



Beyond the NS/NNS Dichotomy: Exploring the Potential of Translanguaging in CPP Practice by Korean EFL Teachers

Soojin Ahn

University of Seoul, South Korea

Mee-Jee Kim

Seoul National University, South Korea

Jin-Young Lee

Seoul National University, South Korea

As a crucial part of English teacher education, this study aims to critically reflect on the commonly experienced issues related to EFL learning and teaching in South Korea. Within the theoretical and methodological framework of critical performative pedagogy (CPP), this study focuses on the analysis of Boalian forum theatre, directed and enacted by seven graduate students majoring in English education in a graduate course. The results of the critical discourse analysis of the forum theatres reveal that the participants experienced the internalized native/non-native speaker dichotomy in communication with native-English speaking teachers at school, regardless of their backgrounds in English learning and teaching. Additionally, the concept of translanguaging can be applied to the Korean school context as an alternative view on Korean-English bilingual practices. The implication of this study emphasizes the importance of teachers' critical reflection of their own experiences in the EFL context and the application of CPP as an alternative teacher education model for EFL teachers.

Keywords: NS/NNS dichotomy, Korean EFL teachers, critical performative pedagogy, translanguaging

Introduction

In the context of teaching English as a second or foreign language (ESL/EFL), one of the most popular misconceptions is that native speakers are necessarily better at teaching than non-native speakers. Kirkpatrick (2007) claims that the native-speaker model has serious disadvantages for non-native speaker local teachers; it could automatically undermine the value and apparent legitimacy of local teachers' own model of English, reduce local teachers' self-confidence, and force them to use teaching methodology that does not consider the diversity of local cultures of learning. Phillipson (2009) also notes that the popularity of English-only instruction reflects the students' high expectations regarding the benefits of English for economic and practical reasons, not the pedagogical benefits which can be made by well-qualified local teachers.

Although such a misconception has been acknowledged by some researchers in the field, ESL/EFL teacher education and related policies are still oriented to the native-speaker model. For example, the

South Korean (Korean, hereafter) government has supported native English-speaking teachers (NESTs) as teacher trainers in public teachers' colleges since 1997 (Ahn & Lew, 2017). They usually teach English skills and culture classes as well as methodology classes to pre-service teachers. The Korean government also assigned a larger portion of the national budget to providing in-service teacher training programs, including the overseas programs designed to enhance their English abilities as well as their teaching skills (Ahn, 2009). During those teacher training programs, it is assumed that English teachers are trained according to the standards of native-like language competences.

Moreover, some researchers reported the problems of the native-speaker model orientation at the classroom level. Interviews with secondary school English teachers in Korea revealed that the most common and important objection was that both teachers and students exhibited a lack of confidence and motivation to communicate with each other in English (Li, 1998; Liu, Ahn, Baek, & Han, 2004; as all cited in Park, 2009). Park (2009) said that this is also related to the monolingualism found in English education in Korea. As Korean teachers believe that it is ideal to speak only or more English, both teachers and students have a negative image of their bilingual use of Korean and English in the classroom.

In light of the discussion mentioned above, this study aims to explore the experiences of Korean EFL learners and teachers within the NS/NNS dichotomy represented in the Korean educational context and a possible alternative approach to the phenomenon. As a mediational tool to foster reflections on their experiences, the performance and the critical discourse analysis (CDA), which provided a basis of critical performative pedagogy (CPP), were used. The guiding research questions are as follows: What are the NS/NNS dichotomy experiences by Korean EFL learners and teachers represented in their enactments? How can the CPP provide Korean EFL learners and teachers with an alternative approach to the native/non-native speaker dichotomy?

Literature Review

The Native/Non-native Speaker (NS/NNS) Dichotomy and English Teacher Identity

The NS/NNS dichotomy has long offered a traditional view on ESL and EFL learners and teachers. The "bio-developmental definition" (Davies, 1996, p. 156) of the term native speaker presupposes no interface between the status of the native speaker and non-native speaker, regardless of the various qualities of proficiency or expertise (Cook, 1999). This term is not neutral, but quite socio-political, which means it involves a preference to native speakers as being considered the only best English learners and teachers (Lin, Wang, & Wang, 2018). The problem with this view is the marginalization of the learners and teachers who are not from English-speaking countries; this can further develop racial, regional, and cultural discriminations (Hall, 2012).

Earlier, Phillipson (1992) raised the question about the ideal of NESTs, which he called the native speaker fallacy. He asserts that there is "no scientific validity" (p. 195) that supports the ideal regarding the NESTs. Norton (1997) also pointed out the issue of teachers' identity and its connection to ownership of English. She argued that the NS/NNS dichotomy should be rejected because it prevents learners from owning English. Nayar (1994) also agreed regarding the crux of the ownership issue raised from the power dynamic between NSs and NNSs. He said that stereotypes based on the strong belief about native speakers' superiority and infallibility are difficult to correct.

Empirical research has attempted to identify how NESTs accept the NS/NNS dichotomy and challenge the native speaker fallacy. For example, both Pavlenko (2003) and Zacharias (2010) found that ESL and EFL teachers in the United States (US) had learning and teaching experiences as non-native speakers and that such experiences had been central in their teacher identity construction. However, Pavlenko (2003) provided an introduction to the concept of multicompetence during the coursework, which eventually helped the participating ESL and EFL teachers form an alternative imagined community of multicompetent or bilingual speakers. Aneja (2016), who examined the cases of four ESL and EFL

teachers in the US, also found that their identity negotiation is better understood as a process of positioning of themselves in social situations, which sometimes can offer no clear-cut distinction between NS and NNS. Reis (2011) recorded an ESL teacher's professional identity development and found that the teacher's beliefs and attitudes towards the native speaker fallacy were ambivalent and contradictory, although the teacher tried to challenge it in his ESL writing class.

Several studies have analyzed Korean EFL teachers' non-native English-speaking teacher (NNEST) identity issue. Kim (2011, 2017) examined how NNESTs' identities were affected by the NS ideology within the intersections of power, language, culture, and race. Particularly, Kim (2011) showed that a Korean NNEST was influenced by the ideology of native speakerism, which led to low professional self-esteem. Jee (2016) also discussed the perceived ideal of NESTs in Korean society using the autoethnographic research method. She pointed out that her belief about native speakerism is socially constructed, and the native speaker fallacy prevalent in the society could be challenged by Cook's (2005) concept of multicompetence. Song (2016) revealed how study-abroad returnee students in the classrooms affect Korean EFL teachers' emotional vulnerability. The study found that the teachers' conflicts with returnee students became the source of pressure regarding NS ideology and orientation to their professional development.

Translanguaging

The use of multiple languages by learners has been viewed in different ways according to the time period. Recently, scholars have shown support for the new perspective on the use of multiple languages for communication purposes. The most recent view on the use of multilinguals in the communication discourses is called translanguaging. García stated, "Translanguaging, or engaging in bilingual or multilingual discourse practices, is an approach to bilingualism that is centered not on languages as has often been the case, but on the practices of bilinguals that are readily observable" (García, 2009, p. 44). The biggest difference between translanguaging and code-switching, which represents a traditional view on the relationship between the first language (L1) and the second language (L2), is the attitude toward the influence of L1 on L2. In code-switching, the use of L1 was considered to be language interference, such as transfer or borrowing, which can inhibit the acquisition of L2, the target language (Hornberger & Link, 2012). However, in the context of translanguaging, instances of L1 are seen "not as marked or unusual, but rather are taken for what they are, namely the normal mode of communication that characterizes communities through the world" (García, 2009, p. 71). Also, in translanguaging, language users are the focus, not the language itself. It means that the speakers' agency, intelligence, and creativity in communicative acts were importantly considered (Poza, 2017). The use of both L1 and L2 can occur when the L2 speakers recognize their native language as a helpful resource for meaningful communication.

