# Resemiotizing the metapragmatics of Konglish and Pidgin on YouTube

**Christina Higgins, Gavin Furukawa, and Hakyoon Lee**

## 1. Introduction

Social media has a great deal of potential to rearticulate social meanings and to circulate new and alternative perspectives in society due to the rapid dispersal of ideas, images, and discourse that digital technology affords. Drawing on foundational writings from linguistic anthropology and social semiotics, Leppänen et al. (2014) explain how *entextualization* and *resemiotization* are central to this rearticulation. While entextualization describes how participants (re)use language and semiotic resources to relocate and appropriate discourse from other contexts, resemiotization refers to the new meanings that are produced because of new arrangements and framings across modes and modalities. Rymes (2012) illustrates how this works in self-produced YouTube videos that resemiotize a range of material, from Barack Obama's "Yes we can" election slogan to "Crank Dat," a popular song by the American rapper Soulja Boy. When individuals remake videos like these and post them in social media, they are making "a bid at recognition by like-minded peers" (ibid., p. 224), and hence are claiming belonging within a system of shared, reentextualized communicative repertoires. Similarly, Georgakopoulou (2014, see also this volume) shows how these processes can yield very different results. She traced how a televised assault of two female MPs by a male MP on a Greek morning show became resemiotized on YouTube, with some versions acting as critiques of Greek politics and others using the backdrop of the incident to convey much more personal and non-serious narratives. By tracking the means by which texts and images are recycled in social media, studies such as these show how platforms such as YouTube, Twitter, and Facebook can provide lay people with "new opportunities to actively engage with global media flows from a local perspective" (Androutsopoulos, 2010 p. 203).

Representations of language in social media are increasingly complex because of the myriad directions that resemiotization can take, including the unfortunate outcome of providing audiences with ways to align with deficiency discourses, homophobic sentiments, and racist rhetoric. Yamaguchi (2013) analyzes one such video posted on YouTube titled "Asians in the library," in which a white American college student produces a rant about what she characterizes as "Asian behavior," which for her, includes talking on one's cell phone in a language best described as Mock Asian: *"O:h! ching chong ling long ting to"ng o:h!"* (p. 381). Other examples can be found in Da Silva (2015), who analyzes videos posted by a teenager in Toronto, Canada, who video-recorded his interactions with his grandmother so that he could publicly make fun of her 'generational' ways of behaving and her language, Azorean Portuguese. Similarly, Leppänen and Häkkinen (2012) analyze "buffalaxed" videos, which are made by adding new subtitles that somewhat resemble the original words or lyrics but which are usually filled with Orientalist representations of the racial Other. One buffalaxed video they analyze is *"Niilin Hanhet"* ('The Geese of the Nile') a version of a traditional Kurdish wedding song performed by the Syrian artist Ebdo Mihemed in which a young girl asks permission to marry the man she loves, rather than accepting an arranged marriage. The buffalaxed video hyper-sexualizes the original lyrics, reframing the song to focus almost entirely on the imagined sexual acts committed by the singer, including homosexuality and sodomy.

Despite, or even because of, their repellent content, these same YouTube videos have also yielded favorable representations due to their location on social media. In the case of buffalaxed videos, this can happen when viewers become curious about the original videos. This happened in the case of Mihemed, who was not a star in his native Syria but was invited to tour Finland due to the popularity of the buffalaxed video, where he became a celebrity. Moreover, despite the offensive nature of the buffalaxed lyrics, fans responded quite positively about Mihemed on the YouTube comments thread, challenging the xenophobic, Orientalist representation of the video with comments like "This is a good guy. Don't you fucking call him bad or a clown. Mihemed rule!s (sic)" (Leppänen & Häkkinen 2012, p. 17). Similarly, although the original intention of the video made by the Toronto teen of his Azorean-speaking grandmother was to ridicule, Da Silva (2015) notes that the responses to her language and behavior are incredibly mixed, with the largest grouping of comments quoting the grandmother's language and showing enthusiasm for it, with a much smaller percentage ridiculing her for her variety of Portuguese. The second largest type of comments reflected general pride in being Portuguese, indicating that the value of the video was not so much about valuing certain varieties of Portuguese, but more about reminding Canadians of their transnational identities, heritage, and family ties. Likewise, with regard to the "Asians in the library" video discussed by Yamaguchi (2013), a number of viewers responded to the video by producing their own parodic versions of it, thereby resemiotizing the racist portrayals in the original video, which included critiquing the original video producer's ways of talking, dressing, and behaving. Another example includes Chun's (2013) analysis of YouTube star Kevin Wu's appropriation of "linguistic blackness," with some viewers responding to his performance as inauthentic posturing while others saw it as a legitimate embodiment of acting black that heightened Wu's masculinity and coolness. In sum, rather than merely reproducing harmful stereotypes that represent the Other as uncivilized, these videos "thrive on the tension between disparagement, on the one hand, and ambiguity and polyvalence, on the other" (Leppänen & Häkkinen 2012, p. 27).

While all of these examples provide cases in which the popular response from viewers was the key location for an alternate, and often positive spin on the social media content, we seek to investigate whether the production of social media content itself can resemiotize languages that have been marginalized in a more positive light. To that end, and based on our ongoing interest in analyzing the sociolinguistics of languages which have been devalued and stigmatized (Higgins, 2015; Higgins et al., 2012; Higgins & Furukawa, 2012), we chose to analyze videos about Pidgin (Hawai'i Creole) and Konglish (Korean English) to see whether and to what degree social media might provide new affordances for representing, and even valorizing, sociolinguistic diversity by studying how video producers (dis)identify with mainstream metapragmatic messages, or ideological statements about language. These two languages are widely used in their respective societies but are usually seen as forms of 'broken English' that are best avoided if one wishes to speak like an 'educated' person who uses 'proper' or 'correct' English (Ahn, 2014; Higgins et al., 2012). These languages are also nonetheless increasingly recognized in popular press materials and on the Internet, where YouTube videos, websites, and social media sites such as Facebook not only acknowledge their existence but also serve as a resource for people who want to share their interest in these languages.[1] Amateur online

---

[1] Resources for Konglish include websites (http://leonsplanet.com/konglish.htm (accessed April 15, 2016) and http://www.connectkorea.com/korean-konglish-definitive-guide/) (accessed April 15, 2016). Websites that host online Pidgin-English dictionaries include (http://www.e-hawaii.com/pidgin, http://www.eyeofhawaii.com/Pidgin/pidgin.htm) (accessed April 15, 2016). Popular publications about Pidgin

dictionaries and wordlists teach newcomers key vocabulary and comment on how to use Konglish or Pidgin in pragmatically appropriate ways. These are arguably examples of how social media can provide spaces for disidentifications with hegemonic language ideologies.  In other cases, however, discussions of Konglish and Pidgin serve only to mock people who use these varieties and to reinscribe the dominant deficiency discourses into the normative metapragmatics surrounding these languages. The two videos that we analyze in this chapter came to our attention since they both provide language 'instruction' aimed at outsiders, which implies that learning or knowing these languages is something valuable. Of course, it is important to note that, because of their location on social media, this so-called instruction is imbued with humor and entertainment value, which calls into question the purely pedagogical value of the videos. Hence, social media can paradoxically provide a space that both acknowledges and validates these languages while also producing comedic and negative portrayals of them (Chun, 2013; Kytölä, 2012). How the producers and consumers of these language lessons manage this tension is our focus.

