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Abstract

Following critical/post-structural perspectives in conducting ethnographic research on the political dimension of language learning, this study examines language learners’ identity and investment in a post-secondary Korean language classroom in Canada. First, this study explores the ways in which Korean-ness is produced through the curriculum, how an instructor’s linguistic and teaching practices in the Korean language classroom function to include some students and exclude others, and how the students on the periphery cope with their marginalization. I argue that peripheral students’ coping strategies are strongly tied to their investment into certain aspects of Korean language and culture, as well as their desire to gain symbolic resources in the Korean language. Second, my study examines the ways in which Korean heritage language learners (re)negotiate their hyphenated Korean Canadian identities by looking at three different discourse sites - Korean home, Korean church, and Canadian schools - and how their hyphenated identities are connected with their investment in maintaining their heritage language.

The data for this study includes classroom observations, semi-structured interviews, bi-weekly written journals and focus group interviews. By adopting critical discourse analysis (CDA) as a means of analyzing the data, this study shows that language learners’ race, ethnicity and gender are salient parts of their identities, and thus impact their learning experiences to
varying degrees and levels. My research findings also suggest that the ethnic identity capital that the heritage language learners embrace in relation to their perceptions of their native speech community as well as its status, is intertwined with the maintenance of their heritage language.

Pedagogical implications from this study enable educators to equally empower students from diverse backgrounds, and help them to be sensitive to the relations between ideologies and power in the language classroom. Central to these pedagogical implications is that it is the role of the teacher to adequately capitalize on the multilingual and multicultural practices that each student brings to the language classroom, and to identify the social and cultural voices present in the class.
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Chapter I: Political Dimensions of Language Learning

1.0. Introduction

The social and cultural politics of language education has attracted much attention and debate in the area of applied linguistics and across interdisciplinary fields over the recent years (Canagarajah, 1993, 1999; Cummins, 1996, 2000; Giampapa, 2004; Goldstein, 1997, 2003; Morgan, 1997, 1998; Pennycook, 2000, 2001; Toohey, 2000). At the heart of cultural politics of language education are the critical understandings of social reproduction in education, showing how schools are part of society, reflecting and reproducing social relations (Giroux, 1983). From this perspective, therefore, language classrooms are not merely the educational context of knowledge and information, but a sociopolitical space that exists in a complex relationship to the outside world. Furthermore, the language classroom becomes a site of struggle where certain forms of social and cultural representations or ideologies are produced and legitimized, and by which some learners are placed on the periphery and thus marginalized. From this political understanding of the language classroom, language learning is no longer conceived of as an abstract cognitive process, but as a highly complex social and cultural process through which learners’ identities are mediated. To this end, Van Lier (2000) argues that “language learning is not a holus-bolus or piecemeal migration of meanings to the inside of the learner’s head, but rather the development of increasingly effective ways of dealing with the world and its meanings” (p. 246).

Recently, drawing on the market metaphors employed by French sociologist, Pierre Bourdieu (1977, 1990), many critical researchers have framed their research on political dimension of language education in reference to critical theories of language (Blackledge, 2001; Ibrahim, 1999; Giampapa, 2004; Goldstein, 1997, 2003; Norton Peirce, 1995, 1997a). The
shared assumption amongst these critical researchers is that social relationships are seldom constituted on equal terms. Therefore, the goal of the critical researchers in language education is to engage in the study of a variety of social relations, especially inequitable relations of power. Bourdieu’s widely used term “cultural capital” was first developed to theorize the unequal education system where certain forms of capital are rightly exchanged for other forms of capital while others are not valued or exchangeable (Pennycook, 2000). Bourdieu (1986) explains the development of “cultural capital” as follows:

As a theoretical hypothesis which made it possible to explain the unequal scholastic achievement of children originating from the different social classes by relating academic success, i.e. the specific profits which children from the different classes and class fractions can obtain in the academic market, the distribution of cultural capital between the classes and class fractions (p. 243).

This notion of “cultural capital” has been tremendously valuable in emphasizing unequal power relations amongst speakers in the same linguistic market, and thus, conceiving of language as a social practice taking place within relationships of power.

In addition to Bourdieu, Weedon’s feminist poststructuralist framework (1987) offers another useful venue to explore issues regarding the political understandings of language education. The notion of Weedon’s ‘subjectivity’, defined as ‘the conscious and unconscious thoughts and emotions of the individual, her sense of herself and her ways of understanding her relation to the world’ (p. 32) has been helpful in conceptualizing the relationship between language learners and the environments where they learn the language and have interaction with the people in the target speech community. From this perspective, language learners’ subjectivity is complex, multiple, and changing over time, while language learners are conceptualized as active agents who engage in constant identity negotiation work.
Following the critical theories of language, my doctoral research enters this discourse on identity and cultural politics (Pennycook, 2000) investigating the language classroom as a domain imbued with relations of power, constructed through the continuous legitimization process in various discourse practices. My particular interest lies in ways in which discourses promoted and legitimized in the language classroom disadvantage a certain group of learners, thereby marginalizing them and placing them on the periphery. To this end, my research will also illustrate a set of strategies to cope with the marginalization of a disadvantaged group of learners in the language classroom, and will demonstrate what it means for them to invest themselves into learning the target language in this globalized world.