Although many studies related to translanguaging attempted to show where and how translanguaging is practiced in the various multilingual contexts, especially in the classroom settings, translanguaging also has great potential for critical or transformative praxis in language education (Ríos & Seltzer, 2017). Poza, who reviewed the body of texts related to translanguaging from 1996 to 2014, asserted that 19 out of 53 texts showed that translanguaging can be used as a tool to "upend traditional language ideologies and norms and simultaneously counter established relations of power" (Poza, 2017, p. 113). That is, translanguaging is not limited to its application in a descriptive way. For instance, García and Leiva (2014) demonstrated how translanguaging provided the Latino immigrant youth with a tool to resist both the dominant English monolingual ideology and Spanish heritage language learning in US classrooms. The translanguaging raps in their language arts class motivated the emergent bilingual students to participate in the class and form their voices. Mazak and Herbas-Dono (2014) studied the translanguaging practices while teaching science at a Puerto Rican university. While the professors accepted the dominance of English in the science field, the students' responses and local needs did not correspond to it. In this study, translanguaging presented a way of resistance to the hegemony of English.

As multilingual contexts arise everywhere, the application of translanguaging has unlimited potential for further research and praxis (Wei, 2018). Although the majority of the research on translanguaging mentioned above had been located in the US pre-K-12 school settings, the practices at tertiary education or professional levels at various locations were also found (Hélot, 2011; Mazak & Herbas-Dono, 2014; Milu, 2013; Wei, 2011). Rymes (2018), who also agrees that “translanguaging is everywhere,” (n.p.) emphasized that researchers should not limit their view regarding which contexts or language users count as translanguaging, because there could be a variety of possible translanguagers and the contexts often with unexpected creativity.

Critical Performative Pedagogy (CPP)

In this study, CPP is applied as a methodological framework. CPP can be defined as an educational praxis using “a kinesthetic, dialogic, and multidimensional process for teacher educators and students to explore social justice issues” (Harman & French, 2004, p. 98). The major activities that arose in CPP were based on Boal’s *image theatre* and *forum theatre* (Boal, 1974, 1998). In CPP, theatre is not conducted in a traditional way with directors and writers; rather, the participants in CPP become their own directors, writers, and actors. The participants make a basic plot based on their own experiences—mostly problematic situations. Then, while they perform the theatre repeatedly, they can rehearse the possible resolutions of the problem. In that moment, the role of the *spect-actor*, someone from either the stage or the floor, becomes a protagonist in the action to change the problematic scene (Boal, 1995). CPP also incorporates CDA as a follow-up activity of the performances.

CDA investigates “the way[s] social power abuse, dominance, and inequality are enacted, reproduced, and resisted by text and talk in the social and political context” (van Dijk, 2003, p. 352). During and after the CPP process, the participants can eventually understand “the politics of representation, the social construction of race, class, and gender and the interconnections between micro- and macro-level power relations” (Harman & French, 2004, p. 98).

CPP were mainly developed and practiced in the teacher education programs of the US. Harman, Ahn, and Bogue (2016) and Harman and Zhang (2015) presented model CPP practices that supported graduate students in recognizing and negotiating their ESL and EFL teacher identities. Similarly, Cahnmann-Taylor and Souto-Manning (2010) presented various models of CPP to raise teacher candidates’ awareness of social justice in ESL and bilingual teacher education programs. The findings from those studies confirmed the potential of CPP as an educational and creative tool to foster language learners’ and teachers’ critical reflection and awareness on the sociopolitical contexts of their learning and teaching experiences.

Methods

Research Site and Participants

This study served as the post-activity for the graduate course in the English education department at a university in Seoul, Korea, during the fall semester of 2018. The title of this graduate course was “Studies in Applied Linguistics: Critical Approaches to TESOL.” It was an elective graduate course designed by the instructor, who is the first author of this paper. The course was designed to help Korean EFL teachers and researchers reflect on their own teaching and learning experiences while critically examining the sociocultural contexts surrounding English language education. Therefore, in the first half of the course, students read about the theoretical background of critical pedagogies and language learning and discussed the critical issues of language, power, and identity as gathered from previous research. In the second half of the course, students learned about and participated in CPP, which enables its participants to enact and reflect on their roles in the school through two performed forum theatres as well as the CDA of the forum

theatres.

In total, seven female graduate students in the class participated whose ages ranged from mid-20s to mid-30s. Two of them (Mina and Jihyun; pseudonyms) were doctoral students, while five of them (Jungwon, Nara, Yuna, Somi, and Juhee; pseudonyms) were master's students. Also, three (Jihyun, Somi, and Juhee) were in-service English teachers in middle and high schools, and one of them (Jungwon) was a teacher at an elementary school. All of the graduate students in the class had either short-term or long-term study abroad experiences before they joined this graduate program. Jihyun and Somi had completed a relatively short-term study abroad (less than one year) in Singapore and the Netherlands, respectively, while Mina, Jungwon, Nara, Yuna, and Juhee had a long-term study abroad (from six to ten years) in the US, Uzbekistan, and China, respectively. The instructor also studied abroad in the US (five years). Their different study-abroad and teaching experiences were incorporated into the discussions during the course of CPP. Among the seven participants, two participants voluntarily decided to conduct research for this study with the instructor after the course was completed. The three researchers had regular monthly meetings in the spring and summer of 2019.

Data Collection and Analysis

The focus of this study was the CDA and reflection on the two forum theatres as a post-activity of the CPP practice. Through the CPP practice, all of the participants were able to critically reflect on and share their previous experiences related to English learning and teaching. Specifically, the primary data of this study were generated by the participants' enactments of the focused story. Based on all participants' narratives of their own critical moments in English learning and teaching, they selected one topic and reconstructed the story which became a main plot for the performance. The performances were formatted as a forum theatre, a kind of Boal's (1979) *Theatre of the Oppressed*, which deals with social equity issues from the characters' authentic experiences. In this process, the performance was conducted twice to rehearse the possible resolution of the problems portrayed in the performance. In other words, in the second forum theatre, the spect-actor came into the middle of the scene and changed the plot. After the two performances were completed, the participants transcribed the performances and discussed the issues represented in the transcripts (see Appendices A and B), such as the NS/NNS dichotomy and teacher identities in the school context. A semester later, the participants voluntarily regathered to process the post-activity of CPP practice. At this time, with all participants' consent forms filled out, three researchers focused on the CDA of the two forum theatres. Also, the researchers individually reflected on how their experiences were reinterpreted during the forum theatres, which represented social discourses. These reflections became another source of data for this study.

In the data analysis, first, the transcripts of two forum theatres were examined using CDA. The researchers adopted the interactional sociolinguistics (IS) approach to discuss the meanings of verbal and nonverbal languages in the performance, which represent the given social contexts. For instance, the researchers adopted the concept of contextualization cues (e.g. intonation, pitch, stress, pause, hesitation, speed, volume, dialect, style, and register) by Gumperz (1982) to investigate the hidden meanings of the verbal and non-verbal messages. Second, the three researchers' written reflections on their experiences in this CPP practice were explored using the thematic analysis. By examining the written reflections repeatedly, the researchers categorized, named, and assessed possible key themes (Creswell, 2003).

Findings

CDA Analysis

The backgrounds of both the first and second forum theatres are the same: the first depicts the first day during which a NEST visits the teacher's office at a Korean elementary school. There are seven

characters in the forum theatres. First, James, as performed by Juhee, a NEST from the US, visits a Korean school on the first day of class. Among the six Korean teachers, Jihyun is the Dean of Academic Affairs, and Yuna is a music teacher at school. Four other teachers—Mina, Somi, Jungwon, and Nara—are all Korean EFL teachers. Whereas Jungwon had studied English abroad growing up, the other teachers had little experience learning English outside of Korea. While all the Korean teachers welcome James during both episodes, the way they treat him and his behavior, articulation, and expressions in response to their utterances are somewhat different, which might be the main focus of the two-forum theatres. Thus, this analysis of the two-forum theatres shows the meaning of the verbal and nonverbal behaviors of the characters behind the scenes.

The first forum theatre

Identity as a non-native English speaker and anxiety about L2 competence. In the first forum theatre, the NS/NNS dichotomy, which has significant influence on the L2 competence of EFL Korean learners, prevailed throughout the interaction not only between the native speaker and non-native speaker but also among the non-native speakers. Excerpt 1 presents a conversation between Yuna and Jungwon about their anxiety before meeting the NEST character, James. Both the verbal and nonverbal behaviors of the two teachers suggested that they were experiencing tremendous pressure and nervousness as well as their anxiety stemming from the idea of forcing themselves to speak English well when meeting a NEST.