## 2. Metapragmatics, non-standardized languages, and social media

*Metapragmatics* refers to how language use itself becomes an object of discourse (Silverstein, 1993) and is a foundational concept in the process of language standardization and language marginalization. Agha (2003) demonstrates this in his analysis of Received Pronunciation (RP), which transitioned from a regional variety used by socio-economically privileged speakers to an idealized, stable variety. This transformation was due in part to processes such as popular novels that valorized RP and portrayed heroic characters as being hard working and deserving of socio-economic mobility. On the other hand, metapragmatics is also essential in understanding how non-standard language varieties can gain prestige or acquire new indexicalities, whether through social media or other contexts. For example, associations with the dialect known as Pittsburghese were originally geographical, but new indexicalities developed when a significant number of the city's residents became upwardly mobile and moved away, thus making the Pittsburgh dialect strongly associated with the city's working class population. After several decades of greater mobility and increased heterogeneity due to in-migration, many of these same features became treated as important identity markers for claiming authenticity and belonging, without necessarily marking class. These features are now celebrated in popular products such as t-shirts and popular press about the dialect. This metapragmatic attention to Pittsburghese has thus changed Pittsburghese from a working-class dialect to a source for identity-making and local pride (Johnstone, Andrus & Danielson, 2006).

As discussed in the introductory sections of this chapter, a growing body of research has demonstrated how social media provides a space where metapragmatic discourse illuminates language attitudes, language prestige, and language and identity relations in new ways (Seargeant & Tagg, 2014). The high degree of entextualization and resemiotization in social media may explain why there can be so much attention to how people use language in the form of metapragmatic discourse. Heyd (2014) notes that new forms of linguistic gatekeeping are also now possible because of *digital enregisterment*, or "processes through which a linguistic repertoire becomes differentiable within a language as a socially recognized register of forms" (Agha 2003, p. 231) through digital means.  In Heyd's study, participants made fun of unnecessary quotes and missing apostrophes on signs and in public texts through photo

---

include *Pidgin to Da Max* (Simonson, Sakata & Sasaki, 1981) and a grassroots-based dictionary *Da Kine Dictionary* (Tonouchi, 2005).

blogs where they attributed these forms with people who lack sophistication, awareness, and basic grammar. While prescriptivism has historically been an institution-sanctioned practice, social media provides new affordances for what she terms "grassroots prescriptivism." Kytölä and Westinen (2015) also examine linguistic gatekeeping in their study of Finland-based internet football forums, with attention to tensions between dismissing linguistic innovations on social media and adopting them. They investigate how social media participants not only comment on football, but also police the boundaries of pragmatically appropriate forms of multilingualism by commenting on tweets by Mikael Forssell, a football professional who re-entextualizes English associated with African American culture and youth culture into his messages. Many of the football fans who followed Forssell disliked this practice and commented, often sarcastically, on the acceptability and authenticity of his tweets, which they characterized as too 'gangsta,' or only appropriate for much younger people. However, others liked and respected this social media style, even adopting it for their own use.

In examining YouTube videos on Konglish and Pidgin, we suggest that the very act of providing any form of language awareness or 'instruction' for these stigmatized languages represents a form of metadiscourse that has the capacity to resemiotize the dominant representation of these languages as illegitimate and unworthy of knowing. We are also sensitive to the likelihood of parody, a common feature of entextualization and resemioticization in social media.  Therefore, in our analysis, we pay attention to how the producers *stylize* (Coupland, 2007) these languages with attention to whether it results in legitimating languages or mocking them.  Stylization is "the knowing deployment of culturally familiar styles and identities that are marked as deviating from those predictably associated with the current speaking context" (Coupland 2001, p. 245).  Through exaggeration and focusing on features of language that are considered social markers and social stereotypes, stylization offers producers and audiences the chance to exploit the meanings for entertainment and/or incisive critique (Labov, 1966). The two videos also contain examples of what we will refer to as *counter-stylization*, whereby standardized or dominant forms of English are mocked and exaggerated in order to highlight the importance and legitimacy of Pidgin or Konglish. We use this new term to draw attention to the ways that stylization can call into question metapragmatic regimes that position dominant languages such as mainstream (i.e., white, upper class) versions of American English as superior to other languages and as the ideal variety of English. Social media is a key resource in providing a space for this counter-stylization due to its capacity for re-entextualization and resemioticization.


## 3. The sociolinguistic contexts of Pidgin and Konglish

From a linguistic perspective, Pidgin is an English-lexified creole, with its own grammatical system distinct from English, and Konglish is a variety of English comprised mainly of lexical and phonological innovations that make it distinct from mainstream, standardized varieties that are associated with upper class, educated, and usually white speakers of English in countries like the U.S. and the U.K.  From a social perspective, both of these languages are marginalized because of the widespread view that they are 'broken' Englishes or deviations from 'proper' English. Nevertheless, speakers in Hawai'i and South Korea treat these languages as important for local identity and express that they are necessary linguistic resources for navigating daily life (Ahn, 2014; Marlow & Giles, 2008). Social media provides a platform where the statuses and values of these languages are created and resemiotized in potentially emancipatory ways.

*Pidgin (Hawai'i Creole)*

The language commonly referred to as Pidgin in Hawai'i is a creole language that emerged on sugar plantations between 1880 and the turn of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, when indentured laborers chiefly from China, Portugal, Japan, and the Philippines toiled together side by side. Pidgin first became a language of political and social struggle at the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, soon after Hawai'i was annexed as a territory of the U.S. As large numbers of Pidgin speaking children entered public schools, white American residents felt that their children were in jeopardy linguistically and culturally. They convinced the government to establish a segregated schooling system known as the English Standard Schools (Benham & Heck, 1998). Admission to these schools was contingent on an English oral language test, and children who failed the test were enrolled in regular public schools. Even though Pidgin was the norm on plantation camps, negative attitudes toward the language became widespread during the 1930s due to the segregated schooling system. Many people (especially middle-aged and older adults) in Hawai'i still tap into the deficiency discourses that are rooted in the plantation history of the islands, where Pidgin was first understood as 'broken' English (Romaine 1999, p. 288). At the same time, however, it is important to acknowledge that Pidgin is a vehicle for expressing both covert and overt forms of prestige, both in conversation and in the semiotic landscape of Hawai'i, where this historically marginalized language is continually resemiotized as valuable, as shown by its widespread use in advertisements, political campaigns, messages about protecting the environment, radio broadcasts, and more (Higgins, 2015; Hiramoto, 2011). Pidgin is a marker of local identity and it distinguishes the residents of Hawai'i from the many visitors and newcomers who populate the state. For many, it is the medium of communication in homes, churches, and at work, and it is a strong feature of personal expression in the form of slogans on t-shirts and bumper stickers, and in written form in local literature and advertising (Hiramoto, 2011). Out of the blue in 2015, and with no consultation by linguists in Hawai'i, the U.S. Census Bureau added Pidgin to the list of languages that people in Hawai'i could claim on the state census after a five-year survey had been conducted on bilingual speakers. This led to a flurry of news coverage and social media commentary about the surprising change, though it was also noted that people underreported their ability to speak Pidgin on the census, with only 1,275 people identifying as speakers, despite an estimation of 500,000 speakers in the state (Sakoda & Siegel, 2003).