The classroom under investigation involves teaching and learning Korean as a foreign language at a post-secondary institution in Canada. My research contributes to the area of language education in two different ways. First, my research will illuminate what goes on in the language classroom where non-English language is taught as a form of a foreign language. To date, many publications utilizing critical theories have paid close attention to the classrooms where English is taught as a second/foreign language, leaving a lot of unanswered questions in regard to the language classroom where non-English language is concerned. Second, foreign language learners are often assumed to have little access to the language and are often thought to have instrumental motivations related to school success. They are not seen to have concerns over changes in social identity or lived experience because they study a target language outside of the communities where it is spoken. For this reason, classroom research exploring learners’ identities or power relations within the classroom has been mainly conducted in the context of second language learning. I would like to fill this gap by showing that issues of identity and power relations are directly related to the foreign language learners’ lives and learning experience.
Through my research, I would like to show that the symbolic resources (Bourdieu, 1991) that the language learners wish to gain by learning a foreign language are closely intertwined with their identities, that is to say, their race, ethnicity, gender, etc. In approaching the issue of identity and power relations, I will also link the language learners’ linguistic, cultural and social lived experiences to the macroscopic and transnational level, thereby exploring the important subject of what it means for the learners to learn a foreign language in this globalized world.

One thing that I need to discuss with regard to my research is the use of the term ‘foreign language classroom’. As I stated earlier, the language classroom under investigation here is a Korean language classroom in Canada. However, viewing the classroom as an absolute ‘foreign language classroom’ can be problematic because the classroom under investigation includes the students of Korean origin. To these students, Korean is considered as a heritage language as they have been exposed to the language since birth through their family connections. If I follow a common definition of heritage language learners as those who have acquired their cultural and linguistic competence in a non-dominant language primarily through contact at home with foreign born parents and/or other family members (Kondo-Brown & Brown, 2008; Valdés, 1995), then we may assume that the needs of these heritage language learners are inherently different from those of foreign language learners. However, in my research, I will still use the term, ‘foreign language classroom’ to designate the class under investigation as it is offered through a post-secondary institution in which language courses are open to any enrolled university students. Despite my rather overarching use of the term ‘foreign language classroom’, I will still address the issue of identity and power relations pertaining to the Korean students through a separate chapter examining their hyphenated identities, and what it means for them to invest in learning their heritage language.
In order to explore the classroom dynamics between different groups of students, their identities, and investments in the Korean language, I address the following questions:

**Question 1**: What kind of symbolic resources does learning Korean in Canada provide for the learners? What are the learners’ investments in learning Korean language?

**Question 2**: How are the representations of Korean-ness constructed through the “centre” discourses in terms of their legitimacy and authenticity? Who benefits from these legitimized discourses? How do these discourses function to include some and exclude others and in what ways is this accomplished?

**Question 3**: How do learners of Korean language negotiate and perform their identities on the periphery? How are the learners’ race, ethnicity, and gender experienced in the context of language learning?

In order to answer these questions from a theoretical point of view, I found Giddens’ (1984) terminology of the “centre” and “periphery” useful. Giddens states:

Those who occupy centres ‘establish’ themselves as having control over resources which allow them to maintain differentiations between themselves and those in the peripheral regions (p. 131).

Those at the centre define what linguistic, cultural and social norms are, and whether consciously or unconsciously, reproduce these norms by having control of symbolic and material resources. By contrast, those at the periphery as potential linguistic and cultural consumers, negotiate their social positionings through the ways in which identities are managed, negotiated and contested (Giampapa, 2004). In relating Giddens’ notion of centre/periphery to my research, I locate two main discourses as centre discourses; the discourse manifested in the language teaching materials and the discourse realized through teacher’s linguistic and teaching practices. For the teaching
materials, I include a textbook that the Korean language learners are currently using in Canada, and other educational media. By exploring ‘centre’ discourses, I wish to unravel the ways in which particular representations of Korean-ness are produced and reinforced, and the ways in which a certain group of learners are marginalized and disadvantaged by these ‘centre’ discourses promoted and facilitated by the native Korean speech community. Therefore, it is my purpose to entail understandings about the ways in which different groups of learners respond to these ‘centre’ discourses and negotiate meanings, values and ideologies promoted by ‘centre’ discourses.

In conceptualizing the power relations using a centre/periphery notion, I also investigate how language learners cope with their marginalization and utilize their investments into learning the Korean language as coping strategies. My position is that power relations are not always oppressive and restrictive, but possibly empowering. Power relations allow for negotiation on the part of learners whereby they become active agents (Weedon, 1987) to turn the power relations around to maximize benefits. As such, representations of Korean-ness, Korean values, norms and ideologies promoted by ‘centre’ discourses are renegotiated and challenged by learners of Korean language.

The following section introduces the theoretical framework on which my research hinges, and provides an overview of how researchers in the field of applied linguistics have begun conceptualizing the language classroom as a sociopolitical space that exists in a complex relationship to the outside world. In so doing, I will pay special attention to race, ethnicity, and gender as critical elements that have significant influences on shaping language learners’ identities and that affect the experiences of language learning.
1.1. Theoretical Framework

Educational researchers active in the critical study of language have been interested in language learning as a social practice (Canagarajah, 1993; 1999; Giampapa, 2004; Goldstein, 2003; Ibrahim, 1999; Morgan, 1997; Norton Peirce 1995; Pennycook, 2001). The shared position of these critical educational researchers is that language constructs and is constructed by a wider variety of social relationships, which may be characterized as inequitable relations of power, on terms that may be defined by race, ethnicity, gender, class and sexual orientation (Norton, 1997b). The main interest of critical researchers in language education is, therefore, in looking at how social realities such as power relations are produced and reproduced through various discourses within a specific learning context.

An in-depth analysis of the dialectical relationship between the individual and the society comes from the sociological work of Bourdieu (1977, 1991). Central to the conception of identities is Bourdieu’s (1991) notion of habitus, which refers to a set of durable dispositions acquired through intensive and extensive involvement in the practice of every day life. This acquired habitus functions as a lens through which individuals see themselves and others, conditioning their language, behaviors, and their attitudes. Habitus can produce a number of practices and perceptions in the field in which they were acquired as well as in other fields. According to Bourdieu, practices and perceptions are the result of the relationship between habitus and the market. To Bourdieu, a market is “structured space of positions” (p.14) in which the interrelationship of positions is determined by the distribution of resources or capital. Bourdieu elaborates different forms of capital as follows; economic capital (e.g. money, capital goods); cultural capital (e.g. knowledge, skills, education); symbolic capital (e.g. prestige, honor) and linguistic capital (e.g. speaking the right form of the language). These forms of capital are
not distributed equally in the linguistic market, thereby entailing a situation where those who control the resources, that is, those in the centre in Giddens’ (1984) term, also control the markets where these resources are distributed. It is my goal in this research, therefore, to investigate how different forms of capital are unequally distributed in a linguistic market, in a language classroom, and to consider who benefits from the ongoing reproductions of these hegemonic practices.