Excerpt 1

- 1 At the office, the teachers are busy getting ready for the day.
- 2 Jungwon: (busy writing down) 아↓, 오늘 제임스 선생님 오시는 날이네요.
Oh↓, today is the day Mr. James is coming.
- 3 Yuna : 아, 맞아요. (throwing her pen down) 오늘 제임스 선생님 오시는 날이네요.
Yeah, right. Mr. James is coming today.
- 4 어떡해요↑. (touching her hair) 저 제임스한테 한 마디도 못하는 거 아니에요?
Oh, my gosh↑. what if I won't be able to say anything to Mr. James?
- 5 Jungwon: (patting on the shoulder) 아니에요.
Oh, no. Don't worry about it.
- 6 Yuna : (blushing) 저 진짜 영어 못하거든요. 저 고등학교 때 공부한 게 끝인데,
I am really bad at English. I only studied English until high school, and that is it.
- 7 (sighing) 정원쌤은 그래도 해외에서 공부도 하시고 영어 진짜↑ 잘하시겠어요.
Jungwon, you should be really good at English, since you have experience studying abroad.
- 8 Jungwon: (shaking her head) 저 어릴 때 갔다와서 다 까먹었죠.
I forgot all about it because I was young.
- 9 Yuna : 아 그래도: (tapping Jungwon) 저보다 훨씬 낫죠.
Oh, well: you must be better than me though.
- 10 (patting on Jungwon's shoulder) 아 정원쌤 오늘 기대할게요. [진짜] (groans)
Well, I will expect your English today. [really].
- 11 Jungwon: (shaking her hand) [아니에요.] (tapping Yuna)
[No, my English may not be as good as you expect.]
- 12 (waving her hands) 아↓hh (..) 빨리 연습해야겠다. 어: I majored in English education↑
Oh↓hh I should practice my English quickly. Ah:
- 13 (..) university↑ 아 h (..) university 말고, undergraduate 이라는 (.)
Ahh other than university, I should use the word undergraduate.

- 14 좀, 더 fancy 한 거 써야겠다. (writing down on the paper)
 the fancier word

As seen in Lines 3 and 4, Yuna's actions of throwing the pen and touching her hair indicate her frustration with English, especially when Yuna said “어떡해요↑ [*Oh, my gosh*]” in Line 4, which connoted anxiety about speaking English. In Line 6, she even marked herself as having low English proficiency by saying “저 진짜 영어 못하거든요 [*I am really bad at English*]” while blushing, which intimated in advance her fear of facing the NEST, James. Although Yuna is a music teacher who does not require a high level of English proficiency within her profession, her frustration and anxiety were fully expressed throughout the conversation in Excerpt 1. This example demonstrates the strong NS/NNS dichotomy Korean EFL teachers perceive, as they usually position themselves as deficient English speakers compared to native English speakers.

Yuna additionally indicated her envy of Jungwon, who studied abroad, even while talking about her personal background with English education and sighing. Such actions can be interpreted as reflecting a passive attitude and low confidence in her English ability, as implied in Lines 6 and 7. This supports the fact that L2 speakers tend to compare themselves with others, which might result in greater anxiety (Ellis, 2015). This kind of conversation continued up to Line 9, with Yuna saying “아 그래도: 저보다 훨씬 낫죠 [*Oh, well, you must be better than me though*]” and continuing with “아 정원쌤 오늘 기대할게요 [진짜] (groans) [*Well, I will expect your English today [really] (groans)*]” in Line 10, indicating her high expectation of Jungwon and placing herself as a more deficient English speaker than Jungwon.

Much of Yuna's expectations burdened Jungwon, who said “아니예요 [*No, my English may not be as good as you expect*]” in Line 11 while shaking her hand to strongly deny her English proficiency. She considered herself to be the deficient English speaker compared to the native-English speaker. Jungwon's non-verbal expressions, such as waving her hands in Line 12, reflected her anxiety resulting from her co-teachers' high expectations of her English skills. Based on the work of Ellis (2015), the fear of negative evaluation from other people might be some sources of anxiety when speaking a second language. Thus, Jungwon, who was comparing herself to others based on her fears of speaking with the NEST because of the evaluation from other peers, even practiced her English before meeting James: “아↓hh (..) 빨리 연습해야겠다 [*Oh↓hh (..) I should practice my English quickly*]” in Line 12.

In sum, the excerpt apparently marked the students' anxiety and fears of EFL speakers that resulted from the NS/NNS dichotomy. Many Koreans implicitly consider high English proficiency to be based on superficial speech factors, such as native-like pronunciation or accent, rather than the content of speech. However, having native-like pronunciation or accents might be an unrealistic goal for Koreans, who are less likely to be exposed to English being used in a natural way, as English is a foreign language in Korea (Kim & Seo, 2012). Such perspectives consequently lead Koreans to self-position themselves as deficient language users regardless of their language competence or professional requirement (Choi, 2013; Harman et al., 2016; Jee, 2016).

The establishment of NS/NNS discourse identities as the assessor/assessed. The interaction between the native speaker and non-native speaker also displays how the NS/NNS dichotomy has affected the establishment of the discourse identities as the assessor and the assessed. In the middle of the first performance, James arrived in the office and met the Korean teachers for the first time. In this moment, James assumed the role of an assessor who made a judgment on the NNESTs' linguistic competence, and Jungwon took on the role of the assessed, whose language capability was confirmed by the native speaker. Excerpt 2 depicts how the identities of the assessor/assessed are embedded in the identities of native speaker and non-native speaker in their interaction.

Excerpt 2

- 62 Jungwon: [Nice to see you.]
 63 James : (surprised, looks at the other teachers for a second and looks back at Jungwon) I'm James.
 64 (keeps on shaking hands)
 65 Jungwon: Ah: (nods)
 66 James : Ah: (smiles)
 67 Jungwon: Yeah, I'm the English teacher (holds James's hand with both her hands and keeps on
 68 shaking it)
 69 James : You're also the **English teacher**↑ (points with her finger and looks toward Jungwon)
 70 Jungwon: Yeah (makes eye contact with James and nods with a smile)
 71 James : Okay. (3) (nods repetitively) Oh: so...
 72 Jungwon: Uh, yeah so ...
 73 James : You've got like, (.) (looks at other teachers) great school here, right?
 74 Jungwon: Oh: right, right. (nods her head)
 75 Actually, I (points herself) majored in English Education for my undergraduate degree↑
 76 James : (makes a round mouth, looking surprised) **Really?**↑ (looks at other teachers)
 77 Jungwon: Yeah (..)
 78 James : You've lived abroad? (looks at Jihyun)
 79 Jihyun : (nods with smile)
 80 James : like, **no grammatical errors**!:
 81 Jungwon: (smiling to James) **Thank**↑ you.
 82 James : (to everyone) =She is **really**↓ fluent, and she's
 83 Yuna : (clapping)
 84 James : got like this **perfect accent**↑ (shaking hands)
 85 Jihyun : (nodding and smiling to each other) 오↓ 역시 정원쌤 다르네!
 Oh↓ Jungwon is outstanding, indeed!
 86 Jungwon: (to James) Please have a seat here↓

While greeting each other, Jungwon introduced herself as an English teacher, presenting her identity as someone with a legitimate linguistic background in Line 67, and James exhibited the signs of her recognition of Jungwon's language proficiency, as denoted by marked rise in pitch and surprised facial expressions in Line 69. James complimented Jungwon's English proficiency, mentioning "no grammatical errors" in Line 80 and a "perfect accent" in Line 84. James seemed to be impressed by Jungwon's fluent English, as shown by the surprised facial expression, the louder volume, and increased voice pitch in Lines 76, 80, 82, and 84. These types of responses from James imply a native speaker, thus entitling James to the right to judge a non-native speaker's English proficiency. James even made his evaluation publicly by saying, "She is really↓ fluent" looking at everyone (Line 82) and displaying a variation in pitch in saying "got like this perfect accent↑" (Line 84). The NS/NNS dichotomy seemed to be consolidated in the discourse when the native speaker confirmed the legitimacy of Jungwon's English.

