

Using Joycean Narrative Inquiry to Historically Explore the Language Use of One Community of Practice in South Korea

John R. Baker

Faculty of Foreign Languages, Ton Duc Thang University, Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam

Abstract

This paper, through the use of Joycean narrative inquiry, offers a qualitative narrative analysis of two types of language input the South Korean community was exposed to when the doors opened to a large number of western teachers in 1993 (i.e., General American and Received Pronunciation). Specifically, this paper provides examples of lexical choice and quotes from two groups of teachers at this time (i.e., American and British). This analysis is accomplished through a reflective narrative drawn from the style found in a story in Joyce's *The Dubliners* (i.e., *The Dead*), where groups are personified into characters, and the events of one day are presented as representative of each groups' people and their language use. Using this technique, this paper reports that the representative of each group held fast to his/her individual varieties to preserve identity. This paper also found that each representative used acts of convergence to reduce social distance. Noting that narrative inquiry is an emerging, recognized, and widely used area in the field but that the use of Joycean narrative inquiry is underrepresented, this reflection provides both a historical perspective and a starting point for future examinations of non-native speaker (NNS) communities' present use of English. Specifically, investigations into what influences such historical examples have had on present language use. Regarding the lack of research using this instrument, this paper is also offered as a starting point for the use of Joycean narrative inquiry as a research instrument in TESOL and its related fields.

Keywords: Convergence, identity, Joyce, narrative inquiry, South Korea

Introduction

The formal teaching of English in Korea began over 130 years ago (Kachru & Nelson, 2006), and, since that time, Standard American English (General American, GA) has, at least historically, generally been favored by the South Korean (S. Korean) educational community (e.g., universities, language schools, teachers, and students) as a superstrate language (Ahn, H, 2013; Ahn, K, 2011; Gibb, 1999; Nam, 2005; Shim, 2002; Yook, 2010). The favor historically afforded to GA seems to stem from a combination of two sources: (a) familiarity and (b) prestige. Examining the first source, familiarity, or how much contact Koreans have had with GA, shows that Koreans have

historically had more contact with GA than with other varieties of English. For instance, the first English school was commissioned in the nineteenth century by Korea's King Kojon to train interpreters who would serve him and his high-ranking aristocrats (Kachru & Nelson, 2006). Although the school was set up by a German and run by a British national, two Chinese teachers who were educated in America (and therefore familiar with GA) generally did the teaching. Shortly thereafter, Koreans were further familiarized with the GA variety because American missionaries, who used English as a vehicle for their religious work, began teaching English. Even during the Japanese occupation of Korea, Koreans' familiarization with the GA variety continued. This is because the Japanese taught English as a foreign language in their occupationalist curriculum. During the Korean War (1950-1953), which ended with the separation of two Koreas (i.e., North and South), S. Koreans' familiarity with GA further increased as a result of the locals' contact with American service people.

After the Korean War, S. Koreans' desire to learn the GA variety was fueled by another factor: the prestige associated with the success of post Korean War America. This and S. Korea's late twentieth century push for globalization resulted in S. Koreans' seeing English as linguistic capital that could provide them with access to many economic and social rewards (Canagarajah, 1999), and, more importantly, for the purposes of this paper, a direction to look to for a linguistic model, i.e., America.

Following this, until the early 1990s, S. Koreans generally looked to America as a linguistic model. *Generally looked to*, however, does not mean that other varieties were completely ignored. Several factors have contributed to the attention to and an ever-growing acceptance of different varieties of English on the language teaching scene. One of these was S. Korea's aforementioned push for English to help the country meet its globalization goals. The second was its requirement that English be taught beginning with the third grade. The third was S. Korea's agreement to comply with the World Trade Organization's Uruguay Round Agreement, which stressed that western teachers were needed to teach in the country. And finally, the fourth was the S. Korean Ministry of Education's stipulation that English should be taught through English, which *assumedly* (emphasis added and questioned) could best be done via a native speaker of English (Davies, 2003; Iams, 2016). These factors, one confounding another, opened the doors to a great many English teachers—1,960 by 1994 (Korea Central Daily, 15 November 1995). And, of course, once the doors were opened, many more than just North American guests arrived. These new arrivals, both speakers of GA and other varieties, modeled their own varieties, and a mixture of these varieties, in such abundance that it created an environment where S. Koreans became familiar with other varieties, to include British (RP).

