that none-TOP NEG-ATTR thing NEG-IR  
**'It should, even a little bit, right?'**

Again, various semiotic resources relate to display of affect in Jeonga's comment. What is important to note is that Jeonga's utterance in line 8 is not simply a statement that she should have been studying English but did not. It is hearable as an implied claim - or even a lament - about the dismal state of her English language skills; that is, due to her lack of English skills, studying English should have been her first priority, but instead she wasted all her time on reading Korean books. In this sense, then, Jeonga's utterance contains a strongly evaluative and affective component. This stance is conveyed in part through her choice of grammatical constructions. The structure *X-haeya hal pane* 'while (one) should be doing X' carries a strong sense of blame and derision, that the subject of the sentence has been neglecting something much more important and doing something else (this becomes clear when we compare the utterance with a more neutral alternative such as *yeongeo gongbu haeya haneunde* '(I) should be studying English'). Thus, there is an inherent affective dimension of regret and desperation that is communicated through Jeonga's choice of this construction. The added sentence-final *jinja* 'really' and the audible sigh in line 9 also strengthen this feeling, conveying a sense of frustration. Jeonga uses all of these resources together to make the utterance strongly filled with an emotion of regret and dissatisfaction over her own competence in English.

This strong negative stance is central to this segment, as Jeonga's turn is basically constructed as a move to counter her friends' compliments, which is done mainly through this opposition of affective stance. In fact, when this affective stance is not taken up by her interlocutors, it is upgraded so as to make it more salient in pursuit of alignment. In line 10, Miyeong takes up the topic of English just introduced by Jeonga, and inquires whether her English skills have improved while living in the U.S.

This turn is disaligned with Jeonga's prior turn; that is, it clearly does not adopt the stance expressed by Jeonga's utterance, ignoring her implicit claims of incompetence and asks how much her English has improved. Not only does it miss the underlying message of Jeonga's utterance (that she has not been studying English like she should have, and therefore her learning of English must be unsatisfactory), but also takes a different stance with respect to affect - Miyeong's line 10 does not address the feeling of regret and frustration that fills Jeonga's previous utterance, and only inquires about Jeonga's present skills in English in a factual manner.

Thus, in line 11, we see Jeonga upgrading the strength of her affective stance. In response to Miyeong's question, she uses the construction *X-kin mwoga X*, which expresses strong denial of the state or action indicated by X. The forceful sense of protest inherent in this construction and the wide pitch range that Jeonga uses to produce it do more than deny any improvement in Jeonga's competence; they also work as a display of affect - that the speaker finds it highly surprising and almost absurd that Miyeong would suggest Jeonga's English would get better. Jeonga also adds a brief, high-pitched laughter in line 12, again treating Miyeong's suggestion as absurd and also invoking the implication that improving her English is only a remote possibility. By doing so, Jeonga overlays a more strengthened affective stance upon her claim of incompetence.

With respect to framing, what is at stake here is how Jeonga's actions are to be interpreted within this interactional context. Jeonga's display of affect underlines that her utterances in lines 8 and 11 are part of her compliment response; they are meant to highlight some negative aspect of herself that she is introducing to counter her friends' praise. By using semiotic resources that convey an affective stance of frustration and regret, she is able to make clear the implications of her utterances; they are meant to be read as self-problematizations which serve as the basis for her compliment response. But in this case, Miyeong's subsequent turn does not clearly show whether this was registered, for her line 10 is neither an acknowledgement of the self-problematization nor a counter-problematization. Thus, Jeonga then upgrades her display of affect to secure intersubjective agreement on this framing - though Miyeong still persists and pursues the issue of whether Jeonga's English has improved while overseas. This example, then, unlike the examples discussed above, illustrates how speakers may fail to achieve an alignment of stance through negotiation of framing. This is, of course, not surprising, as we would expect cases of non-alignment to be found in interaction as well.

Yet, in an important sense, there is indeed a common orientation that is achieved in this interaction. Miyeong's disalignment of affective stance is in fact an important resource that allows her to seek a movement away from the post-compliment interactional work - that is, Miyeong now wants to pursue the topic of learning English in the U.S., a topic triggered by Jeonga's mention of English in her self-deprecative remark; and the non-alignment in terms of affect is precisely what signals this shift. Thus, we may argue that, despite the disalignment, both Miyeong and Jeonga are indeed orienting towards each other's affective stance, treating them as resources for negotiating the interactional task at hand: what they are doing, in what direction they should proceed interactionally, and how to understand the sequential import of the ongoing talk. In this sense, this example demonstrates the importance of affect in the work of framing, for the way in which the speakers deploy semiotic resources commonly associated with display of affect to construct alternative interactional frames

is the central mechanism for their negotiation of the sequential structure of their social actions.