Moreover, James's public judgment over her language competence made Jungwon proud of herself, as shown in her smiles and heightened voice in Line 81. She accepted the compliment, saying "Thank you" in Line 81, and continued the conversation with James. Now as her L2 legitimacy was confirmed by the assessor, the native speaker, she took a more active role in the interaction with James, guiding her to the seat and continuing the dialogue in Line 86. As the NS/NNS dichotomy presupposes the exclusive ownership of language to the native speakers, the compliment on her language competence enabled Jungwon, a non-native speaker, to affirm her identity as a legitimate language speaker. The confirmation led the other Korean teachers to feel envious of her, praising her proficient language use by Jihyun and Yuna in Lines 83 and 85. Though Jungwon was a proficient L2 user herself, the NS/NNS dichotomy was ingrained in her L2 identity so deeply that it was only after she earned a recognition as a legitimate L2 user by the native speaker that she felt comfortable speaking in English with James.

The second forum theatre

Identity as an additive language learner. The second forum theatre starts with similar context with the first forum theatre, whereas the role of spect-actor enables only slight changes. In the first part of the second forum theatre shown in Excerpt 3, Yuna and Jungwon talked about their anxiety before meeting with James due to their low self-confidence in English, just as she did in the first forum theatre.

Excerpt 3

- 105 Jungwon: 아 (hh), (smiling, leaning backward) 연습해야겠다.
Ah I should practice English
- 106 어: University, >University 말고< 좀더 근사한 단어 없나?
hmm: University,> rather than university < what is the fancier word to replace this?
- 107 Jihyun : (leans forward, looking at Jungwon) 아이 정원 쌤:↓ 영어 **외국어로** 배웠는데 뭐.
Hey, Jungwon:↓ You learned English as a foreign language.
- 108 한국어도 잘 하고 영어도 잘 하면 대단한거지. **평소처럼**↑ 해요. (nods, smiles)=
If you are good at both Korean and English, that's a great deal. Just speak in Korean as usual.
- 109 Jungwon: [오↓ 네 (nods)]
[Oh↓ Okay]
- 110 Somi : =(looks from Jungwon to Jihyun) **맞아요**↑ 뭐↓
Yeah, right↑ well↓
- 111 우리가 다 (..) 한국인인데요 뭐 (keeps smiling)
We are all Korean, just feel comfortable and speak Korean to James.
- 112 Jungwon: (nods) 오, 역시: 선생님들 말씀 들어보니 그 말이 옳은 것 같네요.
Oh, yeah: I think that's the right thing to say.
- 113 아 나 **편한대로**↑ 해야겠다. (nods)
Oh, I will not feel pressure on speaking English and just try to speak in Korean as I feel comfortable.

However, following Jungwon's verbal and nonverbal behavior, such as not showing a lack of confidence in speaking English, was deemed in somewhat different ways from the first forum theatre (i.e., Excerpt 1), because of Jihyun's spect-actor role. In Lines 107 and 108, Jihyun told Jungwon that it was great to speak both languages, and she suggested that he speak normally, by saying “영어 **외국어로** 배웠는데 뭐 [You learned English as a foreign language]” and “한국어도 잘 하고 영어도 잘 하면 대단한거지. **평소처럼**↑ 해요 [If you are good at both Korean and English, that's a great deal. Just speak in Korean as usual]” Jihyun's tone became high when she said “**외국어로** [as a foreign language]” and “**평소처럼** [as usual].” At this moment, Jihyun made positive gestures, such as nodding and smiling at Jungwon (Line 108). Reminding them that they are additive language learners of English, not deficient language learners, set a different tone in the conversation. Then Jungwon showed her acceptance of Jihyun's advice by saying “네 [Okay]” and nodding in Line 109. Then in Line 110, Somi, another spect-actor in this scene, also showed her agreement with Jihyun, by saying, “**맞아요**↑ [Yeah, right↑]” with a raised voice and tone. Somi also showed smiles when she said “우리가 다 (..) 한국인인데요 뭐 [We all are Korean, just feel comfortable and speak Korean to James]” in Line 111. In response to these comments, Jungwon showed her agreement by nodding and saying, “그 말이 옳은 것 같네요 [I think that's the right thing to say]” in Line 112 and “아 나 **편한대로**↑ 해야겠다. [Oh, I will not feel pressure with speaking English and just try to speak in Korean as I feel comfortable]” in Line 113.

Translanguaging practice by Korean speakers of English. Another interesting aspect of the interaction in the second forum theatre was translanguaging, the combined use of linguistic resources available, through either Korean, English, or gestures, without fear of being evaluated. Excerpt 4 illustrates translanguaging practice by Korean EFL learners in a natural manner. In this excerpt, Jungwon asked all of the participants to have lunch together and discuss their future lesson plans.

Excerpt 4

- 182 Yuna : =Let's go grab some 급식.
=Let's go grab some school cafeteria lunch.
- 183 James : (.) What is 급식?
What is school cafeteria lunch?
- 184 Yuna : (moving hands, showing the motion) 급식:=
school cafeteria lunch: =
- 185 Mina : =[밥 밥] (moving hands)
=meals meals
- 186 Nara : =[밥 밥] (moving hands)
=meals meals
- 187 James : (looking at Mina & Nara) 밥↓ It's lunch (..) in Korean:?=
meals↓ It's lunch in Korean:?=
- 188 Yuna : =급식 급식 (moving hands) ↑같이 가요. [같이 가요.
=school cafeteria lunch, school cafeteria lunch ↑Let's go. [Let's go.
- 189 Jihyun : [밥 먹으러 갈까요?
[Shall we go for lunch?
- 190 James : (looking at Jungwon) right now? We are going to the cafeteria?
- 191 Jungwon: ↓Yeah: (..) let's go for 급식:↑
let's go for school cafeteria lunch:↑

Specifically, in Line 182, Yuna said, “Let’s go grab some 급식. [Let’s go grab some *school cafeteria lunch*.]” 급식 [*school cafeteria lunch*] is the Korean way to express a school meal, and Yuna spoke the word with emphasis. That is why James asked, “What is 급식 [What is *school cafeteria lunch*?]?” in Line 183. Then Yuna said the word again to help James’ understanding while moving her hands in Line 184. Then Mina and Nara, who were watching their conversation, added another Korean word, “밥 [*meals*],” with their hand gestures in Lines 185 and 186. James repeated the word “밥↓ [*meals*↓]” in Korean again and asked if his guess of the meaning (“lunch”) was right in Line 187. Yuna agreed with James, repeating “급식 급식 [*school cafeteria lunch, school cafeteria lunch*]” while moving her hands and added, “같이 가요. 같이 가요 [*Let’s go. Let’s go*]” in Line 188. Jihyun also said, “밥 먹으러 갈까요? [*Shall we go for lunch?*]” in Line 189. From these lines, we can imply that Yuna and the other Korean teachers tried to use both Korean and English for meaningful communication with James. Also, James continued a conversation with the Korean teachers by repeating their Korean words and continuing the questions to them about his understanding. His final understanding was displayed in Line 190, “(looking at Jungwon) right now? We are going to the cafeteria?” In this scene, we can say that both native and non-native speakers of English recognized Korean as a helpful resource for their communication, which means they became free from the English-only interaction that they were pressed to deliver, as shown in the first performance. In this sense, we can say that translanguaging practice can function as a way to challenge the NS ideologies and norms prevalent in their society (Poza, 2017; Ríos & Seltzer, 2017). Moreover, due to the CPP’s performative nature, which enables the participants to rehearse their everyday practices through the performances (Harman & French, 2004), this translanguaging practice shows great potential for changes in their real-life situations.

Reflections

Reflections on the CDA on the forum theatres

CPP as a newly introduced English teacher education model within the Korean educational context was reflected by the participants. Most participants were not familiar with the concept and procedures of CPP at first, but they recognized that the whole process of CPP was helpful for their reflection and critical awareness regarding the NS/NNS dichotomy embedded among them (Norton, 1997). Particularly, this study focused on the CDA on the performed forum theatres. The researchers' reflection on the functions of forum theatre and its CDA are summarized in three ways: looking at themselves from a third-person view, raising their critical awareness, and confirming the transferability to a real-life situation.