To illustrate the situation that fostered S. Koreans' aforementioned familiarization with varieties of English (e.g., American GA and British RP), this paper provides a reflective and humorous look (i.e., narrative inquiry) at

the time when the doors were first opened, 1993-1994, which encompasses my first year as a language teacher in S. Korea (e.g., August 1, 1993-July 31, 1994).

During this time, some of the British teachers attempted to accommodate their variety of English (RP) to the GA variety their students and language school owners perceived as prestigious in order to command a higher salary (see Jannedy, Polett, & Weldon, 2011). Others, as a matter of national identity, did not (see Yule, 2010). And still others joined their American counterparts in a type of speech accommodation, i.e., acts of convergence where the speaker adopts the speech style of the hearer to reduce social distance (see Yule, 2010). At times, the language bantered about between these groups raised an eyebrow or got confusing. Other times, it was funny. And, at still others, it was downright hilarious. To illustrate each group's language use, I will use a Joycean style narrative reminiscent of Joyce's technique in *The Dubliners* (i.e., *The Dead*).

The purpose of this reflective exploration is three-fold. First, as mentioned above, this work describes two different varieties of English S. Koreans had exposure to in the early 1990s, specifically, (a) lexical examples of GA and RP, (b) examples of how each representative teacher held fast to his/her individual varieties, and (c) acts of convergence each teacher used to reduce social distance. Second, this paper offers a starting point for future examinations into the influence such historical examples have had on present language use, to include language used to preserve identity and social distance when interacting with speakers of different language varieties. This examination is indeed important because, despite the (a) enormous number of teachers who have entered the country over the last 25 plus years, (b) the fact that there has been an increase in the acceptance of and teaching of different varieties of English (Shim, 2002) and (c) there have been evaluations of language use in the region (Jenkins, 2006), studies on the resultant English language use regarding convergence on the Korean Peninsula are limited. And third, the author hopes to offer a starting point for use of the Joycean narrative inquiry with TESOL related narrative explorations.

The third objective, the use of Joycean narrative inquiry, much like narrative inquiry as a whole (Nelson, 2011), has historically required some justification. The use of narrative inquiry in language studies, although used in many other fields in an interdisciplinary nature, e.g., sociology, psychology, health sciences (Barkhuizen, 2011), and listed as a narrative instrument in education research design texts (Creswell, 2012, 2013), is still in its infancy in language studies (Vasquez, 2011); however, this approach is gaining acceptance (Barkhuizen, 2011; Nelson, 2011). On one hand, this early stage of growth is a challenge, as researchers need to continually justify narrative inquiry as "an academically valid research methodology" (Bell, 2011, p. 580). On the other hand, this infancy provides a fertile opportunity for exploration, as narrative inquiry is a broad field that encompasses "a range of theoretical assumptions and analytical approaches" (Taylor, 2003, p. 195). As Stanely

and Temple (2008) point out, there seems to be “little shared sense of core concerns, of approach and even of what narrative is seen as” (p. 276). Barkhuizen (2011) finds such open range opportunity “comforting”, adding that “the field is relatively wide open. ... There is plenty of space to move, plenty of avenues to investigate, plenty of opportunity to muddle around” (p. 410).

Looking at what has been done thus far, we can see that narrative inquiry has been used in a variety of different ways, e.g., life and career histories, digital learning histories, teacher reflective journals, teacher blogs, video recordings of classroom interaction, classroom observation field notes, narratives frames, and memoirs and diaries (Barkhuizen, 2011), and across a variety of fields (Clandinin, 2006). Researchers have used narrative inquiry because of the “light it can shed on research questions” (Menard-Warwick, 2011, p. 541). They have also (as has been done in this paper) gone so far as to group a participant’s experiences as well as participants, in one way or another, to form more unified narratives. Menard-Warwick (2011), in discussing a life history exploration, for example, reported that when writing about her subject, Veronica, she recognized Veronica’s “life history appeared not as one seamless account, but rather in episodes” (p. 568). Similarly, Barkhuizen (2011), when offering the term narrative knowledging to describe the meaning making process narrative researchers go through, explained that when discussing a migrant research project, he found himself grouping the participants together, combining their individual stories, and reporting on their collective experiences.