Having set the backdrop of power relations in the linguistic market, my research raises an important issue in relation to those in the periphery who do not possess the valued linguistic and cultural capital in the linguistic market. The question is: would they remain passive throughout the ongoing reproductions of hegemonic practices or would they resist and challenge their marginal positions by any means? In order to answer these questions, I found Weedon’s (1987) poststructural notion of subjectivity, as noted in the above, to be particularly useful. Norton Peirce (1995) in her work on identity construction among five immigrant women in Canada highlights the discursive construction of identity as “the multiple nature of subjectivity; subjectivity as a site of struggle; and subjectivity as changing over time” (p. 15). Drawing upon the notion of ‘subjectivity’, Norton Peirce conceives of language learners as having a complex social identity and multiple desires while constantly organizing and reorganizing a sense of who they are and how they relate to the social world. From this view, language learners are not only exchanging information with the target language speakers, but also become active agents who may resist the marginalized subject position as women, minorities or non-native speakers of the target language. It is this notion of active agency that enables us to depict those who do not

---

1 I am aware that the use of labels such as native/non-native speaker can be problematic since the labels are not only ambiguous but also may perpetuate the very marginalization. Nevertheless, I will use the term “non-native speaker” in this paper only to indicate one’s status as different from native speakers of the target language.
possess linguistic and cultural capital as agents who resist and challenge their marginal positions in a given linguistic market.

Martina, an immigrant woman from Czechoslovakia included in Norton’s (1995) study presents a good example of language learners as active agents. Despite feelings of inferiority and shame due to her lack of English, Martina refuses to be silenced because her identity as a mother and primary caregiver in the home leads her to challenge the discourse practices governing interactions between Anglophone Canadians and immigrant language learners. Although Martina is aware that her position is inferior to that of her Anglophone co-workers in the restaurant where she works, she confronts her co-workers by taking the initiative to serve the customers by drawing on her symbolic resources as a mother to reframe the power relations between herself and her co-workers who are much younger. Martina, in this case, is depicted not just as a passive language learner, but as an active agent who refuses to concede to her co-workers’ power as legitimate speakers of English, and successfully turns their relations to her own advantage. By conceiving of learners as agents, the poststructuralist framework allows us to consider learners’ historically specific needs, negotiations and resistance as constituting their lives, and determining their investment in the target language.

Another contribution of Norton (1995) in the area of language learning is to reconceptualize the current notion of motivation. She argues that the term ‘motivation’ tends to dichotomize the learners as either motivated or unmotivated, thereby failing to explain learners’ situational desire or shifting needs in learning the target language. As an alternative, she suggests Bourdieu’s term “investment”, which “signals the socially and historically constructed relationship of learners to the target language” (Norton, 2000: 10). Norton (2000) states:

If learners invest in a second language they do so with the understanding that they will acquire a wide range of symbolic and material resources, which will in turn
increase the value of their cultural capital. Learners expect or hope to have a good return on their investment – a return that will give them access to hitherto unattainable resources” (p.10).

Drawing on the notion of Bourdieu’s cultural capital, Norton emphasizes that an investment in the target language is also an investment in a learner’s own social identity, an identity that is constantly changing across time and space.

In the following section, I will critically examine the ways in which educational researchers embracing critical theories of language have conceived of an act of language learning in the language classroom as a social and political practice where access and resources are not evenly distributed or equally available to the learners. I will also look at how these unequal relations amongst a different group of learners are linked to the macro dimensions of social and cultural life outside the classroom.

1.2. Political Conception of Language Classroom

It should be noted that in my research, I use the term ‘political’ as a means to understand the social and cultural politics of classrooms and to make critical interpretations of what goes in the classroom, not to address a formal domain of politics or policy. Benson (1997) supports my position of using the term political apart from the issue of policy:

We are inclined to think of the politics of language teaching in terms of language planning and educational policy while neglecting the political content of everyday language and language learning practices. In proposing a political orientation for learner autonomy, therefore, we need a considerably expanded notion of the political which would embrace issues such as the societal context in which learning takes place, roles and relationships in the classroom and outside, kinds of learning tasks, and the content of the language that is learned. (p. 32)

One of the earliest studies situating the classroom in the larger historical and social contexts of the society is Heath’s (1983) ethnography of how different communities in South Carolina (Roadville- a White working class community, and Trackton- a Black working class
community) socialize their children in different ways. By focusing primarily on the face-to-face network in which each child in the two communities learns the ways of acting, believing, and valuing, Heath illustrates how the language and literacy skills of these children are valued differently in school, and how such cultural capital is developed, valued or devalued. Heath’s critical analysis of social reproduction in education allowed other researchers to locate schooling in the context of social inequality, and to show that schools are part of society, both reflecting and reproducing social relations.

More pertinent to the context of language learning, Canagarajah (1993), in his critical ethnography of an English class at the University of Jaffna in Sri Lanka, demonstrates how students’ preferred learning styles and their resistance to English language learning are connected in complex ways to the social and cultural worlds both inside and outside the classroom. By exploring relationships between his rural Tamil students’ resistance to English language learning and the tensions taking place in Sri Lanka at the time of the research, that is, tensions between Tamil nationalists and the Sinhala government, Canagarajah argues that the classrooms do not simply reflect the outside world, but that there is a complex interplay between the classrooms and the outside world. He goes on to say that the classrooms are “relative autonomous spaces”, which suggests that the classrooms are part of the real world, and should not be used as a contrastive term with the real world. This perspective opens a new possibility in the field of pedagogy, and will be discussed in detail later in this thesis.