First, Mina recognized the differences in her behaviors and utterances from the first forum theatre to the second forum theatre by looking at them from a third-person view. For example, she recognized the feeling of nervousness shown in her gestures when talking to a native speaker as an actor in the first forum theatre, while she found the confidence in her speaking and smiling as an actor in the second forum theatre.

Excerpt 5

Mina: Considering that neither forum theatre had a fixed scenario at first, the changes in my behaviors and utterances suggest syntagmatic significances. When I reflect on the reasons that I acted differently in the two theatres, I might have felt pressured to speak English perfectly in the first forum theatre, as I am an English teacher, which led me to step back and show reluctant behaviors and utterances.

She reflected that the changes in the speaking environment for the second forum theatre caused her to feel less pressure to speak perfect English, as she could naturally replace English with Korean. It is implied that the forum theatre assisted her in performing everyday life practice, and this would lead to a change in her actions in the future.

Second, Jihyun recognized the critical awareness that was carried out in the process of forum theatres and the CDA of them. She recalled that it was not easy to come up with the ideas to solve the issue raised from the first forum theatre, but she agreed with other participants that all of them wanted to make a change in the problematic scene.

Excerpt 6

Jihyun: The difference in the roles I played among the two forum theatres was that I spoke out my belief on the language identity openly in the second forum theatre. I reminded Jungwon that she is an additive language learner rather than a deficient language learning of English, and that made the whole difference in the mood regarding this issue.

She certainly became aware of the problem in the first theatre, and she tried to apply the concept of translanguaging (García, 2009) into this problematic scene by telling everyone else that we were additive language learners rather than deficient language learners of English. Jihyun further reflected that this critical awareness was more powerful when it was shared with other people in a group and became public. This implies that CPP can serve as a powerful tool for the critical awareness of a group of people.

Third, Soojin confirmed the possibility of transferability through the forum theatres and its CDA. As Mina and Jihyun recalled, Soojin also observed that the participants just acted like the characters of scenes. For instance, by acting like confident speakers, they seemed to break their rigid self-perceived non-native speaker identity and enjoy the translanguaging conversation in the second forum theatre. She further believed that such rehearsal of the real-life situations will be beneficial for participants who might face similar problematic situations in school.

Excerpt 7

Soojin: I realized the power of performance which enables the participants to rehearse real-life situations. I believe that these semi-real-life experiences through performances will be beneficial for participants to face and react to the actual problematic situations in school.

From this observation, she also found a strong motivation to continue to introduce CPP to more English learners and teachers in the community. Due to its performativity and transferability into real-life situations (Harman & French, 2004), the participation in the forum theatre and CDA in the CPP process could be recommended to a variety of English learners and teachers in our community. This would serve as a step to resolve the problems which are pervasive in the educational and cultural context of that community.

Conclusion

This study naturally elicited language identities as EFL learners and teachers in Korea, based on participants' experiences using CPP. It analyzed two forum theatres to determine the solution by enacting the spect-actor. Forum theatres served as a site to make visible the hidden relationship between the NS/NNS dichotomy and language identity of non-native speakers, and enabled us to deliberate on how social identities of NS/NNS were constructed and consolidated by the social discourses (Pavlenko & Blackledge, 2004). We oriented ourselves to the native speaker of standard English and consequently construed ourselves as deficient language users, as shown in the high level of anxiety demonstrated in the verbal and nonverbal behaviors of Korean EFL learners in the forum theatres. The fact that returnee teachers who have academic background in the English-speaking countries with a high proficiency of English were also modest about their L2 proficiency showed that the NS/NNS dichotomy has compelled us to position ourselves into deficient language learners on an "elusive quest for NS competence" (Pavlenko, 2003, p. 259). Furthermore, "the sacred story of all-knowing teachers" (Song, 2016, p. 649) has forced greater pressure on us to develop native-speaker proficiency of English, which undermines the legitimacy of local English teachers and reduces our sense of self-confidence (Harman et al., 2016; Jee, 2016; Kirkpatrick, 2007).

The NS/NNS dichotomy was deeply ingrained in the Korean EFL learners' language identity that L2 anxiety was evident even without the presence of native speaker, like "a ghostlike presence" (Cook, 1999, p. 190). We often evaluate each other based on the native-speaker model of English, regardless of our professional background, as shown in the high level of anxiety of the music teacher along with the forum theatres. However, we believe that it needs to be changed to help Korean EFL learners to self-position themselves as additive language learners rather than failed native speakers, considering the massive amount of time and money spent on English language education inside and outside Korea. We further propose that translanguaging (García, 2009) could provide an alternative approach to EFL education in Korea, as the spect-actor in the second forum theatre made a huge difference in participants' attitudes toward interactions. Setting achievable goals for English language education in the specific EFL context is necessary for the EFL learners as well as teachers in order to provide a balanced view on the development of language identity, which might be the first step to provide an EFL learning context with curriculum design, teaching materials, and test designs, attuned to the particular learners. We believe that the implication of this study could be applied to a wider range of EFL contexts where the prevalent NS/NNS dichotomy has affected EFL language learning and teaching.

This study is not without limitations. It might be difficult to immediately apply the findings in the EFL contexts due to the importance of the high-stakes exams. For instance, most Asian countries have nationwide university entrance examinations, which determine the overall curricula of English language education (Choi & Lee, 2008). In line with this, compulsory English education has shifted from secondary school level to the elementary school level in many Asian countries, which can raise questions

about the goals of English teaching for young learners (Choi & Lee, 2008; Lee, 2002). Notwithstanding these limitations, the framework of CPP has assisted us in reflecting on our language identity from a third-person view. Sharing our experience of English learning and teaching has helped us to discuss what it means to learn and teach English in the EFL context in depth. Also, the framework of CPP has shown the transferability to a real-life situation. In this context, implementing CPP into pre-service and in-service teacher education may lead to crucial changes in English language education in the EFL context. Moreover, integrating CPP into elementary, middle, and high school classrooms could also provide young EFL learners a more balanced perspective of their language identity. Further research on the change in the teaching practices by the teachers who participated in CPP might also provide us insights into English teaching and learning in the EFL context.

Acknowledgements

All co-authors contributed equally to this paper (listed in alphabetical order). An earlier version of this paper was presented at the 2019 ALAK International Conference in Seoul, South Korea. The study was approved by the University of Seoul IRB.

The Authors

Soojin Ahn (first & corresponding author) is a visiting professor in the Division of General English at the University of Seoul in Seoul, South Korea. Her current research interests include second language writing, language and identity, critical discourse analysis, critical performative pedagogy, and teacher education.

Division of General English
University of Seoul
163 Seoulsiripdaero, Dongdaemun-gu, Seoul, South Korea, 02504
E-mail: soojina2013@uos.ac.kr

Mee-Jee Kim (co-author) is a Ph.D. candidate in the Department of English Language Education at Seoul National University in Seoul, South Korea. Her current research interests include pragmatics, corpus, speaking and writing especially in EFL setting.

Department of English Language Education
Seoul National University
1 Gwanak-ro, Gwanak-gu, Seoul, South Korea
Email: mjeeymi@gmail.com

Jin-Young Lee (co-author) is a Ph.D. candidate in the Department of English Language Education at Seoul National University in Seoul, South Korea. She has been teaching English as a foreign language at a public high school in Korea. Her current research interests include instructed second language acquisition, discourse analysis, corpus linguistics, and second language writing development.