Despite the work that has been done with narrative inquiry, Joycean narrative “that blends analysis with artistry, in the form of plays, poems, stories, and the like, remains relatively uncommon within language education research” (Nelson, 2011, p. 463). This lack of use in language education research is disappointing, as such “narratives have the potential to make a significant and timely contribution to the field, given the ways in which knowledge is being reconceptualised in this postmodern, transglobal era.” The disappointment stems from the fact that this sort of artistry, which “may be serious or humorous, contemplative or dramatic, other- or self-focused, or some combination” (p. 465), does not just report the facts. “It uses a dialogic process where temporal connections and theoretical evaluations are made of out of remembered personal experiences” (Menard-Warwick, 2011, p. 572).

Having identified this gap in the narrative inquiry toolbox, I will, as mentioned earlier, use Joycean narrative inquiry in this study (and term it as such), much as James Joyce did in his work *The Dead*, a short story in his novel *The Dubliners*. In this work, Joyce, in a combination of third-person narrative and first-person exchanges, described Ireland and its language during the early 1900s by personifying Ireland’s people and language into single characters and representing multiple events in the course of one day.

Method

To illustrate the types of input the S. Korean community was exposed to (i.e., the language use of American and British teachers), I will, in the course of this historical humorous Joycean style narrative, draw on my observations as a participant observer of the western teaching community in 1993. I will use this sort of qualitative thick description to demonstrate three uses of language. First, I will reflectively (a) provide, via third person, textual examples of lexical choice (i.e., GA and RP) that I reflectively recall these two groups using and (b) via first person, provide direct quotes from these groups to show examples of how each group used its individual varieties. Finally, (c) I will provide specific examples of acts of convergence each group used to reduce social distance as a further type of language use that S. Korean locals were exposed to during this time. Each of these uses of language will be identified in italics throughout the narrative. To illustrate these examples, I will, using a Joycean narrative, personify each group into a single pseudonymed character (i.e., American and British characters, Ron and Mary, respectively) and illustrate their language choices during a single day, much as Joyce did in his work *The Dead* from his novel *The Dubliners*.

Narrative

As English teachers and friendly coworkers, Mary (British) and Ron (American) would start their day by preparing their lessons together. On this particular day, a cold day in December 1993, they wanted to begin their lessons with a mingling activity, or what Mary called *a walkabout*, an activity where the students would move around the classroom, meet other students, and then sit with a new partner in preparation for the next language activity.

Mary and Ron arranged such activities, hoping that the students would become friends or *mates* (not the kind that kissed or got *cheeky* after class, though romantic partnerships did form sometimes). One popular activity included bringing a bag of different colored nice tasting things that they would pass out to their students. Then, they would have the students form pairs according to the color of the nice tasting thing each student received.

Being frugal, Mary and Ron would buy large bags of these goodies together, and this is where things would get interesting. It never turned into an argument or a *row*. Instead, it just raised an eyebrow or two.

Once in the shop, Mary would call out, "Did you find any *sweets*?"

And Ron would reply, "Yes, I found a nice bag of candies."

To which, Mary would ask, "Are they *boiled sweets*?"

And Ron would respond queerly, "Boiled sweets. Who would boil candy? They're just hard candies."

The discussion about the colors of these nice tasting things didn't go much better. Mary would ask if there were any *amber* ones. To which Ron would

reply, “No, but there are some yellows.” An exchange about colors/*colours* similar to this ended up with Mary getting *pinched* one night (and I don’t mean anyone touched her inappropriately). It happened when she tried to explain to the local *bobby* (a Korean policeman trained in English by a North American teacher) that the light was amber and not red when she pulled out of the *car park*. But that’s another story.