While English forms much of the vocabulary basis of Pidgin, Hawaiian, which is the state's co-official language,[2] with English, has had a significant impact on its grammatical structures. Cantonese and Portuguese also shape the grammar, while English, Hawaiian, Portuguese, and Japanese influence the vocabulary the most (Sakoda & Siegel, 2003). Contemporary language use in Hawai'i is characterized by a high degree of linguistic fluidity between English and Pidgin, and many people's linguistic repertoires are better described as translingual or simply as "talking local" (Higgins et al., 2012).

*Konglish*

---

[2] Spurred by the U.S. Civil Rights Movement of the 1960s, a cultural and political Hawaiian Renaissance developed in the early 1970s and led to the establishment of Hawaiian as an official language of the state in 1978. This paved the way for Hawaiian language revitalization programs, including the establishment of Hawaiian immersion schools. There are now more than 10,000 immersion school graduates (Marlow & Giles, 2006).

The term "Konglish" refers to the use of words derived from English as used by South Koreans, and to the L2 production of English in South Korea (Lee, 2014; Nam, 2010). Konglish is a term that is widely used among Koreans and circulates in opposition to 'authentic' English, which typically means American English in a country whose economic policies and political strategies are heavily influenced by the U.S.. As the value of American English and oral communication skills are now highly emphasized in educational and job markets, many Koreans seek more exposure to American English and strive to speak it in a way that exhibits no traces of Korean (Kim, 2013). In this context of neoliberal competition, 'authentic' English takes a central role in the "English fever" that has gripped Korean society for the last two decades. While speaking American English indexes a modern and global social orientation for its speakers, Konglish is metapragmatically represented in popular culture and media as living a provincial life that is limited to Korea (Park, 2009).

English is embedded in a web of complex metapragmatic discourses in Korea. On the one hand, English has acquired new ideologies associated with modernity and global cosmopolitanism, and therefore English in Korea has also become an index of modernity, power, and high class. On the other hand, the ability to speak American English can also carry negative connotations since sounding too American conveys pretentiousness or immodesty, characteristics which are at odds with the traditional Korean cultural value of humility (Park, 2009). In this vein, English proficiency is now widely understood by researchers, politicians, and citizens alike as a social class divider since it is a key marker for upward mobility in Korean society (Lee, 2010; Song, 2007). Much of the *linguistic schizophrenia* (Kachru, 1977) of Konglish is due to the politics of location. In a recent study exploring attitudes towards Konglish among Korean and non-Korean teachers in Korea, Ahn (2014) found that many teachers have positive attitudes towards it due to its intelligibility among Koreans and its widespread use. However, most remain largely conflicted about it since they perceive English as a language to be used with Americans, who are themselves perceived as expecting Koreans to speak American English. Media uses of Konglish further complexify the social meanings of Konglish since, like Pidgin, Konglish is often part of a comical persona in Korean comedy shows that relates Konglish to general incompetence and lack of sophistication. At the same time, however, research on transnational Koreans' English usage in the presence of other Korean nationals has demonstrated that accents which sound 'too American' are also problematic (Park, 2004). Clearly, one's location and one's conception of who language is for is at the heart of metapragmatics of Konglish.

## 4. Analysis of videos

For data collection and selection, we first identified YouTube videos that sought to 'teach' some aspects of Pidgin and Konglish to outsiders. There are only a handful of these 'instructional' videos for each language. For Konglish, the typical genre of the few existing videos is for a Korean-speaking person to 'test' their knowledge of Konglish words among native speakers of English who are unfamiliar with Konglish. The Konglish words typically bewilder them, thereby demonstrating the distinct nature of Konglish words and meanings.[3] For Pidgin, the videos typically involve a person from Hawai'i reading a list of Pidgin words and providing the equivalents in English to the viewing audience, with some commentary. Additional videos also exist in which local people discuss Pidgin

---

[3] See "Ask Hyojin: How much Konglish do you understand?" on the *Talk To Me In Korean* YouTube channel and "What Foreigners Think of Korean Style English" (https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=hQuJwjAnWHA) (accessed 4/15/16) on the Asian Boss channel.

from a historical and political context while giving examples of Pidgin as they go.[4]  Due to limitations in space, we present our analysis of one video for each language. The videos were posted between 2012-2013 and had received over 50,000 views each (as of March 1, 2016).

To analyze the videos, we transcribed them and then focused our attention on 1) how linguistic differences were presented; and 2) how authenticity in the form of stylization played a role in depicting the languages and their speakers in a positive, negative, or ambiguous light. We were especially interested to see whether the videos attempted to challenge mainstream discourses of deficiency tied to these languages through resemiotization. In addition to analyzing the transcripts of the interviews, we paid attention to overt comments provided through on-screen writing, which, in the Konglish video in particular, provided us with insights into the producer's stance toward Konglish vis-à-vis mainstream American English.

### 4.1 Teaching Pidgin on YouTube

The first video we analyzed is a 5-minute comedic video titled "Pidgin vs. English," posted in 2012 by 2dudes1car[5].  A sequel[6] was also posted in 2012, but we do not have the space to analyze it here.  In their description of the video, the two producers, who refer to themselves as 2dudes1car and whose lesson is partly filmed while they are driving a car, state that the video can be used as a Pidgin 101 (i.e., introductory) language lesson. Both men exhibit high proficiency in Pidgin, though they do stylize it in the videos.  We have little information about the producers of this video. Based on brief digital communications with the producers, we learned that the first of the duo appearing in the video, whom we have called Dude1, is a native Pidgin speaker, while Dude2 is a second language speaker, having acquired the language as an adult after moving to Hawai'i from American Samoa. At the beginning of the video, they state that viewers will learn basic Pidgin phrases: "even you will be able to speak Pidgin basics," constructing the audience as not yet able to speak basic Pidgin.  Despite this, the comments from viewers are only from Pidgin speakers, often in Pidgin, and largely positive towards Pidgin. Representative comments were:

- *Brah, dis had me crying. Fricking hilarious! :D* ('Dude, this had me crying. Fucking hilarious!')
- *Yeah I no need one lesson I speak pidgin all da time"* ('I don't need a lesson I speak Pidgin all the time).
- *So wat Aunty get chance??? CLASSIC!!! LMFAO* ('What do you think, miss, are you sexually attracted to me???' [the commenter is quoting the video] Classic!!! Laughing my fucking ass off')

*Stylizing linguistic differences*

---

[4] See *The Daily Pidgin* YouTube channel (https://www.youtube.com/user/ToolinAroundHI), hosted by comic Andy Bumatai and "How fo' talk Pidgin" https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=GLmfQSR3EI0 (both accessed 4/15/16).