Department of English Language Education
Seoul National University
1 Gwanak-ro, Gwanak-gu, Seoul, South Korea
Email: jinyoung2.lee@gmail.com

References

- Ahn, K. (2009). *Learning to teach within the curricular reform context: A sociocultural perspective on English student teachers' practicum experience in South Korea* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). The Pennsylvania State University, University Park: PA.
- Ahn, S., & Lew, S. (2017). Native English-speaking teachers (NESTs) in Korea: Voices from two NESTs and one Korean English teacher. *Korean Journal of Teacher Education*, 33(2), 89-119.
- Aneja, G. A. (2016). (Non)native speakerhood: Rethinking (non)nativeness and teacher identity in TESOL teacher education. *TESOL Quarterly*, 50(3), 572-596.
- Boal, A. (1974). *Theatre of the oppressed* (C. McBride & M. O. Leal McBride, Trans.). London, England: Pluto.
- Boal, A. (1979). *Theatre of the oppressed*. New York, NY: Theatre Communication Group.
- Boal, A. (1995). *The rainbow of desire: The Boal method of theatre and therapy*. London, England: Routledge.
- Boal, A. (1998). *Legislative theatre: Using performance to make politics* (A. Jackson, Trans.). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Cahnmann-Taylor, M., & Souto-Manning, M. (2010). *Teachers act up! Creating multicultural learning communities through theatre*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Choi, Y. H., & Lee, H. W. (2008). Current trends and issues in English language education in Asia. *The Journal of Asia TEFL*, 5(2), 1-34.
- Choi, S. J. (2013). The possibility of critical pedagogy in TESOL teacher education in Korea. *Modern English Education*, 14(2), 239-262.
- Cook, V. (1999). Going beyond the native speaker in language teaching. *TESOL quarterly*, 33(2), 185-209.
- Cook, V. (2005). Multicompetence: Black-hole or worm-hole. In *Plenary speech presented at the Second Language Research Forum, New York City, NY*.
- Creswell, J. (2003). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative and mixed methods approaches* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Davies, A. (1996). Proficiency or the native speaker: What are we trying to achieve in ELT? In G. Cook & B. Seidlhofer (Eds.), *Principle and practice in applied linguistics* (pp. 145-157). Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
- Ellis, R. (2015). *Understanding second language acquisition*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
- García, O. (2009). *Bilingual education in the 21st century: A global perspective*. Malden, MA: John Wiley & Sons.
- García, O., & Leiva, C. (2014). Theorizing and enacting translanguaging for social justice. In A. Blackledge & A. Creese (Eds.), *Heteroglossia as practice and pedagogy* (pp. 199-216). Dordrecht, Netherlands: Springer.
- Gumperz, J. (1982). *Discourse strategies*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Hall, S. (2012). Deconstructing aspects of native speakerism: Reflections from in-service teacher education. *The Journal of Asia TEFL*, 9(3), 107-130.
- Harman, R., Ahn, S., & Bogue, B. (2016). Reflective language teacher education: Fostering discourse awareness through critical performance process. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 59, 228-238.
- Harman, R., & French, K. (2004). Critical performative pedagogy: A feasible praxis in teacher education? In J. O'Donnell, M. Pruyne, & R. Chávez Chávez (Eds.), *Social justice in these times* (pp. 97-115). Greenwich, CT: New Information Press.
- Harman, R. M., & Zhang, X. (2015). Performance, performativity and second language identities: How can we know the actor from the act? *Linguistics and Education*, 32, 68-81.
- Hélot, C. (2011). Children's literature in the multilingual classroom: Developing multilingual literacy acquisition. In C. Hélot & M. Ó Laire (Eds.), *Language policy for the multilingual classroom: Pedagogy of the possible* (pp. 42-65). Bristol, England: Short Run Press.

- Hornberger, N. H., & Link, H. (2012). Translanguaging and transnational literacies in multilingual classrooms: A biliteracy lens. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 15(3), 261-278.
- Jee, Y. (2016). Critical perspectives of world Englishes on EFL teachers' identity and employment in Korea: An autoethnography. *Multicultural Education Review*, 8(4), 240-252.
- Kim, H.-K. (2011). Native speakerism affecting nonnative English teachers' identity formation: A critical perspective. *English Teaching*, 66(4), 53-70.
- Kim, H.-K. (2017). Demystifying native speaker ideology: The critical role of critical practice in language teacher education. *The Journal of Asia TEFL*, 14(1), 81-97.
- Kim, T.-Y., & Seo H.-S. (2012). Elementary school students' foreign language learning demotivation: A mixed methods study of Korean EFL context. *The Asia-Pacific Education Researcher*, 21(1), 160-171.
- Kirkpatrick, A. (2007). *World Englishes: Implications for international communication and English language teaching*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Lee, B. M. (2002). An early English education: Its effects and significance in the Korean EFL context. *Foreign Language Education Research*, 5, 13-37.
- Li, D. (1998). "It's always more difficult than you plan and imagine": Teachers' perceived difficulties in introducing the communicative approach in South Korea. *TESOL Quarterly*, 32(4), 677-703.
- Lin, T.-B., Wang, L.-Y., & Wang, M.-Y. (2018). Diverse interpretations on nativeness but unanimous subscription to native-speakerism: Identity of future non-native English teachers in Taiwan. *The Journal of Asia TEFL*, 15(3), 603-617.
- Liu, D., Ahn, G.-S., Baek, K.-S., & Han, N.-O. (2004). South Korean high school English teachers' code switching: Questions and challenges in the drive for maximal use of English in teaching. *TESOL Quarterly*, 38(4), 605-638.
- Mazak, C. M., & Herbas-Donoso, C. (2014). Translanguaging practices and language ideologies in Puerto Rican university science education. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies*, 11(1), 27-49.
- Milu, E. (2013). Translingual practices in Kenyan hip hop: Pedagogical implications. In S. Canagarajah (Ed.), *Literacy as translingual practice: Between communities and classrooms* (pp. 104-112). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Nayar, P. B. (1994). Whose English is it? *TESL-EJ*, 1(1). Retrieved from <http://www.tesl-ej.org/wordpress/issues/volume1/ej01/ej01f1/>
- Norton, B. (1997). Language, identity, and the ownership of English. *TESOL Quarterly*, 31(3), 409-429.
- Park, J. S.-Y. (2009). *The local construction of a global language: Ideologies of English in South Korea*. Berlin, Germany: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Pavlenko, A. (2003). "I never knew I was a bilingual": Reimagining teacher identities in TESOL. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education*, 2(4), 251-268.
- Pavlenko, A., & Blackledge, A. (2004). *Negotiation of identities in multilingual context*. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.
- Phillipson, R. (1992). *Linguistic imperialism*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
- Phillipson, R. (2009). *Linguistic imperialism continued*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Poza, L. (2017). Translanguaging: Definitions, implications, and further needs in burgeoning inquiry. *Berkeley Review of Education*, 6(2), 101-128.
- Reis, D. (2011). Non-native English-speaking teachers (NNESTs) and professional legitimacy: A sociocultural theoretical perspective on identity transformation. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 2011(208), 139-160.
- Ríos, C., & Seltzer, K. (2017). Translanguaging, coloniality, and English classrooms: An exploration of two bicoastal urban classrooms. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 52(1), 55-76.
- Rymes, B. (April 27, 2018). Translanguaging is everywhere. *Anthropology News*. doi: 10.1111/AN.842
- Song, J. (2016). Emotions and language teacher identity: Conflicts, vulnerability, and transformation. *TESOL Quarterly*, 50(3), 631-654.

- van Dijk, T. A. (2003). Critical discourse analysis. In D. Schiffrin, D. Tannen, & H. Hamilton (Eds.), *The handbook of discourse analysis* (pp. 352-371). Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Wei, L. (2011). Moment analysis and translanguaging space: Discursive construction of identities by multilingual Chinese youth in Britain. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43(5), 1222-1235.
- Wei, L. (2018). Translanguaging as a practical theory of language. *Applied Linguistics*, 39(1), 9-30.
- Wong, J., & Waring, H. Z. (2010). *Conversation analysis and second language pedagogy: A guide for ESL/EFL teachers*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Zacharias, N. T. (2010). The teacher identity construction of 12 Asian NNES teachers in TESOL graduate programs. *The Journal of Asia TEFL*, 7(2), 177-197.