Another thing Mary and Ron would do before classes that always produced a little confusion was to create and practice homemade lesson activities. It wasn’t that they couldn’t afford the store-bought variety because they didn’t get good salaries. They both received pretty good *pay packets* each month. It was just that *proper* published activities back then were in limited supply. As a result, Mary and Ron would make a game of tic-tac-toe, or *naughts and crosses*, depending on who was describing the game. At other times, they would create an activity where the students were supposed to find the differences in two pictures. On this day, it was the latter. The picture was about a street scene, and things indeed got confusing. As Mary and Ron practiced the picture game they had made, Ron understood some of the things that Mary described and could respond in kind. For example, when Mary said, “In my picture, I see a bunch of school children *queuing up* at the shop for *lollies*,” Ron could reply that his picture was the same: He saw a bunch of children standing in line at the ice cream shop for frozen ice cream. And they would generally understand each other. Other descriptions, however, were a bit more difficult for the two. When, for example, Mary said, “There is a chap with a *spanner* trying to fix a *tyre* on a *cab* with a cracked *windscreen* and a dented *boot* on the *opposite side* of the *roundabout* from the *chemist*,” Ron indeed looked perplexed. He couldn’t spot the difference in his picture. It wasn’t that Ron was stupid. He wasn’t a *duffer*. He was a smart fellow, and he really *swotted*. I mean he tried hard to understand what Mary was explaining. But it was no use. Mary helped by pointing to a few things in Ron’s picture, so he finally got it and said, “Oh you mean, there is a man with a wrench trying to fix the tire on the taxi—the one with a cracked windshield and dented trunk across the traffic circle from the drugstore.”

Trying to describe the position of a bicycle in the street scene didn’t go much better, and in fact, it got a bit funny. Mary explained that she saw two crossings, a *pelican crossing* and a *zebra crossing*. She further explained that there was a *push bike* with *trainers* next to the *pelican crossing* and another *push bike* without *trainers* next to the *zebra crossing*. Ron replied, “There are no damned animals in the picture, and no gym trainers are pushing any bikes. There’s just a bicycle with training wheels next to the pedestrian crossing with lights and another bicycle without training wheels next to the pedestrian crossing with lights.”

Mary laughed and smiled at Ron’s exclamation. She also realized that she had made quite a mess of her picture because she had been checking off the items as they were going along. Instead of just *chucking* her picture in the *bin*, however, she tried to *tidy things up* and asked Ron for a *rubber*. Ron

smiled with a peculiar pause and pointed to his rain boots, to which Mary, mumbling something about *Wellies*, replied, “Give me an eraser before I throw this thing in the trash, and stop being so damned *cheeky* or I’ll send you *legging off* to the *chemist*.”

Mary then smiled and gave Ron a *two-finger salute*. To which Ron, replied, “Peace,” not understanding that when Mary turned her fingers around, this sign means something entirely different in Britain than it does in the U.S. As you can see, Ron didn’t get that Mary’s fingers meant that he was to *get on his bike*, or in terms Ron would understand, *piss off*, so he just laughed. He really thought that she was giving him the international peace symbol.

Mary liked Ron and told him not to worry: “She was *just taking the piss out of him*.” He didn’t get this either, but he knew they were *mates* who would *tease* one another. I mean friends, of course. It wasn’t that Ron wasn’t *swarmy*. He certainly could talk to the ladies. Nor did it mean Mary wasn’t a *totty*. She was certainly a looker. It’s just that their relationship was of the platonic variety.

After Mary and Ron prepared their lessons, they would go off separately to teach their classes, but they would often meet up for a *nosh* to talk about their day’s classes. Setting up a time to meet to get a bite to eat was difficult though. This is because Ron would say, “Let’s meet up for dinner.” But there’s the rub. Mary was never quite sure if Ron meant noon or six o’clock, as the word for lunch and dinner is often interchanged in Britain.

Ending up in the same spot wasn’t much easier. Ron would say, “Let’s meet up on the first floor of this or that restaurant,” and Mary would often end up one floor above him. This is because the initial floor in Britain is often called the *ground floor* and the next floor is the first floor. Ron wouldn’t throw a *wobbler*. He would keep his cool and *give her a bell*. I mean a ring. And no, he wasn’t proposing marriage. He’d call her on the phone. Remember, the platonic thing? They were just friends.

When Mary and Ron would finally meet up to have a bite to eat, there were always more laughs. They would look at the menu, which of course had always been translated by, and thus inadvertently catered to, North Americans. Looking at the menu, Ron would want a cheeseburger and potato chips, and Mary would want fish and *chips*. Mary would usually repeat the order before the waiter came to make sure there was no confusion, and this is where things always got down-right hilarious. Mary would say, “You want a cheeseburger and *crisps*, and I’ll have fish and *chips*. Is that right?” To which Ron would say, “Uhm, I’ll have a cheeseburger and potato chips, and you will have the fish and fries.” And so it went.

As you can imagine, ordering a meal always took a long time, and so the laughs continued. Frustrated, Mary would tell Ron to quit *waffling*, to which he would explain that it was dinner time, and waffles were breakfast food. She would counter, “No you *twit*, quit *fanny*ing around and order.”