Canagarajah’s (1999) later publication on his Tamil’s students’ resistance to the English language learning embraces a centre/periphery framework (Giddens, 1984) to explore the challenges and possibilities facing English Language Teaching. His use of the centre/periphery terminology is two fold; the technologically advanced communities of the West as “Centre” and
the less developed communities materialistically dominated by the “Centre” communities as “Periphery”, native English communities as “Centre” and non-native communities as “Periphery”. Canagarajah was primarily interested in looking at the textbooks used in an English class as the centre discourses and ways in which periphery students and teachers confront the centre discourses and how people in the periphery communities cope with the tensions that characterize their encounter with centre-based teaching materials and hidden curricula. By conceiving of teaching materials as a means to carry cultural and ideological messages, full of cultural and ideological interpretations, Canagarajah successfully shows that language learning is a highly complex social and cultural process, reflecting and reproducing social relations outside the classroom.

Here, it is worth noting Pennycook’s (2000) evaluation of Canagarajah’s study. Pennycook sharply points out that Canagarajah’s study enables us to move beyond Bourdieu’s rather closed and deterministic view of equating forms of cultural capital with a slightly over-generalized and static notion of class. While Bourdieu’s social analysis does not seem to allow for change and does not explain how people take up and resist cultural capital, Canagarajah draws our attention to the opposition and resistance of those on the periphery, and to the complex ways peripheral students and teachers act within the context of schooling by calling for their autonomy. It should be noted that Canagarajah’s term autonomy, here, shares common ground with the notion of subjectivities employed by researchers such as Norton (1995), McKay and Wong (1996), and Siegal (1996) in that those in the periphery communities are perceived as active agents who resist and oppose discourses produced and reproduced by the people in power.

Language learning as a social and political practice is also strongly advocated by Morgan (1998). He criticizes the traditional static views of language learning as “…psychology’s focus
on the individual understates the causative role played by social and political conditions. Constructed this way, research can only offer a partial view at best. Language learning appears to take place in a social vacuum. The conditions, histories, and conflicts that have precipitated anxiety, confidence, or a desire for prestige have been essentially obscured” (p 26). Morgan’s (1997) study of an ESL classroom in Toronto, therefore, shows how an ESL class on intonation is connected to social and cultural relations, and how issues pertaining to social identity are constantly being reworked in the classroom. By looking at his Chinese ESL participants, Morgan persuasively conceptualizes his language classroom as a site where his students reassess their past in the context of present, and negotiate their identities through constant classroom interactions and reflections. He also discusses how the students’ exploration of different possibilities of intonation in dialogues is related to social and gender relations in the Chinese community. Morgan’s study is also important in that it engenders many valuable implications in language pedagogy as well as methodology, and thus, will be discussed in later chapters.

A more recent ethnography that explores a political dimension of the language classroom is Goldstein’s (2003) exploration of bilingual Cantonese-English life at Northside high school in Toronto. Goldstein raises questions of negotiating language use, the dilemmas of speech and silence that arise from promoting English monolingualism in the classroom, and the challenges of the every day discrimination that both teachers and students face inside and outside school. Goldstein’s ethnography reflects Morgan’s sociopolitical views of language learning, that is, as a continuous process of evaluating and negotiating their histories, conflicts and desires, thereby shaping and reshaping their identities. From this perspective, in Goldstein’s study, it becomes an issue that Cantonese students from Hong Kong strive to use a Cantonese language in an English
medium high school, and that these Cantonese students maintain their silence in the pair/group work with their English speaking peers.

What these studies have in common is that they conceptualize the language classroom as a sociopolitical space that exists in a complex relationship to the outside world, and where learners bring their identities, past histories, conflicts and desires. By adopting these political understandings of language learning, my study will show that Korean language learning not only concerns memorizing sets of grammar rules, symbols or words, but also is a process in which a variety of social realities such as power relations have an impact on the course of language learning, and where learners’ identities, ethnicities, races or genders are constantly at play.

In the next section, I will narrow my focus to the subject of language learners, and critically examine how language learners have been studied in connection with their identities and investments into a target language.

1.3. Discourses on Identity

Discourse has been connected to ideological processes and their role in the production of different subjectivities (Giampapa, 2004). Fairclough (1992) argues that discourse constitutes the social identities of and relationships between people in a way that helps to sustain and reproduce the social status quo and transform it. From this view, discourse becomes a mode of political and ideological practice, and as a system of representation, becomes a means through which identities are produced (Hall, 1997). In my research, the notion of discourse takes up an important space as I intend to explore the way in which certain representations and dialogues manifested through a variety of centre discourses are legitimized and justified, and the impact these centre discourses have on my students who learn Korean as a foreign/heritage language. In so doing, I am particularly interested in examining the ways in which students cope with their
marginalization, negotiate their identities, and invest themselves into learning the Korean language.

There are countless things that define one’s identity including ethnicity, race, gender, class, citizenship, age and sexual orientation, etc. Nevertheless, my focus is on the ways in which my students shape and reshape their identities in the course of learning Korean, whether it is as a form of foreign or heritage language, in connection with their culture, ethnicity, race and gender. For this reason, what is important in my research is to understand how my students’ culture, ethnicity, race and gender come into play in the Korean language classroom where diverse cultures, ethnicities, races and genders are brought together, and get into a highly complex but steady interplay. In the following sub-section, therefore, I will critically review how previous research adopting a poststructuralist framework has approached the subject of identity in relation to culture and ethnicity.