### **5. Constructing an enduring frame: Affect and language ideology**

The discussion above illustrates the central role of affect in the constitution of interactional frames. The examples show that a wide range of semiotic resources (ranging from grammatical constructions to prosodic gestures to non-verbal actions) are employed in the expression of affective stance, and such displays of affect in turn allow speakers to negotiate how they would position themselves in relation to the subject at hand, thus forming a frame for the interpretation of ongoing talk.

Our discussion provides us with some clues regarding why affect serves as an important basis for framing. Display of affect naturally invites negotiation of affective stance among participants, and in this process, speakers come to jointly participate in the work of framing. That is, as they construct patterns of affective alignment through interaction, they intersubjectively arrive at a common frame for interpreting the ongoing talk. Therefore, our examples serve as a useful illustration of the close relationship between stancetaking and framing outlined at the beginning of this article. While affective stance is only one dimension of stance which a participant in interaction may take, other aspects of stancetaking - such as instrumental, epistemic, cooperative, and moral stance (Goodwin 2007) - are also employed in similar ways to structure the way speakers understand what is going on in the current interaction. Understanding framing from this perspective allows us to appreciate its interactive nature; interactional frames must be dynamically shaped and constructed from the bottom up each time, based on how participants negotiate and manage different ways of understanding the import of ongoing talk through their complex manipulation of various semiotic resources.

But at the same time, we should also acknowledge that repeated structures of interaction may give rise to more enduring frames for interpreting discourse, thus linking with broader language ideologies that have implications beyond the immediate interaction. Even though the examples we discussed arise from considerably different discourse contexts - some involve framing upcoming performances of English while others are about framing particular elements or moves within talk about English - they all involve a similar affective stance towards English: that is, a problematization of the speaker's own competence in English conveyed through expressions of embarrassment and anxiety. Though the negotiation of such affective stance is emergent in the sense that it is always grounded in local contexts of interaction, repeated occurrence of similar stances across multiple, disparate contexts may give rise to a more enduring frame for speaking (or speaking about) English. On the one hand, this may be a reflection of dominant language ideologies of English in Korean society, which position Koreans as incompetent speakers of English, as we discussed above (Park 2009). But on the other, this may also be a channel through which such language ideologies are reproduced. In other words, when recurrent interactional contexts regularly lead to similar interactional strategies for dealing with specific situations - in this case, talking about the language of English - it is entirely possible that such regular structures may become entrenched, becoming distilled as normative frames that participants must refer to when those very contexts occur. Indeed, as we have noted above, expressions of anxiety and

embarrassment are quite common and noticeable among Koreans' talk in and about English.

If so, the work of displaying affect and negotiating stance becomes a highly important mechanism for the reproduction of such ideologies. While this contrasts with the popular conception of affect as fleeting and transient, it is in line with current theories of affect which view it as a fundamental basis for socialization of normative behavior and practice (Kulick and Schieffelin 2004). For this reason, though this article has looked at cases of interaction involving a highly specific kind of metalinguistic discourse, its findings have broader implications for the analysis of frames; it suggests that we need to look at framing simultaneously from the level of the specific semiotic resources that make up that frame, and the level of the more enduring structures that result from the use of those resources. When we take this perspective, the study of interactional frames becomes an important locus for our investigation of the link between micro-level interactional practices and macro-level concerns of social structure.

### Transcription symbols (based on Du Bois et al 1993)

<i>{carriage return}</i>	intonation unit
..	short pause
...	medium pause
...(n.n)	long pause
[ ]	speech overlap
(( ))	transcriber comment
.	transitional continuity: final
,	transitional continuity: continuing
?	transitional continuity: appeal
--	cut-off intonation unit
@	laughter
<@ @>	laugh quality
<X X>	uncertain hearing
<IEMP IEMP>	iconic emphasis
<u>Underline</u>	non-korean word

### Abbreviations

ATTR	attributive
CL	classifier
COMM	committal
COMPL	complementizer
CONCESS	concessive
COND	conditional
CONN	connective
DECL	declarative
HON	honorific

IE	informal ending
IMPF	imperfective
INDUC	inductive reasoning
IR	interrogative
LOC	locative
NECESS	necessitative
NEG	negative
NOML	nominalizer
OBJ	object
PL	plural
PRESUM	presumptive
PST	past
REASON	reason
RES	resultative
RETROS	retrospective
SG	singular
SUB	subject
TOP	topic
UNASSIM	unassimilated knowledge