After a few smiles, Ron would quit procrastinating, but he would always have a little more fun with the language. When ordering, he would say, “I’ll

have a burger and crisps, and she would like fish and fries.” The waiters always looked perplexed when Ron did this, and they had a bit of a giggle too, so she would sometimes get a bit *cheesed off*. But that didn’t have anything to do with cheese. Remember, Ron had the cheeseburger. Mary was just getting what Ron would call *pissed*, and no she hadn’t had anything to drink—that came later. She just wanted to throw a *wobbler* because she wanted a *real dog’s dinner*. And no, she wasn’t stumbling because she had too much to drink. Are you following this story? Nobody was drinking. She just wanted to throw a tantrum because she couldn’t get the proper British meal she was hoping for.

After Ron and Mary had a bite to eat, they would go out for drinks. And no, we aren’t going to try and figure out that lunch and dinner thing. Let’s just move on with the story. Sometimes they would go to have *drinks* at a *watering hole* he liked, and sometimes they would go to her favorite *pub* for a few *pints*. They often got a little *squiffy*, and sometimes they got downright *pissed*—but let’s get it straight, nobody got angry. They just had quite a lot to drink.

Once they were feeling a little *tight*, Mary and Ron would inadvertently start talking about the activities they had created together and how the activities had worked in their classes that day. On this occasion, Mary and Ron talked about the picture activity. Mary explained that she had used the activity in two of her classes, her class *year 13s* and her *year 12s*. This story made almost no sense to Ron, so he just smiled. The thing is that the school years in America are held back one year, and that doesn’t mean the kids in the U.S. are any more *daft* than those in the Britain. They are just as smart as their classmates across the seas. It just means that kindergarten in America translates to first year in Britain and so on.

Moving on, Mary and Ron started talking about their classes. Mary explained that the picture activity they had created had really got the kids *full of beans*. In fact, she explained, “The kids were so *wound up* that they couldn’t stop talking.” Ron had only caught the full of beans part of the comment, and, trying his hand at convergence, retorted, “*Bollocks*. It was a fine activity.”

Mary laughed and said, “Yes, it was the *dog’s bollocks*.” He didn’t quite get this either. As a result, he, again attempting convergence, asked what she *was on about*: “Pelicans, zebras, and now dogs. What’s all this about animals?”

Mary laughed, but she didn’t explain what dog’s bollocks meant. Instead, she just smiled and ordered another round.

When the drinks arrived, Ron paid the bartender. To which, Mary replied, “*Ta*,” and the fun was on again.

Ron: “Leaving so soon?”

Mary: “No, I mean thanks for the drink.”

Ron: “Oh, *Cheers*.”

Mary: “Are you leaving?”

Ron: “Uhm, no.”

Mary: “*Cheers* always sounds funny with an American accent.”

Ron: “Are you taking the *piss out* of me again?”

Smiling, Mary joked, “I think you are finally speaking English.”

To which, they both laughed and clinked their glasses.

Mary and Ron then had a few more drinks and even considered *skiving* the next day—but *skipping class* would probably end up with both of them getting *sacked*, and they needed their jobs. And so, their year went on: preparing lessons, learning to respect each other’s varieties of English, introducing their students and the S. Korean community to these varieties, and generally having a good time.

Results

Looking back on Mary and Ron, I realize that it has been *yonkers* since I last saw this odd couple, more than 25 years. Reflecting on this humorous expatriate pair (that is, the communities they represent) and their teaching preparation, interaction, and jocular exchanges (as described above), I have offered speech examples respective of Ron and Mary’s own language varieties (GA and RP). These are shown as third person, in-text lexical examples of American GA and British RP (Table 1), contrasting speech samples of American GA and British RP (Table 2), and acts of convergence (Table 3).

Table 1 illustrates lexical examples of American GA and British RP used. Thirty-six examples were found.