2.3.1. Discourses on Culture and Ethnicity

Before beginning any discussion on culture and ethnicity, I should note that the term ‘ethnic identity’ has been used with the term ‘cultural identity’ with many shared meanings because culture has a tendency to construct itself centering on one ethnic group. Nevertheless, ethnic identity is constructed through participation in activities where one’s ethnicity is more central and meaningful than others (Heller, 1987), whereas cultural identity is formed mostly through the relationships between the individual and members of the group who share common cultural background (e.g., history, language) (Norton Peirce, 1997a). My use of the terms in this paper constructs different meanings, following the definitions above.

Studies adopting a poststructuralist framework move beyond essentialist definitions limited by geo-spatial boundaries, thereby dismantling the notion of ethnic and cultural identity
as heterogeneous. Leung, Harris, and Rampton (1997), for example, problematize the notion of ethnicity by studying a group of secondary students in England. Using biographical data, they call into question a one-to-one correspondence between ethnicity and language. They demonstrate that the students’ experiences are not congruent with the linguistic and ethnic categories imposed on them, and argue that fixed categories of ethnicity and language cannot accommodate the scholastic needs of ESL students.

Similarly, by conducting case studies of four families of Mexican-descent, Schecter and Bayley (1997) examine the relationship between language and cultural identity manifested in the language socialization practices. They demonstrate that the families in their study present heterogeneous socialization practices although they all define themselves in terms of allegiance to their Mexican or Mexican American cultural heritage. Such a finding problematizes essentialist descriptions based on the reductionist categories, which ignore the diverse perspectives and backgrounds represented by U.S. Latinos. Like Leung, Harris, and Rampton, Schecter and Bayley bear out the poststructuralist idea of ethnic and cultural identity as contextualized, multifaceted, and individualized. Quoting Hall (1992), Leung, Harris, and Rampton (1997) state as follows:

Everywhere, cultural identities are emerging which are not fixed, but poised, in transition between different positions… People belonging to such cultures of hybridity have had to renounce the dream or ambition of rediscovering any kind of “lost” cultural purity or ethnic absolutism. They are the products of the new diasporas created by the post-colonized migration (p. 551).

Here, Hall sees the nature of cultural hybridity as “neither remains within one boundary, nor transcends boundaries” (2000, p. 226). Focusing on contemporary postcolonial communities characterized by multicultural diasporas resulting from displacement, exile, or migration, Hall illustrates the contemporary British society as: “the besuited Asian chartered accountant… who
lives in suburbia, sends his children to private schools and reads *Readers Digest* and *The Bhagavad Gita*, or… the Muslim student who wears baggy, hip-hop, street-style jeans but is never absent from Friday prayers, are all, in their different ways, ‘hybridized” (2000, p.226). Hall’s analysis of cultural hybridity caused by postcolonial multicultural diasporas is deeply tied into Bhabha’s (1994) notion of ‘third culture’ which occurs in colonial as well as immigrant contexts where more than one culture collide. The third space offers freedom for people to continually negotiate and translate all available resources in order to construct their own hybrid cultures and consequently, reconstruct their own individual identities.

This notion of identities in flux situates the negotiation of identities as part of a process that calls forth past, present and future, within the notion of “being and becoming” (Giampapa, 2004). Ibrahim (1999) explains this as follows:

> The former is an accumulative memory, an experience, and a conception upon which individuals interact with the world around them, whereas the latter is the process of building this conception (p.354).

Thus, identity is not merely about where we come from, or a “recovery of the past” but rather “who we might become”, and how presentations of whom we are bears upon how we represent ourselves (Hall & du Gay, 1996). This notion of “being and becoming” as a dialogical relationship amongst one’s past, present and future in the negotiation of identities is aptly expressed in Giampapa’s study (2004) that explores the process of ‘being and becoming’ Italian Canadians. By examining ways in which three Italian Canadian youths negotiate their multiple identities from the ‘periphery’ of their multiple worlds, Giampapa shows that the participants constantly challenge the undesirable imposed identities based on ethnicity, religion, language, and sexual orientation, and attempt to reconfigure what is valued and what is legitimate.

Speaking from the margins, these participants have found ways to re-articulate their identities
within the multiple spaces of their multiple worlds and to redefine what it means to be an Italian Canadian.

The poststructural conception of cultural and ethnic identity offers a useful direction in my study as it helps me to move beyond an essentialist approach to different ethnic groups of students in the Korean language classroom, and to view identities that students of diverse cultural backgrounds bring, not as something fixed or static but as fluid and constantly shifting. Thus I am able to explain students’ ambivalent feelings towards their investments into Korean language and culture in a more transparent manner. In the next sub-section, I will show how this notion of “being and becoming” has been central in the discourses on gender by discussing some of the existing literature.

1.3.2. Discourses on Gender

Many researchers investigating the subject of language and gender have adopted feminist poststructuralist approaches (Norton Peirce, 1995; Pavlenko, 2001; Pavlenko and Piller, 2001; Piller, 2001; Siegal, 1996). With an emphasis on the role of language in producing gender relations, Pavlenko and Piller (2001) believe that language is so important that it enables us to think, speak and give meanings to the world around us (Weedon, 1987). In this light, meaning and consciousness do not exist outside language, and the primary interest of feminist poststructuralists is in examining how social relations of gender are manifested through language. I would argue that the value of this framework in looking at gender issues is twofold: first, it helps to understand how gender constructions are manifested through discourses; and second, it illuminates the ways in which men’s and women’s language learning and use are not determined by their gender but constructed, negotiated, and transformed through social practices informed by particular social settings, relations of power, and discourses (Kubota, 2003).
Therefore, within this framework, gender differences in language learning are no longer expressed in generalized terms, but contextualized within the social situation in which the learning takes place.