[5] "Pidgin vs. English" (https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=du6_XvsP_i4) (accessed 8/4/2015) on the Twodudes Onecar channel.

[6] "Pidgin vs. English" Part II https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=3_Eb3cmdoBw (accessed 8/22/2015) on the TwodudesOnecar channel.

The title of "Pidgin vs. English" sets up a basic dichotomy that forms the basis of the video's structure. Differences include the sequential structuring of the video itself, the lexical choices used in translation humor, performative qualities such as sentence final intonation, pitch and stress-rhythm (here indicated with [/]), and utterance length. By using these resources, 2dudes1car are able to exaggerate, or stylize the differences between Pidgin and English, which certainly enhances its entertainment value. In presenting our transcription of the videos, we use text boxes to frame language that appeared in written form on the videos between the scenes. Visual aspects of the videos are indicated in double parentheses. We also make use of eye dialect, an orthographic representation of Pidgin (and later, Konglish) based on popular press and social media norms. We chose to avoid more technical transcription styles for ease of reading and because it was in alignment with how the video makers themselves represented the language. Finally, Pidgin and Konglish appear in italics for ease of identification.

The first extract teaches *da kine*, which is a Pidgin term that is a rough equivalent of 'watchamacallit,' and which can be used as a non-specific reference for a person or thing that is shared knowledge among speakers. *Da kine* is probably the most iconic Pidgin expression in Hawaiʻi.

After a brief written introduction and 'dictionary' definition of *da kine*, the sequence of Pidgin and English comparisons begins. Dude1, speaking on the phone, gives the English question *Have you seen Johnny?,* which is then followed by Dude2, who gives the Pidgin equivalent, *Eh, you wen see da kine?* in line 2. This standard sequence pair format continues throughout the entire video, reproducing the dichotomy of the two languages.

Extract 1. *Da Kine*

---

CHAPTER 1

DAKINE

(duh kai-n) Much like the word Aloha, da kine has multiple definitions, meanings, and uses. It si (sic) the key stone of Pidgin. It can be used anywhere, anytime, anyhow.

---

((a white man portrayed by Dude1 is on the phone))

1    Dude1:Have you seen John↑ny?

((scene fades, Dude2, who has brown skin and several piercings – and whose appearance might be seen as more prototypically local— is sitting at the same desk on the phone))

2    Dude2: *Eh, you wen see ↑da ↓kine?*

((scene change, character change))

3        Dude2: Hey, did you watch that show last ↑night?

((scene change, character change))

4        Dude1: *Eh, you wen spark ↑da ↓kine?*

((scene change, Dude1 leaning over desk speaking to off camera))

5        Dude1: Have you eaten at that u:h new restaurant ↑yet?

((scene change, Dude 2 leaning over desk speaking to off camera))

6        D2: *You wen sample ↑da ↓kine?*

((scene change, both dudes leaning over a safe))

7        D2: Have you tried checking the batter↑ies?

8        D1: *YOU TRY CHECK ↑DA ↓KINE?*

((scene change, Dude1 leaning on desk, speaking on phone))

9

D1: Okay yeah, yeah I see. Can you tell me how to get there from ↑here?

((scene change, Dude2 leaning on desk, speaking on phone))

10      D2: *Eh, uh wea stay ↑da ↓kine?*

((scene change, Dude2 sitting at desk eating))

11      D2: Whoa, this is <u>really</u> good.

((scene change, Dude1 sitting at desk eating))

12      D1: Ho, (smacks mouth) *dis da <u>kine</u>.*

*Stylizing lexical, semantic, and prosodic differentiation*

The video's motif is that Pidgin and English are different, sometimes comically so. The Pidgin term *da kine* can be used as a pronoun, pro-verb, or pro-adjective. In the case of Extract 1, every Pidgin example is using the term as a pronoun except for the final sequence pair. Despite the fact that pronouns are quite abundant in English, the video only uses specific noun phrases and proper nouns in the English examples, resulting in a stylization of English as more specific and lengthy than Pidgin. Nouns and noun phrases such as Johnny in line 1, *that show* in line 3 or *that new restaurant* in line 5 are made to stand out in sharp contrast to the use of *da kine* as a pronoun.

The linguistic difference is further increased by other lexical choices used in some of the Pidgin halves of the sequence pairs. In the second pair, 2dudes1car specifically use terms that are *bivalent* (Woolard, 1999), existing simultaneously in both Pidgin and English, yet having different semantic values. For example, in the Pidgin translation of line 4, Dude1 uses the verb *spark* rather than using a verb like *see*. Both verbs are English and Pidgin bivalent but *see* has similar semantic values in English and Pidgin while *spark* does not. Similarly, the word *sample* is used as a Pidgin translation for the English verb *eaten*. Although it is perfectly fine to say *you wen eat da kine* ('did you eat there?') in Pidgin, the item marking greater linguistic difference is consistently selected, thereby stylizing Pidgin as well.

In addition, contrasts are made through prosody. One of the more distinct qualities about Pidgin is the use of rising-falling intonation at the end of sentences to signal a yes-no question (Sakoda & Siegel, 2003, p. 30). This intonation is extremely important in Pidgin because there is no syntactic difference between questions and statements unless pronouns such as *who* or *what* are used.  Throughout Extract 1, nearly all English questions are given with a single rising tone on the final syllable, and they are all syntactically structured as questions. Although it is quite possible in colloquial English to ask questions that are syntactically the same as statements, syntactic inversion is used to create English questions, once again stylizing English as consistently different from Pidgin.


*'Short' and 'long' languages*

The metapragmatic discourse of Pidgin utterances as short and English utterances as long is often mentioned in discussions about Pidgin (Tonouchi, 2004), and this assessment of Pidgin is often used as reasoning for why Pidgin is 'broken' English.  In "Pidgin vs. English," longer English utterances often use a type of *stylized native speaker English* (Furukawa, 2015), one that is hypercorrect and unnecessarily wordy. A simple example of this kind of stylized English can be seen in line 9 above, where "from here" is superfluous in the sentence "Can you tell me how to get there from here."

Similar stylizations regarding length are found in the video's lesson on Pidgin *shoots,* a term that indicates agreement or alignment, but which can also be used to offer thanks or to say farewell. In this video, short English exchanges and sentences are followed by Pidgin translations utilizing the word *shoots*, typically preceded by *ho*, an emphatic marker.

Extract 2. *Shoots!*

35     D2:     Hey man I got this extra burger you want it?

36     D1:     Hey. Sure thanks man, right on.

                  (scene change)

37     D1:     *Eh, you like dis?*

38     D2:     *Ho shoo:ts.*

                  (scene change)

39     D2:     Hey they're selling limited edition Sponge Bob cards at the mall. Do you want

40             to go?

41     D1:     What? I'm in. Let's go. That sounds great ((walks out door))

                  (scene change)

42     D1:     *Eh you like go mall?*

43     D2:     *Ho shoo:ts.* ((walks out door))

The Pidgin sentence in line 37 is purposefully short due to the use of the pronominal *dis*. On the other hand, the English question in line 39 is made purposefully long due to the detailed context provided, whereas the Pidgin version in line 42 lacks any such content. The use of short sentences, pronominals, and missing (or assumed) context stylizes Pidgin as a strongly high-context language (Hall, 1976) in which speakers do not ever need to spell things out. As such, it depicts Pidgin as the unmarked code, and as a language that is more straightforward and efficient, but also overly simple. In contrast, English is counter-stylized portrayed as marked, circuitous and laborious, a portrayal which resemiotizes English as a language associated with negative qualities.