Table 1

In-text lexical examples of American GA and British RP

| General American (Ron) | British RP (Mary) |
|--|------------------------------------|
| 1. <i>mingling activity</i> | <i>walkabout</i> |
| 2. <i>friends</i> | <i>mates</i> |
| 3. <i>argument</i> | <i>row</i> |
| 4. <i>colors</i> | <i>colours</i> |
| 5. <i>receiving a ticket from a police officer</i> | <i>getting pinched by a bobby</i> |
| 6. <i>yellow traffic light</i> | <i>amber traffic light</i> |
| 7. <i>parking garage</i> | <i>car park</i> |
| 8. <i>salary envelopes</i> | <i>pay packets</i> |
| 9. <i>store bought activities</i> | <i>proper published activities</i> |
| 10. <i>tic tac toe</i> | <i>naughts and crosses</i> |
| 11. <i>Ron was stupid</i> | <i>he wasn't a duffer</i> |
| 12. <i>he tried hard</i> | <i>he really swotted</i> |
| 13. <i>chucking her picture in the bin</i> | <i>this thing in the trash</i> |
| 14. <i>tidy things</i> | -- |
| 15. <i>a two-finger salute</i> | <i>piss off</i> |
| 16. <i>talk to the ladies</i> | <i>swarmy</i> |

| | |
|--|----------------------------------|
| 17. <i>a looker</i> | <i>a totty</i> |
| 18. <i>to meet to get a bite to eat</i> | <i>meet up for a nosh</i> |
| 19. -- | <i>there's the rub</i> |
| 20. <i>first floor</i> | <i>ground floor</i> |
| 21. <i>second floor</i> | <i>first floor</i> |
| 22. <i>throw a tantrum</i> | <i>throw a wobbler</i> |
| 23. <i>give her a ring</i> | <i>give her a bell</i> |
| 24. <i>procrastinating, waffling</i> | <i>waffling</i> |
| 25. <i>eraser</i> | <i>Rubber</i> |
| 26. <i>rubber</i> | <i>Wellies</i> |
| 27. <i>pissed off</i> | <i>cheesed off</i> |
| 28. <i>proper British meal</i> | <i>a real dog's dinner</i> |
| 29. <i>a watering hole</i> | <i>a pub</i> |
| 30. <i>tight</i> | <i>squiffy</i> |
| 31. <i>drunk</i> | <i>pissed</i> |
| 32. <i>12th and 11th grade</i> | <i>year 13s and her year 12s</i> |
| 33. <i>Stupid</i> | <i>daft</i> |
| 34. <i>skipping class</i> | <i>skiving</i> |
| 35. <i>getting fired</i> | <i>getting sacked</i> |
| 36. <i>long time</i> | <i>yonkers</i> |

As illustrated in Tables 2 and 3, I have (drawing on the narrative) also shown that by holding fast to their own varieties and then engaging in acts of convergence to reduce social distance, Ron and Mary not only learned quite a lot about each other's language varieties, they also, like the other teachers of the time, were pioneers that helped bring about a different sort of community of practice: one that provided input S. Koreans (i.e., the locals they encountered—customers in candy shops, their students, waiters, and pub personnel) could draw on while becoming familiarized with the English language, a model that demonstrated examples of American GA, British RP, and a mix of the two.

Fourteen contrasting speech samples of American GA and British RP were identified. These are listed in Table 2.

Table 2

Contrasting speech samples of American GA and British RP

| | | |
|---|----|---|
| 1 | RP | Did you find any <i>sweets</i> ? |
| | GA | Yes, I found a nice bag of <i>candies</i> . |
| 2 | RP | Are they <i>boiled sweets</i> ? |
| | GA | They're just <i>hard candies</i> . |
| 3 | RP | In my picture, I see a bunch of children <i>queuing up</i> at the shop for <i>lollies</i> . |
| | GA | He saw a bunch of children <i>standing in line</i> at the ice |