### References

- Agha, Asif (2007) *Language and Social Relations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bateson, Gregory (1972) A theory of play and fantasy. In *Steps to an Ecology of Mind: Collected Essays in Anthropology, Psychiatry, Evolution, and Epistemology*. San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Company, pp. 177-193.
- Besnier, Niko (1990) Language and affect. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 19: 419-451.
- Chin, Cheongsook (2002) Native English-speaking teachers' perception of learning and teaching EFL in Korea. *Yeongeog Gyooyuk [English Teaching]* 57.2: 113-135.
- Du Bois, John W., Stephan Schuetze-Coburn, Susanna Cumming, and Danae Paolino (1993) Outline of discourse transcription. In Jane A. Edwards and Martin D. Lampert (eds.), *Talking Data: Transcription and Coding in Discourse Research*. Hillsdale, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum, pp. 45-89.
- Englebretson, Robert (ed.) (2007) *Stancetaking in Discourse: Subjectivity, Evaluation, Interaction*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Goffman, Erving (1974) *Frame Analysis: An Essay on the Organization of Experience*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Goffman, Erving (1981) *Forms of Talk*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Goodwin, Charles (2007) Participation, stance and affect in the organization of activities. *Discourse and Society* 18.1: 53-73.
- Hill, Jane H., and Judith T. Irvine (eds.) (1992) *Responsibility and Evidence in Oral Discourse*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.



- Horwitz, Elaine K., Michael B. Horwitz, and Jo Ann Cope (1986) Foreign language classroom anxiety. *Modern Language Journal* 70: 125-132.
- Hunston, Susan, and Geoff Thompson (eds.) (2000) *Evaluation in Text: Authorial Stance and the Construction of Discourse*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jaffe, Alexandra (ed.) (2009) *Stance: Sociolinguistic Perspectives*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Jang, Jong-Duk (2003) Relationship between student anxiety and corrective feedback: Case of Korean college-level EFL learners. Ph.D. dissertation, State University of New York at Buffalo.
- Kim, Joohee (2002) Anxiety and foreign language listening. *Yeongeog Gyooyuk* [English Teaching] 57.2: 3-34.
- Kim, Seung Jung (2004) Exploring willingness to communicate (WTC) in English among Korean EFL students in Korea: WTC as a predictor of success in second language acquisition. Ph.D. dissertation, Ohio State University.
- Kulick, Don, and Bambi B. Schieffelin (2004) Language socialization. In Alessandro Duranti (ed.), *A Companion to Linguistic Anthropology*. Malden: Blackwell, pp. 349-368.
- Lutz, Catherine, and Lila Abu-Lughod (eds.) (1990) *Language and the Politics of Emotion*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lutz, Catherine, and G. White (1986) The anthropology of emotions. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 15: 405-436.
- MacIntyre, Peter D., Richard Clément, Zoltán Dörnyei, and Kimberly A. Noels (1998) Conceptualizing willingness to communicate in a L2: A situational model of L2 confidence and affiliation. *Modern Language Journal* 82.4: 545-562.
- Ochs, Elinor, and Bambi B. Schieffelin (1989) Language has a heart. *Text* 9.1: 7-25.
- Park, Gi-pyo (1995) Language learning strategies and beliefs about language learning of university students learning English in Korea. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Texas at Austin, TX.
- Park, Joseph Sung-Yul (2009) *The Local Construction of a Global Language: Ideologies of English in South Korea*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Pomerantz, Anita (1978) Compliment responses: Notes on the co-operation of multiple constraints. In Jim Schenkein (ed.), *Studies in the Organization of Conversational Interaction*. New York: Academic Press, pp. 79-112.
- Pomerantz, Anita (1984) Agreeing and disagreeing with assessments: Some features found in preferred/dispreferred turn shapes. In J.M. Atkinson and J. Heritage (eds.), *Structures of Social Action*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 57-101.
- Schegloff, Emanuel A., Gail Jefferson, and Harvey Sacks (1977) The preference for self-correction in the organization of repair in conversation. *Language* 53: 361-382.
- Tannen, Deborah, and Cynthia Wallat (1987) Interactive frames and knowledge schemas in interaction: Examples from a medical examination/interview. *Social Psychology Quarterly* 50.2: 205-216.
- Truitt, Susan N. (1995) Anxiety and beliefs about language learning: A study of Korean university students learning English. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Texas at Austin, TX.