Appendix A

The Transcription Symbols in CA

.	(Period) falling intonation
?	(Question mark) rising intonation
,	(comma) continuing intonation
::	(colon(s)) prolonging of sound
<u>word</u>	(underlining) stress
word	(in bold) loud speech
↑word	(upward arrow) raised pitch
↓word	(downward arrow) lowered pitch
>word<	(more than and less than) quicker speech
<word>	(less than and more than) slowed speech
hh	(series of h's) aspiration or laughter
(hh)	(h's in parentheses) aspiration or laughter inside word boundaries
[word]	Simultaneous or overlapping speech
=	(equal sign) latch or continuing speech with no break in between
(.)	(period in parentheses) micro-pause: 0.2 second or less

(Adapted from Wong & Waring, 2010)

Appendix B

The Transcripts of the First and Second Forum Theatres

The first forum theatre [0:00-02:30]

- 1 At the office, the teachers are busy getting ready for the day.
- 2 Jungwon: (busy writing down) 아↓, 오늘 제임스 선생님 오시는 날이네요.
Oh↓, today is the day Mr. James is coming.
- 3 Yuna : 아, 맞아요. (throwing her pen down) 오늘 제임스 선생님 오시는 날이네요.
Yeah, right. Mr. James is coming today.
- 4 어떡해요↑. (touching her hair) 저 제임스한테 한 마디도 못하는 거 아니에요?
Oh, my gosh↑. what if I won't be able to say anything to Mr. James?
- 5 Jungwon: (patting on the shoulder) 아니에요.
Oh, no. Don't worry about it.
- 6 Yuna : (blushing) 저 진짜 영어 못하거든요. 저 고등학교 때 공부한 게 끝인데,
I am really bad at English. I only studied English until high school and that is it.
- 7 (sighing) 정원쌤은 그래도 해외에서 공부도 하시고 영어 진짜↑ 잘하시겠어요.
Jungwon, you should be really good at English since you have an experience of studying abroad.
- 8 Jungwon: (shaking her head) 저 어릴 때 갔다와서 다 까먹었죠.
I forgot all about it because I was young.
- 9 Yuna : 아 그래도: (tapping Jungwon) 저보다 훨씬 낫죠.
Oh, well: you must be better than me though.
- 10 (patting on Jungwon's shoulder) 아 정원쌤 오늘 기대할게요 [진짜] (groans)
Well, I will expect your English today. [really]
- 11 Jungwon: (shaking her hand) [아니에요.] (tapping Yuna)

- [No, my English may not be as good as you expect.]
- 12 (waving her hands) 아\hh (..) 빨리 연습해야겠다. 어: I majored in English education↑
Oh\hh I should practice my English quickly. Ah:
- 13 (.) university↑ 아 h (..) university 말고, undergraduate 이라는 (.)
Ah h other than university, I should use the word undergraduate.
- 14 좀, 더 fancy 한 거 써야겠다. (writing down on the paper)
the fancier word
- 15 (Knocks on the door)
- 16 James : (coming in to the office holding a cup of coffee in her hands)
- 17 Hello! I'm the James, (...) from the States.
- 18 (Everyone stops what they are doing and looks at James.)
- 19 James : Hello (bowing her head: greeting in Korean way)
- 20 Jihyun : 아이고: [James, (getting up from her seat) 오셨어요?
Oh, my gosh: [James, are you here?
- 21 Mina : [어떡해 (looking at Nara)
[What am I supposed to do
- 22 Jihyun : 아↑ [반가워요. (shaking hands with James) =
Oh↑ [Nice to meet you.
- 23 Jihyun : =[Thanks for having me here. (shaking hands with JY)=
- 24 Nara : [쌤이 먼저 이야기 해요 (looking at Mina, tapping her hand)
[Mina, you talk to Jame first
- 25 Jihyun : =(shaking hands) 우리 학교에 온 걸 환영해요
Welcome to our school.
- 26 James : [Thank you]
- 27 Jihyun : [우리 선생님들하고 (.) (pointing to the teachers) 인사 하실래요?
[Would you like to say hello to our teacher?
- 28 James : (approaching Mina)
- 29 Mina : (Standing from the seat) Hi:↑(approaching her right hand in front) I am an English
30 teacher (.) I am Mi:↑=(shaking hands)
- 31 James : (Keeps shaking hands) =Me[e?=
32 Mina : (Keeps shaking hands) =[Yes:=
33 James : (Keeps shaking hands) =Glad to meet you:=
34 Mina : (Keeps shaking hands) =Oh:↑good to see you=(hh)
- 35 Nara : (Standing from the seat) =Hi I am Ki-Yeun:↓(.) I am an English teacher
36 too=
37 James : =You are Ki-Yeun?=
38 Nara : (Nodding head) =[Eung
39 James : [English teacher? I am James:=
40 Nara : =Nice to meet you=
41 James : (Pointing at Mina and Nara) =So you two are English teache[rs?
42 Mina : (Nodding head) [Ye[ah:
43 Nara : (Nodding head) [Eu[ng:
44 James : [Oh ok: (..) thank you
45 (Approaching to other teacher, Yuna) Nice to meet [you
46 Yuna : (Standing from the seat) [Ooo: oh:↑ hi: hi↑ James:↑
47 (shaking hands) uhh: (.) I (.) am (.) the music teacher: (..) (looking around)
48 in this s:ch[ool (..) nice to meet you]
49 James : [huh: (..) you are the music] tea[cher? (looking at
50 other teachers in the room)]

- 51 Yuna : [Yes:]
 52 Teachers: [(hhhhh)]
 53 Yuna : [I am Park]
 54 James : [Very cute:↑]
 55 Yuna : [Nice to meet] you:
 56 James : Nice to (looks at Jihyun and back to Yuna) meet you. Thanks for having me here. (moves
 57 toward Jungwon)
 58 Yuna : (sits down clapping her hands)
 59 Jungwon: (stretching her arm towards James for a handshake) Hello:↑, my name is Jungwon.
 60 (shakes hands with James)
 61 James : [Oh, Jungwon?]
 62 Jungwon: [Nice to see you.]
 63 James (surprised, looks at the other teachers for a second and looks back at Jungwon) I'm James.
 64 (keeps on shaking hands)
 65 Jungwon: Ah: (nods)
 66 James : Ah: (smiles)
 67 Jungwon: Yeah, I'm the English teacher (holds James's hand with both her hands and keeps on
 68 shaking it)
 69 James : You're also the **English teacher**↑(points with his finger and looks toward Jungwon)
 70 Jungwon: Yeah (makes an eye contact with James and nods with smile)
 71 James : Okay. (3) (nods repetitively) Oh: so...
 72 Jungwon: Uh, yeah so ...
 73 James : You've got like, (.) (looks at other teachers) great school here, right?
 74Jungwon: Oh: right, right. (nods her head)
 75 Actually, I (points herself) majored English Education for my undergraduate degree↑
 76 James : (makes a round lip, looking surprised) **Really**?↑ (looks at other teachers)
 77 Jungwon: Yeah(..)
 78 James : You've lived abroad? (looks at Jihyun)
 79 Jihyun : (nods with smile)
 80 James : like, **no grammatical errors**!
 81 Jungwon: (smiling to James) **Thank**↑ you.
 82 James : (to everyone) =She is **really**↓ fluent, and she's
 83 Yuna : (clapping)
 84 James : got like this **perfect** accent↑ (shaking hands)
 85 Jihyun : (nodding and smiling to each other) 오↓ 역시 정원쌤 다르네!
Oh↓ *Jungwon is outstanding, indeed!*
 86 Jungwon: (to James) Please have a seat here↓
 87 Mina : (to Kiyeun) 우리가 더 좋은 것 같은데=
I think we are better than her=
 88 Nara : (to Mina) =그렇게 좋은 건 잘 모르겠는데?
=I don't think she is that good
 89 Mina : (to Kiyeun) [그러니까]
[That is what I meant]
 90 Jihyun : (to Yuna) [잘한다]=
[So good]=
 91 Yuna : (to Jihyun) =[진짜 잘한다]
=[She is really good]
 92 James : [How long (have you been abroad)]?
 93 Jungwon: For about (3 or 4 years)
 94 James : Oh↑ Very good (..) very good (.) very good (.) Like (..) nice (.)