*Authentic Pidgin; ridiculous English*

Stylization takes a central role in establishing Pidgin as the authentic language of the common person. Pidgin is portrayed as genuine while English, and English speakers, are counter-stylized. In lines making the focus of the activity going out to buy "limited edition Sponge Bob cards," 2dudes1car construct the image of English speakers as being childish and unmanly. The concept of limited edition cards indexes the hobby of collecting while the use of the character Sponge Bob, the main character of a cartoon series aimed towards very young children, makes the hobby seem particularly ridiculous and unrealistic. In line with this, Dude1 is presented as an overeager nerd through his string of responses marking enthusiasm in line 41 ("I'm in, let's go, that sounds great"). With the constructed English-

Pidgin dichotomy, English is resemiotized as superstandard and lacking in masculinity when compared to colonialist metadiscourse found in various representations of Hawai'i that portray Local Pidgin speakers as uncivilized, brutish Others (Higgins & Furukawa, 2012). The masculinity of Pidgin is iconicized in the terms *moke* ('tough local man'), and *tita*, ('tough local woman, tomboy') (Meyerhoff, 2004), two terms which are strongly associated with speaking Pidgin and exhibiting strength, defiance, and local pride.

Extract 3 taken from the "Pidgin vs. English" video displays a significant amount of profanity, which is quite common in Pidgin translation humor and visible in the form of Pidgin t-shirts and bumper stickers in Hawai'i.[7] In line 45, Dude1 uses clean language to encourage his friend to go to a party. However, the Pidgin version that follows contains two uses of *faka* ('fucker') followed by English "fuck." The high proportion of curse words per utterance here portrays Pidgin as a way of talking with a primal, limited vocabulary and depicts Pidgin speakers as pushy and coarse since the 'encouragement' is constructed through a command *("you gotta go brah")* and a warning *("Faka no ack faka")*. In contrast, the English version is much less pushy not only since it lacks profanity, but also because it takes the form of a question that shows some deference to the fictional interlocutor, Manny.

Extract 3. Missing a Party

45     D1:    Oh Manny, you gotta go. You can't make it?

               (scene change)

46     D2:    *Brah, you gotta go. What you mean you no can go. You gotta go brah, dis*

47               *party's for you brah. Faka no ack you faka*. ('Fucker, don't play dumb, you

48               fucker') Fuck. *Shoots.*

In other similar segments, sexual euphemisms in English are clearly replaced with overt sexual terms. Since 2dudes1car are aiming to entertain, it is not surprising that their videos contain sexual content; however, they present Pidgin speakers as totally unconcerned with propriety, which is of course a stylization. In Extract 4, the euphemism "go back to my place" is replaced with the over the top Pidgin term *breed*. While the English version in line 54 is spoken with a feeling of containment, there is a high level of affect in the Pidgin version through Dude1's head movement and ardent smile.

Extract 4 Pick-up Lines

The scrub

54     D2: What do you say we get out of here, go back to my place?

---

[7] The expression *Wot u faka* ('what are you looking at you fucker?!') is found with numerous spellings on t-shirts and bumper stickers.

55    D1: *Wot?* ((nods head up as a confirmation check)). *Breed?* ((smiles))

      ((car drives up))

56    D2: *Ho auntie, get chance? No? K.*

57    ((laughter is heard off camera))

Line 54 is a stereotypical, and even smarmy, invitation to a romantic encounter. These multiple word clauses are replaced in the first Pidgin translation with two single word clauses. Reducing the number of words so dramatically underscores the crudeness of the invitation to *"breed."* In addition the use of *"wot"* in line 55 gives the Pidgin a sense of belligerence and aggressiveness while the verb *breed* turns the English romantic invitation into a Pidgin invitation to sexual intercourse. This shift stylizes the Pidgin speaker as highly sexual. These elements combine together to create an image of Pidgin users that is filled with a visceral sex drive. In contrast, English speakers are counter-stylized as repressive or weak in their expression of sexual desire. At the same time, the specter of Orientalist characterizations is also present in the characterizations of Pidgin speakers as crude, aggressive, and sexual, thereby making it difficult to say that in this particular instance that Pidgin is resemiotized in a better metapragmatic light, a reminder of the polyvalence of social media representations (Leppänen & Häkkinen, 2012, see also Westinen this volume).

### 4.2 Teaching Konglish on YouTube

Next, we analyze a 7-minute video entitled *CRAP SALAD? Why you must know Konglish*[8]*,* produced and posted in 2013 by Professor Oh, an alias for Korean-American Mina Oh. Due to Oh's more extensive social media presence, we know more about her than we do for the *Pidgin vs. English* video. Oh was born and raised in California and began her YouTube journey by providing simple lessons for teaching the Korean alphabet, with her first video posted in 2008. She has continuously produced videos on Korean language and Korean culture through her YouTube Channel named *Sweet and Tasty TV*, which had more than 1.5 million views and more than 140,000 subscribers as of March 30, 2016.

Oh scripts, films, edits, and produces video series called *Korean Word of the Week*, or KWOW. All of her videos examine Korean language, culture, and travel. Oh says," my goal is to make my lessons and KWOW episodes as friendly and fun possible" (interview by Japan Cinema, episode 132 of "Creative Spotlight" 6/19/2012). Professor Oh is the main host of the show, but she embodies different characters by using wigs, makeup and clothing. The different characters represent different genders, ages, and interests, and though their speech styles differ in terms of pitch and prosody, they are all depicted as users of Konglish. In the particular episode focusing on Konglish, the characters featured are Professor Oh, Granny Kim, who is a hip hopping gangster grandmother who speaks very slowly and creakily, and Billy Jin, a young woman who wants to be a K-pop super star.

In the first moments of the the video, Professor Oh addresses her target audience as English speakers who are interested in learning more about visiting Korea. She explains that everyone visiting Korea or

---

[8] CRAP SALAD!? Why you must know Konglish (KWOW #85) (https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=oc0hmZP66Rc) (accessed on 8/4/2015) on sweetandtasty TV channel.

wishing to communicate more with Koreans in the U.S. needs to know some Konglish. Throughout the video, Professor Oh relates the language to both English and Korean within the framework of an English-speaking audience. She moves between showing Konglish as illegitimate (grammatically incorrect and not acceptable by English speakers) to legitimate (a variety of English and widely used in Korea), asserting that it is valuable to learn and not just something to laugh at. The viewers' comments generally align with the expected audience, appear in English, Korean, and Konglish, and are largely positive toward the messages. Many commentators posted their favorite words, which included but were not limited the Konglish words taught in the video. A significant number posted metapragmatic comments about the origins of Konglish, and occasional comments posed questions about Korean language and culture. Several representative comments appear below:

- My favorite konglish word is crap salad.
- My fav. Konglish is "kissuh" and "datuh" often said in Korean Dramas, meaning "kiss" and "date". So cute! Saranghe Korea!!! Saranghe Prof. O. (authors' note: saranghe = Korean for 'I love you')
- nobody's perfect, so just laugh at our own mistakes, remember; laughter is the best medicine! fighting! (fighting = Konglish for a cheer associated with sports; 'go team')

*Konglish as a triple-edged sword*

The video begins with a screen that portrays Professor Oh's various characters and states "Visiting Korea? You must know Konglish!," which clearly establishes the audience as non-knowers of Konglish and begins a metapragmatic construction of Konglish as necessary and important. The first moments of the video then address the thorny question of what Konglish is exactly. In line 4, she ventriloquizes the assumed viewer's thought processes, which is emphasized by the screen text KONGLISH?, which refers to the viewer's supposed lack of familiarity with this term.