| | | |
|----|-----------|---|
| | | cream shop for <i>frozen ice cream</i> . |
| 4 | RP | There is a chap with a <i>spanner</i> trying to fix a <i>tyre</i> on a cab with a cracked <i>windscreen</i> and a dented <i>boot</i> on the <i>opposite side</i> of the <i>roundabout</i> from the <i>chemist</i> . |
| | GA | Oh you mean, there is a man with a <i>wrench</i> trying to fix the <i>tire</i> on the <i>taxi</i> —the one with a cracked <i>windshield</i> and dented <i>trunk</i> across <i>the traffic circle</i> from the <i>drugstore</i> |
| 5 | RP | Mary explained that she saw two crossings, a <i>pelican crossing</i> and a <i>zebra crossing</i> . She further explained that there was a <i>push bike</i> with <i>trainers</i> next to the <i>pelican crossing</i> and another <i>push bike</i> without trainers next to the <i>zebra crossing</i> . |
| | GA | There are no damned animals in the picture, and there are no gym trainers are pushing any bikes. There's just a <i>bicycle</i> with <i>training wheels</i> next to the <i>pedestrian crossing</i> with lights and another <i>bicycle</i> without <i>training wheels</i> next to the <i>pedestrian crossing</i> with lights. |
| 6 | RP | <i>legging off</i> to the <i>chemist</i> |
| | GA | <i>run</i> to the <i>drugstore</i> |
| 7 | RP | She was <i>just taking the piss</i> out of him. |
| | GA | <i>tease</i> one another |
| 8 | GA | You want a cheeseburger and <i>crisps</i> . |
| | RP | I'll have a cheeseburger and <i>potato chips</i> . |
| 9 | GA | You will have the <i>fish and fries</i> . |
| | RP | I'll have <i>fish and chips</i> . |
| 10 | GA | quit <i>procrastinating</i> |
| | RP | No you <i>twit</i> , quit <i>fannying</i> around and order. |
| 11 | RP | had created had really got the kids <i>full of beans</i> |
| | GA | The kids were so <i>wound up</i> that they couldn't stop talking. |
| 12 | GA | -- |
| | RP | Yes, it was the <i>dog's bollocks</i> . |
| 13 | GA | <i>Ta</i> |
| | Mary (RP) | <i>Leaving so soon?</i> |
| 14 | RP | -- |
| | GA | Oh, <i>Cheers</i> . |

Four acts of convergence were found. These are listed in Table 3.

Table 3

Acts of convergence

| | | |
|---|------|--|
| 1 | Mary | Give me an eraser before I throw this thing in the trash, and stop being so damned <i>cheeky</i> or I'll send you <i>legging off</i> to the <i>chemist</i> . |
| 2 | Ron | <i>Bollocks</i> . It was fine activity. |
| 3 | Ron | What she was <i>on about</i> |
| 4 | Ron | Are you <i>taking the piss out of me</i> again? |

Discussion, Implications, and Suggestions for Future Research

This paper provides a historical and humorous look (narrative inquiry) at one community of practice, i.e., British and American (personified as an odd pair of expatriate teachers) in North East Asia (i.e., S. Korea). This work shows how these teachers provide examples of different varieties of English S. Koreans might have drawn on in the early 1990s. That is, (a) lexical examples of GA and RP, (b) examples of how each teacher held fast to their individual varieties, and (c) acts of convergence each teacher used to reduce social distance.

By exploring these areas in this historical context, this paper has practical and theoretical implications in that the discussion and data presented here can support the growing dialogue regarding linguistic democracy in English language teaching policy, pedagogy, and testing (see Acar, 2007; Ahn, 2013; Sato & Suzuki, 2007), an approach that embraces the intra-national and international sides of this multifaceted area (Mirshojaee, 2011) to support learners' needs in this globalized era.

As more than 25 years have passed, and S. Korea has seen an influx of a wide variety of teachers, several more research opportunities present themselves. The first opportunity is directly related to the examples illustrated in this paper: An examination of what lexical examples of different Englishes are presently used by Korean speakers of English as a result of contact with these historical examples (i.e., GA and RP).

Taking the discussion further, two other possibilities present themselves: (a) How S. Korean learners of English hold to the varieties they have encountered when interacting with others who speak other varieties (e.g., teachers, expatriates, and Korean speakers of other varieties, and (b) what acts of convergence S. Korean English learners engage in with speakers of different varieties of English. The discussion could, and should, be taken even further by exploring how other world Englishes have influenced S. Koreans use of English.

Another opportunity also exists, and it is one that the author hopes will take seed and grow. It is hoped that this paper will be a starting point for the use of Joycean narrative inquiry as a research instrument in TESOL and its related fields.