Using first person narratives as data, Pavlenko (2001) convincingly depicts cross-cultural transitions as a locus where L2 learners go through changes in dominant ideologies of gender, normative gender roles, social/economic gender relations, and verbal/non-verbal gender performances. In line with researchers such as Norton (1995) or McKay and Wong (1996), Pavlenko uses the concept of active agents, who, as language learners, may resist the marginalized subject position as women, minorities or non-native speakers of the target language. Emphasizing the constitutive role of language in a poststructuralist sense, Pavlenko demonstrates that it is the speech communities that produce gendered styles while individuals make accommodations to those styles in the process of producing themselves as gendered agents. Nevertheless, in these cross-cultural transitions, while some of the L2 learners successfully assimilate with the target speech community, others resist assimilation. Watson, who is an American man and learning French, for example, resists assimilation with the target speech community because he does not want to effeminate himself by speaking French, which he considers “weak”. This finding cogently points to the fact that decisions to assimilate or resist assimilation to a particular speech community are influenced by ways in which gender is indexed linguistically in that community. This, in turn, implies that learners’ investment in learning the target language can be facilitated by negative attitudes towards gender ideologies of their native speech community. This finding is supported by Kobayashi’s (2002) study on how the positive attitudes towards learning English shown by Japanese high school female learners can be
interpreted in connection with women’s marginalized status in the Japanese mainstream patriarchal society.

Like Kobayashi, some researchers who have adopted the feminist poststructuralist framework emphasize the marginal status of female learners, focusing on the power relations reinforced through discourse practices. Siegal (1996), for example, investigates the sociolinguistic competence of Mary, an American White woman learning Japanese in Japan. Although Mary conforms to a normative Japanese women’s speech by employing “singing voice” or hesitancy, her language lacks appropriate sociolinguistic registers. She uses inappropriate verb endings in a conversation with her male Japanese professor, and ironically, the professor does not seem to be annoyed by her improper usage of the language. Siegal explains this phenomenon by arguing that the Japanese education system does not fully teach the sociolinguistic aspects of Japanese to foreigners, thereby reinforcing their marginal status as ‘outsiders’. This finding is a clear indication that L2 learners’ gendered agency is not entirely involved with their own free choice but co-constructed with the speakers of the target language who can accept or reject them and impose alternative gendered agency as a foreign woman.

Similarly, Piller (2001) identifies the ways in which women in linguistic intermarriage are subject to “otherization” in both L1 and L2 communities. In studying the linguistic choices of the couples of English and German speaking backgrounds, she found that women are marginalized from their migrant, non-native speaker status in the L2 community, and further contested regarding their L1 membership even within their native community. Piller’s finding points to the patriarchal attitudes concerning marriage, in which women automatically become associated with their husband’s native identity while men are not denied their status as natives.
This also implies that transition from one speech community to another is a gendered experience, having a different impact on female and male learners.

Studies by Siegal and Piller raise an important point that power and ideologies of dominant groups are engendered through discourse practices, thereby marginalizing those who want to assimilate with their target speech community. When we take a poststructural stance on power relations as socially and discursively constructed through such relations as gender, attending to power will help us to locate gender relations within larger social structures. As Bourdieu (1977) argues, discourse always owes a major part of its value to the value of the person who utters it, and from this view, men and women, and different ethnic or racial groups may carry different “rights to speech” or “power to impose reception” (p. 652) in a different speech community. In order to better understanding this issue, I will explore ways in which centre discourses are constructed, imparting “rights to speech” to a certain group of learners in the language classroom, and how power relations are to be created amongst different ethnic, racial and gendered groups of students.

In the next sub-section, I will examine how previous studies have approached the discourses on race in relation to the question of identity and language.

1.3.3. Discourses on Race

Although much academic literature has examined the questions of race and identity, with a focus on Whites and Blacks in particular, there have been only a few studies addressing the issue of race and identity within the context of language learning. Ibrahim’s (1999) critical ethnography is one of the few studies investigating the impact of becoming racialized in ESL. By looking at a group of French speaking immigrant and refugee continental African youths who are attending an urban Franco-Ontarian high school in Canada, Ibrahim demonstrates how French-
speaking African immigrant high school boys “become black” through identifying themselves with Black American pop culture, such as rap and hip-hop, and also by learning ‘Black English’ as a second language. Ibrahim further contends that these African youths enter a social imaginary in which they are already imagined, constructed, and thus treated as Blacks by hegemonic discourses and groups, thereby learning how to “become black”. He states:

Becoming black, I have argued, was an identity signifier produced by and producing the very process of BESL (Black English as a Second Language). To become black is to become an ethnographer who translates and looks around in an effort to understand what it means to be black in Canada, for example. In becoming black, the African youths were interpellated by black popular culture forms, rap and hip-hop, as sites of identification… Choosing the margin, I emphasize, is simultaneously an act of investment, an expression of desire, and a deliberate counterhegemonic undertaking. The choice of rap especially must be read as an act of resistance (p. 365).

Ibrahim’s finding points to the fact that the language classroom is neither neutral nor without its social and cultural politics, and that language learning is an engagement of one’s identity, a fulfillment of personal needs and desires, and an investment in something (e.g. BESL) that has a personal or a particular significance to who one is or what one has become. For ESL pedagogy, Ibrahim calls for educators’ critical identification of the different sites in which the students invest their identities and desires, and further supports the needs of the teaching materials that engage the students’ raced, classed, gendered, and sexualized identities.

In a similar fashion, Stacey Lee (2005) explores what “being American” means for Asian immigrants by examining Hmong American students in University Heights high school. She explores various ways that the Hmong American youth create their identities on the margins of the school, encounter racism, and respond to their subordinate positions both in school and in the larger American society. Lee argues that on immigrating to the United States, Asian immigrants and their children enter a society in which race has been and continues to be central to the
national discourse on identity. While immigrants may imagine an idealized America that is open and free, what they truly experience is a society where race and racism structure identities, and alter opportunities. It is their encounters with the dominant society that Asian American immigrants undergo a process of racialization and become racialized. In conclusion, Lee contends that school, as a site to reflect and reproduce the racial inequality of the larger society, should challenge this inequality and recognize the way race operates in the lives of students of color and White students.