The second forum theatre [0:00-02:35]

- 95 Jungwon: 아↑ 오늘 James 오는 날이네요: (looking at Yuna)=
Oh↑, today is the day Mr. James is coming.
- 96 Yuna : =(looking at Jungwon) 맞다 오늘 James 오시는 날이죠: (...)
Right, Mr. James is coming today:
- 97 James 선생님, >아 (hhh) 저 영어 진짜 못하는데<
Mr. James, > ah (hhh) I am really bad at English<
- 98 정원샘은 (looking at Jungwon) (..) 외국에 살다 오셨으니까: (.)
Jungwon (..) Because you have lived abroad: (.)
- 99 영어 잘 하시겠어요: =
You should be really good at English: =
- 100 Jungwon: =저도 어릴 때 살다 온거라: 영어 다 까먹었죠 뭐: =
=I lived there when I was really young: (..) So I forgot everything: =
- 101 Yuna : =아: (hh) (...) 그래도 저희보단 더 잘하시죠. >
=Ah: Well, you must be better than us though. >
- 102 외국에 오래 살았, < 살았으니까: (looking at Jungwon and nodding her head)
Since you lived abroad for a long time:
- 103 Jungwon: 아 (hhh) (looking at the computer) 저=
Ah I=
- 104 Yuna : =기대할게요 (smiling)
= I am expecting on your English (smiling)
- 105 Jungwon: 아 (hh), (smiling, leaning backward) 연습해야겠다.
Ah (hh), (smiling, leaning backward) I should practice English
- 106 어: University, >University 말고< 좀더 근사한 단어 없나?
hmm: University, > rather than university < what is the fancier word to replace this?
- 107 Jihyun : (leans forward, looking at Jungwon) 아이 정원쌤: ↓ 영어 외국어로 배웠는데 뭐.
Hey, Jungwon: ↓ You learned English as a foreign language.
- 108 한국어도 잘 하고 영어도 잘 하면 대단한거지. 평소처럼↑ 해요. (nods, smiles)=
If you are good at both Korean and English, that's a great deal. Just speak in Korean as usual.
- 109 Jungwon: [오↓ 네 (nods)]
[Oh↓ Okay]
- 110 Somi : =(looks from Jungwon to Jihyun) 맞아요↑ 뭐↓
Yeah, right↑ well↓
- 111 우리가 다 (..) 한국인인데요 뭐 (keeps smiling)
We are all Korean, just feel comfortable and speak Korean to James
- 112 Jungwon: (nods) 오, 역시: 선생님들 말씀 들어보니 그 말이 옳은 것 같네요.
Oh, yeah: I think that's the right thing to say.
- 113 아 나 편한대로↑ 해야겠다. (nods)
Oh, I will not feel pressure on speaking English and just try to speak in Korean as I feel comfortable.
- 114 James: (knocks on the desk three times) (..) (leans forward) May I come in↑ (walks toward Jihyun)
- 115 =Hello? uh, I'm (..) James (.) Stevenson?
- 116 Jihyun : (looking at Jihyun) [Uhhh] (stands from the chair, with a smile)
- 117 =ah: ↑ (stretches arm to shake hands)
- 118 James : [from the States↑] (shaking hands) [Hello.](slightly bows)
- 119 Jihyun : [안녕하세요?] =Uooh:, (shaking hands)
[Hello?]

- 120 우리 학교에 오신 걸 [환영합니다.] (keeps shaking hands)
Welcome to our school
- 121 저는(.)이 학교 **교무부장**(slightly nods)이에요.↑
I am the Dean of Academic Affairs in school.
- 122 James : (looks at others briefly and looks back at Jihyun)(..) teacher? [ah haha](nods)
- 123 Jihyun : =Yes.(strongly nods and shakes hand) 반갑습니다:↑(keeps smiling, slightly bows
124 once)
Nice to meet you:↑
- 125 James : =[Thank you for having me here.(Looks at others)
- 126 Jihyun : =네. (pointing other teachers) 선생님들↑ 같이 인사...
=Yes. (pointing other teachers) Hey everyone↑ let's say hello to James...
- 127 Yuna : [(stands up) **ahh**↑] [ah]
- 128 James : (leaning forward, moves toward SH and bows once) =[Hello?
- 129 Yuna : (slightly bows)안녕하세요?
Hi?
- 130 =[Hi,]James? Uh, (pointing herself) I (.) I am **Park** (nods once) 유나.(.)
- 131 I am **Park**: (..) (nods once) **유:나**.
- 132 James : **Hi**:? [Hi:] (leans forward) [Park↑?] (...) [Yuna↓].
- 133 Yuna : (shaking hands with James) I am the 음악 teacher. (.) 음악(.) la↑la↑la↑ [teacher]
I am the music teacher. (.) Music (.)
- 134 James : (shaking hands with Yuna) [음악↑] (..) music teacher?
[music↑]
- 135 Yuna : (nodding intensely) um um
- 136 James : (keeping shaking hands) really nice to meet you.
- 137 Yuna : (nodding intensely) nice to meet you.
- 138 Jungwon: (standing up from her seat) Hello James!
- 139 (sliding her chair inside) My name is Kim jungwon. (.) I am also the English
140 teacher↑.
- 141 James : (shaking hands with HY) Oh, you are **the English**↑ teacher.
- 142 Jungwon: (shaking hands with JH) Yeah I will be working with you.
- 143 James : (nodding) Oh as a co-teacher.
- 144 Jungwon: I graduated English Education in my university?
- 145 James : My major was chemical engineering, but I've been teaching students for (...) like
146 Jungwon: several years?
- 147 Jungwon: oh ↑ nice to see you (smiles and moves her arm to point to the chair that Jihyun is
148 going to sit on) Please have a seat here. These are also English teachers↑ (quickly
149 points to all the English teachers with her hand)
- 150 James : You've got (.) like (.) a great school (sits on the chair and throws her hair back)
- 151 Mina : [Hi] (waves her hand with smile)
- 152 Somi : [Hi] (waves her hand with smile)
- 153 James : [Hello]
- 154 James : So, you four: are: the English teachers↓ (points to all the English teachers quickly
155 and looks at Jungwon)
- 156 Jungwon: Yeah (nods her head)
- 157 Nara : (nods her head)
- 158 James : So, what grade (.) are you (..) teaching ↓
- 159 Mina : Uh (..) Um(..) I teach **fifth** grade ↑ (...) 5 학년↑ I'm 미나.
fifth grade↑ I'm Mina.

- 160 James : 미나↓ nice to meet you (nods with smile). I'm James.
Mina↓
- 161 Nara : I teach **6th** grade (points herself)↑, I'm, ah, 나라↓. =um. 나라 (nods).
I'm, ah, Nara↓. =um. Nara (nods).
- 162 Nice to meet you (looks at Somi) =
- 163 James : = [나라? (nods) 나라.]
=[Nara? Nara]
- 164 Somi : Hi, I'm, I teach **3rd** grade↑. = Yeah. I'm 소미. =um.
Somi.
- 165 James : =[3rd grade.] =[소미?]
=[Somi?]
- 166 I'm really happy to be, (points herself) part of your (..) (looks at Somi) school↓
167 (looks at Jungwon, nods with smile). =yeah.
- 168 Jungwon: (nods with smile) =[um.]
- 169 Somi : Yeah. Um. Um. It won't be **easy** (.) (using her hands) for you to **teach**↑: (using her
170 hands) our students.
- 171 James : So: these: (using her hands) students (...) are↑ they **nice**? (looks at Somi)
- 172 Somi : They are: some of, some of them↑ (.), are: **not nice**↓. (shakes her head and hands)
173 (Everyone laughs)
- 174 James : [(nasty kids)]
- 175 Teachers: [(hhhh)]
- 176 Somi : (...) not nice=
- 177 James : =not nice: (looking at Jungwon)
- 178 Jungwon: (.) So let's discuss about our future lesson plans=
179 James : =ok=
- 180 Jungwon: =after we have lunch together↑=
181 James : =ok=
- 182 Yuna : =Let's go grab some 급식.
=Let's go grab some school cafeteria lunch.
- 183 James : (.) What is 급식?
What is school cafeteria lunch?
- 184 Yuna : (moving hands, showing the motion) 급식:=
school cafeteria lunch:=
- 185 Mina : =[밥 밥] (moving hands)
=meals meals
- 186 Nara : =[밥 밥] (moving hands)
=meals meals
- 187 James : (looking at Mina & Nara) 밥↓ It's lunch (..) in Korean:?=
meals↓ It's lunch in Korean:?=
- 188 Yuna : =급식 급식 (moving hands) ↑같이 가요 [같이 가요].
=school cafeteria lunch, school cafeteria lunch ↑Let's go. [Let's go.
- 189 Jihyun : [밥 먹으러 갈까요?
[Shall we go for lunch?
- 190 James : (looking at Jungwon) right now? We are going to the cafeteria?
- 191 Jungwon: ↓Yeah: (..) let's go for 급식:↑
let's go for school cafeteria lunch:↑