Extract 5. What's Konglish?


| KONGLISH? |
| --- |


1  Oh:    Are you or someone you know visiting Korea?

2         Or maybe you're just stopping by your local Korean market.

3         If you don't know Korean, at least learn some Konglish.

4         "What's Konglish?" you ask.

5         The simplest way put, Konglish is Korean English.

6         You gotta know this sub-language because it's widely used in Korean culture.

7         And just because you know English doesn't mean you know Konglish.

8         It helps to know English, but Konglish is not 100% English!

9        Konglish is its own animal.

10       One that you need to tame.

11       Or else it's going to bite you.

In contrast to the dichotomy presented for Pidgin by 2dudes1car, Professor Oh portrays Konglish as typologically English, yet one that is "its own animal." While academic studies on Konglish focus on comparing Konglish to (authentic or 'correct' forms of) English (e.g., Ahn, 2014), Professor Oh draws three partly overlapping and conflicting metapragmatic evaluations about Konglish into play: 1) Konglish is Korean English; 2) Konglish is not entirely English; and 3) Konglish is a sub-language. To emphasize its own characteristics and social importance, she uses the metaphor of "its own animal," which emphasizes the distinctive nature of Konglish and which imbues it with a 'wild' quality. It also implies that "you" (the audience) need to domesticate and train it (i.e., learn it) because of its own characteristics. This metaphor also entails that not learning Konglish will lead to a trouble ("it's going to bite you"). While this presents Konglish in a humorous frame, portraying the language variety as uncouth or uncivilized (similar to Pidgin), it is polyvalent since it also suggests that Konglish is necessary for survival.

Professor Oh's use of "you" in the video helps to clarify who is in her target audience and to relate her mostly positive Konglish 'lesson' to their assumed metapragmatic stance toward Konglish.

Extract 6. Koreanizations

1 Oh:  Some Koreanizations sound funny to you, right?

2        Well, what can I say? ((shrugs shoulders)) It's mutual.

3        To Koreans, romanizations can sound super funny.

Here, she presumes that her audience will think Konglish is problematic because it "sounds funny." She defends Koreans and Konglish by turning the tables and notes that for Koreans, romanizations of Korean also sound problematic, which is a counter-stylization that questions the usual practice of Americans passing linguistic judgments on Korean varieties of English. Professor Oh begins to make the case for respecting Konglish based on the idea of bidirectional respect (and bidirectional mockery), which is a basis for resemiotizing it.

*Highlighting structural differences in English and Konglish*

In line with many educational materials, the beginning of the video starts with easy examples and builds to more complicated ones. Professor Oh 'tests' the viewer by asking if they can guess what is meant by Konglish words such as *po-keu* ('fork') and then provides a comparison from mainstream U.S. English, thereby implicitly drawing attention to the sound substitutions and shortenings between these two varieties (see Table 1).

Table 1. Linguistic contrasts presented in *CRAP SALAD? Why you must know Konglish*

| Groups | English | Konglish |
|---|---|---|

| 1. Sound substitutions (same meaning) | dollar<br><br>party<br><br>banana<br><br>supermarket | 달러  dal-luh<br><br>파티  pa-tee<br><br>바나나  bah-nah-nah<br><br>슈퍼마켓 shu-puh-mah-ket |
|---|---|---|
| 2. Sound substitutions (different meaning) | fork<br><br>sign<br><br>fighting | 포크   po-keu (fork)<br><br>싸인   ssa-een (signature)<br><br>파이팅  hwa-e-ting (good luck) |
| 3. Shortenings | air conditioner<br><br>apartment<br><br>motocycle | 에어컨 eh-uh-cun<br><br>아파트 ah-pa-teu<br><br>오토바이 oh-toh-ba-ee |

Her examples draw attention to English sounds which do not exist in the Korean language (primarily /f/ and /r/), are unpronounced, or are pronounced in a "wrong" way in Konglish (e.g. "fork" /f/ → /p/, "fighting" /f/ → /h/). In Korea and among Koreans, these sound substitutions are marked and frequently used as resources for Korean humor to draw attention to a lack of sophistication (Park, 2009). However, Professor Oh patiently explains each item, resemiotizing the Koreanized version as legitimate and worth learning.

*Illegitimate Konglish*

Though the video takes pains to legitimize Konglish, Professor Oh includes a segment called "Epic Fail Konglish," a category that clearly delegitimizes at least some aspects of the English variety. The examples in this category are clearly presented as mistakes in written forms of English. Some of the examples are taken from Korean-owned shops in the U.S., while others are shown in Korean contexts. Three examples presented below are caused by misspellings due to Englishized Korean and translation errors.

The first example, "Charming cream butter" is a name of a popular Korean cracker (originally, 참 ing cream butter (/chaem/ meaning "truth" or "truly")) that is imported to Korean markets in the U.S. It also looks like an obvious misspelling of *charming* which is further troubled by the shortening of *butter* to *butt*, most likely due to a lack of space on the box. If one does not know Korean or has not eaten these crackers before, it is hard to understand the basis of this epic fail. Professor Oh voices the metapragmatic stance of the presumed viewer in line 1, which is echoed in textual format on the screen. She then advises the viewer to read the Korean (if they can), and she proceeds to correct their mistaken assumptions about the Konglish sign, even if it is an "epic fail" approximation of (American) English.

Extract 7. Charing Cream Butt

> (photo): 크라운 차밍 크림버터 Charing Cream Butt

1 Oh:        Are they selling cream to heal burnt rears?

> Are they selling cream to heal burnt rears?

2             Actually, read the Korean. It says cha-ming keu-reem buh-tuh.

3             Charming Cream Butter. It's a snack to relieve your sweet tooth, not your charred

4             butt.

Professor Oh reads the Korean sign with vowel epenthesis to emphasize the clarity of the original name of the snack. This example presents how Korean knowledge serves as part of understanding the Konglish writing in the U.S. context. This type of Konglish is illegitimate, but it is an embarrassing 'mistake' only for people who do not have any Korean linguistic knowledge.