References

- Acar, A. (2007). Standards and competence in English as an international language pedagogy. *Asian EFL Journal*, 9(4), 39-53.
- Ahn, H. (2013). English policy in South Korea: A role in attaining global competitiveness or a vehicle of social mobility? *Journal of English as an International Language*, 8(1), 1-20.
- Ahn, K. (2011). Conceptualization of American English native speaker norms: A case study of an English language classroom in South Korea. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, 12(4), 691-702.
- Barkhuizen, G. (2011). Narrative knowledging in TESOL. *TESOL Quarterly*, 45(3), 391-414.
- Bell, J. S. (2011). Reporting and publishing narrative inquiry in TESOL: Challenges and rewards. *TESOL Quarterly*, 45(3), 575-584.
- Clandinin, D. J. (Ed.). (2006). *Handbook of narrative inquiry: Mapping a methodology*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Canagarajah, A. S. (1999). *Resisting linguistic imperialism in English teaching*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
- Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational research: Planning, conducting and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (4th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson.
- Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Davies, A. (2003). *The native speaker: Myth and reality* (Vol. 38). Cleveland, OH: Multilingual Matters.
- Gibb, M. (1999). A comparative study of attitudes towards varieties of English held by professionals and tertiary level students in Korea. *The Korea TESOL Journal*, 2(1), 31-51.
- Globalization in 1994 (1995, Nov. 15). *Korea Central Daily*.
- Iams, S. (2016). Unpacking the native speaker knapsack: An autoethnographic account of privilege in TESOL. *Korea Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages*, 12(2), 3-21
- Kachru, Y., & C. L. Nelson. (2006). *World Englishes in Asian contexts*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.
- Jannedy, S., Poletto, R., & Weldon, T. L. (1994). *Language files: materials for an introduction to language & linguistics* (6th ed.). Columbus, O.H.: Ohio State University Press.
- Jenkins, J. (2006). Current perspectives on teaching world Englishes and English as a lingua franca. *TESOL Quarterly*, 40(1), 157-18.
- Mirshojaee, S. B. (2011). Divergence and Convergence: The Ebb and Flow of

- English as an International Language. In Chandalia, H. S. (Ed.), *Language and literature teaching: ELT across borders*. (pp. 65-79). New Delhi: Creative Books
- Menard-Warwick, J. (2011). A methodological reflection on the process of narrative analysis: Alienation and identity in the life histories of English language teachers. *TESOL Quarterly*, 45(3), 564-574.
- Nam, J. M. (2005). *Perceptions of Korean college students and teachers about communication-based English instruction: Evaluation of a college EFL curriculum in South Korea* (Doctoral Dissertation). Available from Proquest Dissertations and Theses Database (3160833).
- Nelson, C. D. (2011). Narratives of classroom life: Changing conceptions of knowledge. *TESOL Quarterly*, 45(3), 463-485.
- Sato, T., & Suzuki, A. (2007). Diagnosing factors of the preference for English as a center variants of English in as a lingua franca settings. *Journal of English as an International Language*, 2, 51-64.
- Shim, R. J. (2002). *Changing attitudes towards TESOL in Korea*. *Journal of Asian Pacific Communication*, 12(1), 143-158.
- Stanley, L., & Temple, B. (2008). Narrative methodologies: Subjects, silences, rereadings and analyses. *Qualitative Research*, 8(3), 275-281.
- Taylor, S. (2003). A place for the future? Residence and continuity in women's narratives of their lives. *Narrative Inquiry*, 13(1), 193-215.
- Vasquez, C. (2011). TESOL, teacher identity, and the need for “small story” research. *TESOL Quarterly*, 45(3), 535-545. doi:10.5054/tq.2011.256800
- Yook, C. M. (2010). *Korean teachers' beliefs about English language education and their impacts upon the ministry of education-initiated reforms* (Doctoral Dissertation). Available from Proquest Dissertations and Theses Database (760087664).
- Yule, G. (2010). *The study of language: An introduction*. New York, N.Y.: Cambridge University Press.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Pat Bizzaro for being a constant inspiration in the area of humor; Resa Bizzaro for her helpful feedback; Jean Niencamp for her liberating thoughts on research methodology; and Sivakumar Sivasubramaniam, Murat Hismanoglu, and the editors of the *Journal of English as an International Language* for their suggestions and guidance.

This paper was funded by Ton Duc Thang University (TDTU). Questions regarding this research can be sent to Dr. John Baker, Ton Duc Thang University, 19 Nguyen Huu Tho St, Tan Phong Ward, Dist. 7, Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam.

Note on Contributor

John R. Baker holds a PhD in English. He has taught and worked with writing centers in Asia and the U.S.A. His research interests include second language writing and reading, self-access and writing center administration, various literature interests, research methods, and how these come together in an interdisciplinary nature. Email: drjohnrbaker@tdtu.edu.vn