In my research, issues concerning race are important not only because the Korean language classroom under investigation is racially mixed, but also because it has a number of students of Korean backgrounds. When these Korean Canadian students enroll in my Korean language class, they bring their day to day experiences, histories, and desires to the classroom, not to mention their hyphenated identities that they acquired as a minority child in Canada. In order to understand these heritage language learners’ desires, attitudes, and investment in the Korean language, I will have to situate their experiences in a broader social and political scale, thereby examining what it means for them to be and become Korean Canadians in Canada. The White and Black dichotomy that surrounds that U.S. conversation on race points to the fact that whiteness is constructed as the norm and blackness as the other (Feagin, 2000; Ong, 2003). According to Lee (2005), Asian Americans have been likened to either Blacks or Whites depending on the historical period. Whereas early Chinese immigrants, for example, were likened to Blacks during the 1960s, Asian Americans were likened to Whites as the stereotype of Asian Americans as hard-working and successful “model minorities” emerged (Takaki, 1989). Nevertheless, as “model minorities”, Asian Americans did not have the actual privileges associated with “real” whiteness. Robert Lee (1999) states:
The Asian American model minority is thus a simulacrum of both an imaginary Asian tradition from which it is wishfully constructed and an American culture for which it serves as a nostalgic mirror. The model minority can operate as the paragon of conservative virtues that all Americans should emulate only if Asian Americans remain like “us” but utterly are not “us” (p. 183).

From this view, the model minority rhetoric was certainly used to serve the interest of whiteness by helping to proving that the United States are an open society free of racial bias and inequality (Tuan, 1998).

I would argue that the model minority rhetoric is also embedded in my Korean Canadian students’ day to day lives in Canada. By exploring constant (self)positionings between Korean Canadian students and their surroundings, my research will investigate ways in which Korean Canadian students are racialized in a White dominant Canadian society, and what it means for them to maintain their Korean identities and to invest themselves into learning Korean language.

In the following section, I will begin to discuss various discourses on identity where Korean language and its maintenance are concerned. I will limit the scope of the discussion to the context of North America as most of the studies have been conducted in the United States, which is home to the world’s second largest Korean immigrant population.²


In the United States, Korean Americans were one of the largest and fastest-growing populations among post-1965 Asian ethnic groups by 2000 (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 2000). In 1990, there were approximately 800,000 Koreans in the United States. However, by 2000, the Korean population had increased to approximately 1.2 million. According to the 1990 statistics,

² According to the data provided by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade in South Korea (2008), the total number of Koreans overseas is 6,833,973. The number of Koreans residing in the U.S is 2,045,866. China has the largest number of Koreans with 2,764,990, the third is Japan with 597,992, and the fourth is Canada with 210,176.
more than 600,000 of these Korean-Americans were foreign-born, which means that a majority of Korean Americans today are either first or second generation residents (Takaki, 1989).

Korean immigration to Canada shows a similar pattern with Korean Canadians making up the seventh largest non-European ethnic group in the country after the Chinese, East Indian, Filipino, Jamaican, Vietnamese, and Lebanese populations (Statistics Canada, 2001). The Korean community in Canada is growing considerably faster than the overall population. Between 1996 and 2001, for example, the number of people who said they had Korean origins rose by 53%, while the overall population grew by only 4%. In 2001, 70% of Canadians of Korean origin were foreign-born, which suggests that the largest share of Korean immigrants living in Canada are relatively recent arrivals. In fact, of foreign-born people of Korean origin in Canada in 2001, 60% had arrived between 1990 and 2000. As the Korean immigrant population in the U.S. grew around the urban areas such as Los Angeles or New York, Koreans mostly lived in or around Toronto and Vancouver.

In the next section, I will engage identity discourses by examining what it means to be hyphenated Korean in North America, and ways in which 1.5 and second generation Koreans negotiate ethnicity and race in bi/multilingual worlds. As Danico (2004) points out, the term “1.5 generation” is not easily defined as it is placed in a continuum between the first generation who were born in homeland and the second generation who were born in the adopted country. In this paper, however, I define second generation as those who were born in their adopted country, and the 1.5 generation as those who have memories of their homeland, and at the same time, are bicultural and bilingual with their heritage language as well as with the language spoken in the adopted country (Danico, 2004).
1.4.1. Hyphenated Korean Identity

The crux of defining what it means to be hyphenated Koreans in North America is strongly tied to issues of social inequality in relation to ethnicity and race. A lot of scholarly work on hyphenated Korean identities points to the fact that the subsequent Korean generations in America have difficulties in being accepted by a mainstream society while also being marginalized by their own immigrant communities (Danico, 2004; Kibria, 2002, Lew, 2006). For this reason, Kibria (2002) argues that neither an ethnic assimilation model, which considers that Asian Americans follow the similar footsteps of the European immigrant tradition of assimilation into the mainstream, nor a racial minority model, which emphasizes the significance of race and the identity of Asian Americans as racial minority persons adequately explain how Asian Americans integrate or become parts of a mainstream society.