In other cases, however, Professor Oh critiques Konglish that is clearly the result of poor translation and does not attempt to challenge the presumed negative interpretation of viewers. In including additional examples such as those found in Extract 8 as "Konglish," this has the effect of illegitimating Konglish. Here, she dramatizes the example of bad translation by taking on the character of Billy Jin, a young Korean woman who is aspiring to be a K-pop star (this is a recurring character in all of her sketches). Billy Jin is a stylized character in every sense: she is a fashionable 'airhead' with voluminous, blonde hair who speaks with a very high pitch and blinks a great deal to express her confusion about everything. In Extract 8, Billy Jin shares her experiences of getting confused by the Konglish statements on a cosmetic product.

Extract 8

1     BJ:    There's the eyeglash glue that I get all the time.

> Eyeglash!? New Konglish!?

2     BJ:    I'm still trying to figure out the Konglish on it. Maybe you can help me! ((reads)):

> It is possible that the Eyelashes adhesive is harmless for health.

> ?!

3       BJ:      The more I read it the more confused I get! ((blinks eyes many times))

Here, Konglish is treated as an umbrella term that includes mistakes and misspellings, rather than the more linguistically informed approach taken earlier. Through taking on the character of Billie Jin, Oh constructs this Konglish as a language spoken by an airhead. Metapragmatic evaluations of this form of Konglish are also created through the on-screen comments, which appear to show the viewer's stance toward this "Konglish" as questionable and suprising. Other examples of this type include the use of *crap salad*, a famous 'mispronunciation' of *crab* so widely used in Korea that it serves as the title of the video. In explaining this Konglish item, Professor Oh labels it clearly as a misspelling, or as bad English. Overall, the different examples show that there is some authentic Konglish that is perfectly fine and ought to be respected (see examples in Table 1) as in shortened words, for example. *Apato* (presented as "ah-pa-teu" in the video), referring to an apartment building, a shortened form of "apartment," is widely used in Korea without any problem. While this word is equally Korean and Konglish, the point is that some localized forms are deemed fine while others are not. The problem in metapragmatics that arises here (and in other contexts) is that both are called Konglish, which may well have a negative effect on the 'legitimate' forms of Konglish.

*Everyone makes mistakes: A call for linguistic equality*

In the final scene of the video, Professor Oh reverses the tables by rebuking her viewers in case they attempt to treat Konglish as deficient. In Extract 9, she explains "even native speakers make mistakes" and then draws attention to examples she has collected such as "Your Plan Cancelation," (exhibiting incorrect word order) and a sign with the 'error' of "9 days a week," perhaps as a hyperbolic claim of their dedication to their customers.

Extract 9  Turning the tables?

1      Oh:      But dear viewers, before you make fun of any Koreans, please remember that
2                even native English speakers make mistakes!

> on-screen: Bad English not limited to only Asians :)

3                Whether it's a mass email sent out by an American corporation.

> picture of text: Your Plan Cancelation

4      Oh:      Or the dollar store enlightening customers that there are now 9 days in a week.

> picture of text: "Open 9 Days a Week"

| 5 | Oh: | What I'm saying is, we all make mistakes. So let's have a friendly laugh and |
| 6 | | gently let the people know that crab is spelled with a b, not a p. |

Once again, and by comparison, this message has the potential to cast Konglish as based on mistakes similar to typos or a failure to copyedit properly in native speaker contexts. On the other hand, however, Professor Oh creates a metapragmatic equivalency with native speaker English by drawing attention to the fact that all speakers do in fact make mistakes, and that Konglish speakers should not be put under more scrutiny for being just like speakers of mainstream varieties of English. Rather than taking the stance that mistakes in Konglish are to be ridiculed, what stands out here is Professor Oh's call for non-Korean English users to respond in a more empathetic way that reflects intercultural awareness and respects diversity in English. Arguably, she is calling for a more affable intercultural stance that would involve a deeper understanding of different Englishes and a greater tolerance for variation, including mistakes. This is a far cry from treating Konglish as a deficient variety of English.

## 5. Discussion

In this chapter, we have compared two videos posted on YouTube that humorously teach marginalized languages to outsiders so that we could examine the metapragmatic messages they conveyed. On one hand, the very act of teaching these languages in any manner is arguably a resemiotization in that providing instruction presents them as languages that people need to learn, even from a humorous standpoint. Our in-depth analysis of the representations of the languages in the videos showed that both Pidgin and Konglish were presented as legitimate vis-à-vis standardized, mainstream (U.S.) English. Both videos resisted portraying Konglish or Pidgin as lesser versions of English by drawing attention to linguistic difference as a key feature that is not just highlighted but also valorized. Though it is unlikely that they planned to discuss linguistic structures in their video, 2dudes1car actually resemiotized Pidgin as a legitimate language by highlighting its structural differences with English, including differences in syntax, prosody, and utterance length. Similarly, Professor Oh legitimized Konglish by decoding its phonology and noting the importance of knowing Konglish for travel to Korea or interacting with Koreans in the U.S.

We found that the videos reproduce metapragmatic regimes that locate Pidgin and Konglish as subordinate through social stereotypes (Labov, 1966), but we also argued that through counter-stylization of mainstream English and the behavior associated with mainstream English speakers, this unidirectional subordination was in fact ultimately challenged in many instances. In the case of 2dudes1car, Pidgin speakers are, perhaps ironically, presented as foul-mouthed, unsophisticated people, a representation that seemingly perpetuates the enduring colonialist metadiscourse in Hawai'i which portrays local and Hawaiian people as the uncivilized Other in comparison to the refined English speaker. In contrast, English speakers are counter-stylized as immature and lacking in sensuality. In the case of Professor Oh, Konglish was sometimes treated as mistakes, but as mistakes that nevertheless ought to be given some respect since native speakers were also presented as making mistakes. In both cases, a discourse of deficiency was presented, but was then countered with a discourse of legitimacy and value, hence leading to ambiguous and polyvalent metapragmatic messages.

It is important to acknowledge the anti-hegemonic moves visible in both videos in the form of stylization and counter-stylization. Both videos use stylization to dichotomize the marginalized languages as polar opposites with reference to standardized American English, but this largely has the effect of legitimating them as their own linguistic systems, rather than characterizing them as failed

attempts at English. English itself is counter-stylized when it is presented as problematic for Korean society and depicted as a sign of inauthenticity and immaturity in Hawai'i. A necessary component for legitimating stigmatized languages appears to be the explicit questioning of the valorization of mainstream varieties of hegemonic languages in order to make space to value other languages. In future research on marginalized languages, we expect that stylization and counter-stylization may play a significant role in transforming discourses of deficiency and creating new metapragmatic regimes that circulate in social media and beyond which open up new spaces to value multilingualism.

In contexts like Hawai'i and Korea, where deference to mainstream Englishes has long held sway, it is significant when we are beginning to see glimpses of counter-stylization of English in the rather public forum that YouTube provides. As more videos are produced and published on YouTube and other similar platforms that show Koreans testing foreigners on their knowledge of Konglish, and as more lessons on Pidgin are posted for outsiders to not only be amused by but also learn from, the metapragmatic regime that positions mainstream American English as superior to these languages is contested, even if only in a small way. As social media take an increasingly central role in people's lives, it seems likely that platforms such as YouTube will have tremendous potential to influence metapragmatic regimes about language and to offer those who participate in social media with the opportunity to take up a myriad number of positions towards hegemonic representations of marginalized languages.

## References

Agha, A. (2003). The social life of cultural value. *Language & Communication*, *23*(3), 231-273.

Ahn, H. (2014). Teachers' attitudes towards Korean English in South Korea. *World Englishes, 33*(2), 195-222.

Androutsopoulos J. (2010). Localising the global on the participatory web. In N. Coupland (ed.) *Handbook of Language and Globalization* (pp. 203–231). Oxford: Blackwell,

Benham, M., & Heck, R. (1998). *Culture and educational policy in Hawai'i: The silencing of native voices.* Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Chun, E. (2013). Ironic blackness as masculine cool: Asian American language and authenticity on YouTube. *Applied Linguistics* 34(5), 592–612.

Coupland, N. (2007). *Style: Language variation and identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.

Da Silva, E. (2015). Humor (re)positioning ethnolinguistic ideologies: "You tink is funny?" *Language in Society* 44, 187–212.

Furukawa, G. (2015). "Cool" English: Stylized Native-Speaker English in Japanese television shows. *Multilingua, 34*(2), 265-291.

Georgakopoulou, A. (2014). Small stories transposition and social media: A micro-perspective on the 'Greek crisis' *Discourse Society* 25: 519-539.

Hall, E. T. (1976). *Beyond culture*. New York: Anchor.

Heyd, T. (2014). Folk-linguistic landscapes: The visual semiotics of digital enregisterment. *Language in Society*, *43*(05), 489-514.

Higgins, C. (2015). Earning capital in Hawai'i's linguistic landscape. In R. Rubdy (Ed.) *Unequal Englishes: The Politics of Englishes Today* (pp. 145-162). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Higgins, C., & Furukawa, G. (2012). Styling Hawai'i in Haolewood: White protagonists on a journey of self discovery. *Multilingua, 31*, 177-198.

Higgins, C., Nettell, R., Sakoda, K., & Furukawa, G. (2012). Beyond contrastive analysis and codeswitching: Student documentary filmmaking as a challenge to linguicism in Hawaii. *Linguistics and Education, 23*, 49-61.

Hiramoto, M. (2011). Consuming the consumers: Semiotics of Hawai'i Creole in advertisements. *Journal of Pidgin and Creole Languages*, *26*(2), 247-275.

Johnstone, B., Andrus, J., & Danielson, A. E. (2006). Mobility, indexicality, and the enregisterment of "Pittsburghese". *Journal of English Linguistics*, *34*(2), 77-104.

Kachru, B. B. (1977). Linguistic schizophrenia and language census: A note on the Indian situation. *Linguistics* 186, 17-32.

Kim, H. (2013). Huffing and Puffing about /f/-ing everything: Language ideologies and phonological borrowing in South Korea. M.A. thesis, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

Kytölä, S. (2012). Peer normativity and sanctioning of linguistic resources-in-use – on non-standard Englishes in Finnish football forums online. In J. Blommaert, S. Leppänen, P. Pahta & T. Räisänen (Eds.) *Dangerous Multilingualism: Northern Perspectives on Order, Purity and Normality* (pp. 228-260). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Kytölä, S. & Westinen, E. (2015). "I be da reel gansta"—A Finnish footballer's Twitter writing and metapragmatic evaluations of authenticity. *Discourse, Context & Media 8*, 6-19.

Labov, W. (1966). Hypercorrection by the lower middle class as a factor in linguistic change. In W. Bright (Ed.), *Sociolinguistics: Proceedings of the UCLA Sociolinguistics Conference, 1964*. (pp. 84–113). The Hague: Mouton.

Lee, H. (2010). "I am a *Kirogi* mother, so this is my job, NOT father's!": Education exodus and life transformation among Korean immigrant women. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education, 9*(4), 250-264.

Lee, J. (2014). English on Korean television, *World Englishes, 33*(1). 33-49.

Leppänen, S., & Häkkinen, A. (2012). Buffalaxed superdiversity: representations of the Other on YouTube. *Diversities*, *14*(2), 17-33.

Leppänen, S., Kytölä, S., Jousmäki, H., Peuronen, S. & Westinen, E. (2014). Entextualization and resemoticization as resources for identification in social media. In P. Seargeant & C. Tagg (Eds.) *The language of social media: Identity and community on the internet* (pp. 112-138). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Marlow, M. & Giles, H. 2006. From the roots to the shoots: A Hawaiian case study of language revitalization and modes of communication. In C. S. Beck (ed.) *Communication yearbook* 343-385. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Marlow, M. L., & Giles, H. (2008). Who you tink you, talkin propah?: Hawaiian Pidgin demarginalized. *Journal of Multicultural Discourses, 3*(1), 53-68.

Meyerhoff, M. (2004). Attitudes to gender and creoles: A case study on mokes and titas. *Te Reo, 47*, 63-82.

Nam, H. (2010). Konglish, Korean L2 learners' unique interlanguage: Its definition, categories and lexical entries, *The Applied Linguistics Association of Korea, 26*(4), 275-308.

Park, J. S.-Y. (2004) *Globalization, language, and social order: Ideologies of English in South Korea*. Unpublished dissertation, University of California, Santa Barbara.

Park, J.S. (2009). *The local construction of a global language: Ideologies of English in South Korea.* Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Romaine, S. (1999). Changing attitudes to Hawaii Creole English: Fo' find one good job you gotta know how fo' talk like one haole. In J. R. Rickford, & S. Romaine (Eds.), *Creole genesis,*

*attitudes and discourse: Studies celebrating Charlene J. Sato* (pp. 287-302). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Rymes, B. (2012). Recontextualizing YouTube: From Macro–Micro to Mass‑Mediated Communicative Repertoires. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, *43*(2), 214-227.

Said, E. (1978). *Orientalism.* New York: Vintage.

Sakoda, K., & Siegel, J. (2003). *Pidgin Grammar.* Honolulu: Bess Press.

Seargeant, P. & Tagg, C. (2014). 'Introduction: The language of social media,' in P. Seargeant and C. Tagg (eds.), *The language of social media: Identity and community on the internet*. Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 1-20.

Silverstein, M. (1993). Metapragmatic discourse and. In J. Lucy (ed.) *Reflexive language: Reported speech and metapragmatics*. Cambridge UP.

Simonson, D., Sakata, K., & Sasaki, P. (1981). *Pidgin to Da Max.* Honolulu: Bess Press.

Song, J. (2007). Language ideologies and identity: Korean children's language socialization in a bilingual setting. Ph.D. Dissertation, Ohio State University.

Tonouchi, L. A. (2004). Da state of Pidgin address. *College English, 67*(1), 75-82.

Tonouchi, L. A. (Ed.) (2005). *Da Kine Dictionary: Da Hawaiʻi Community Pidgin Dictionary Projeck.* Honolulu: Bess Press.

Woolard, K. A. (1999). Simultaneity and bivalency as strategies in bilingualism. *Linguistic Anthropology, 8*, 3-29.

Yamaguchi, M. (2013). Reconsidering communicative competence in Web 2.0 environments: "Asians in the library" and four parodic responses on YouTube. *Language & Communication*, *33*(4), 376-389.