Since they are both racial minorities and ethnic Americans, Asian Americans’ experiences merge features of the experiences of European ethnics as well as those of racial minorities. In fact, as Waters (1990) makes clear, ethnic options are more available to Whites than to ethnic minorities who are visibly branded as a particular racial group and are seen by others as an ethnic minority before anything else. Whereas ethnic affiliation is symbolic, voluntary, and subjective in character to the European subsequent generations, ethnicity, to Asian Americans, may be a central basis for the organization of family and community, a means of collective organization and assertion in American political life (Kibria, 2002). Ideally, in a society pledging social equality and social justices, Asian Americans should not have difficulties being accepted and participating in the institutions and groups of the dominant society. However, Kibria’s (2002) detailed recounts of Chinese and Korean American’s experiences suggest that their minority ethnic and racial status turns out to be a central point of tension and conflicts that
these Asian Americans have to deal with from everyday experiences and encounters with the members of the dominant group. Kibria (2002) describes a strong sense of frustration and marginality experienced by Asian Americans as follows:

Childhood marked the beginning of an awareness of the difficulties of being American, given an Asian racial identity. Within the family, members of second generation encountered messages of race – lessons and ideas about how to deal with the experience of racialized exclusion. Among these messages was the counsel to retain a sense of consciousness and pride in being Chinese or Korean when faced with racism… But my informants also spoke of growing up with a sharp awareness of the uncertainties of their Chinese or Korean membership. They could draw on the powerful symbol of blood to affirm this membership, but they still faced ongoing challenges to their authenticity as “true Chinese” or “true Koreans” (p. 64).

Here, Kibria demonstrates how Asian Americans identify with the idea of being ethnic Americans. While they see themselves as part of the long-standing experiences of immigration and ethnicity, they often get frustrated as racial minorities, recognizing the gap between their own situation and that of White Americans. As a means of solving this problem, Kibria, citing the work of Tuan (1998), suggests that Pan-Asian American identity may offer a means to fill the identity gaps left by their own weakening ties to the ethnic communities and cultures of their immigrant ancestors while providing a means of being ethnic that meshes with the social and cultural expectations of the dominant society. It should be noted, however, that Kibria stresses that Pan-Asian identity does not replace the specific ethnonational identity of Asian American. What she foresaw instead was the emergence of dual Asian and ethnonational identification pattern. She explained that such dual identities will coexist, possibly uneasily at times, but at other moments in comfortable and even seamless ways.

Variables such as race, ethnicity and class are central in the examination of Korean hyphenated identity. By comparing high-achieving Korean American students attending an elite high school with Korean American students who have dropped out of a neighborhood high
school, Lew (2006) illustrates how these two groups of students resist racial barriers; the former who were equipped with strong social capital at home, in their community, and in school, resist them by using education as a strategy to achieve economic mobility whereas the latter who had limited social capital were more vulnerable to stratifying forces and learned to adopt an oppositional cultural frame of reference not conducive to schooling. This finding points to the fact that the ways in which Korean American youths negotiate becoming “American” has much to do with how they interpret racial barriers within their given opportunity structure. In order to develop educational policies that more fully address the needs of second generation Korean American students, Lew proposes that Korean parents and community based organizations should be more involved with the school system through outreach programs by school staff or encouragement from other parents who spoke their native language. She also advises that it is important for immigrant children to have access to institutional agents both in and outside of their co-ethnic networks for academic achievements in schools.

As is in the findings of Lew’s study (2006), the role of parents is instrumental in the construction of hyphenated Korean identities. Park (2003) found that students’ educational and occupational aspirations closely mirrored those of their parents, and that students’ aspirations were correlated with their parents’ educational level, but not with their parents’ socioeconomic status. Numerous studies have reported on clashes between the first generation Korean parents and their 1.5 or second generation children (Danico, 2004; Kang, 1996; Kibria, 2002; Kim, 2000; Kim, Kim, and Hurh, 1991; Lew, 2006; Min, 1995, 1998). The conflicts between parents and children mainly stem from the language barrier, parents’ Confucian ideologies, and their overemphasis on education and academic success. Korean parents fear the traditional values of hard work, family ties, social status, education, etc. are unimportant to their children who either
were born or raised in North America. On the other hand, 1.5 or second generation children fear that their memories of Korea, exposure to Korean values, culture, and social norms hinder them from being or becoming an “ordinary kid” in a mainstream society. Danico (2004) points out that what exacerbates the parental and children conflicts in the Korean immigrant families is the first generation Korean parents’ traditional values and characteristics. She explains as follows:

The Korean American families in this study immigrated to Hawaii from the early 1970s to the mid-1980s; thus their “Koreanness” is based on expressions of being “Korean” during that time period. As one subject stated, the parents of 1.5ers are in a time capsule; their understanding and expression of being a Korean family is based on their experiences of what it means to be a family today in Korea. As a result, families may hold on to more “traditional” Korean cultural values and in many ways glorify these cultural traits and traditions to their children (p. 72).

Nevertheless, in today’s globalized world, these prototypes of traditional Korean parents are increasingly questionable. Due to a heightened transnationalism involving active and ongoing linkages between Korea and North America, through email communications, an influx of media and travel mobility, more and more Korean immigrants overseas are able to maintain and cultivate ties with a Korean society. For example, with the permission of Canadian Television Radio-Television and Telecommunications Commission, Korean immigrants in Canada can access all sorts of Korean dramas, news, or entertainment shows produced and aired in Korea on their home TV within a couple of days of their original broadcast. Although one is not able to access the latest Korean news or dramas, or fashions, he or she is able to catch up with today’s Korea, Korean cultures and fashions by logging onto the internet. Especially considering the fact that Korea is one of the world’s most wired communities, and internet communities and organizations are widely developed across the nation, political, social and cultural boundaries between native and overseas Korean communities are not as rigid as they used to be, but thinner and blurred. How would these thinner boundaries between native and immigrant communities
affect what it means to be 1.5 or second generation Koreans? How would the media from the native Korean community influence 1.5 or second generation Koreans? How would this globalized world influence on their identity (Re)construction? As the world is getting smaller and smaller due to communication technologies and the globalized economy, future studies on what it means to be and to become 1.5 or second generation Koreans in North America should take these questions into consideration.

What follows in the next section is an overview of the field of Korean language education in North America, identification of problem areas in the field, and suggestions for future studies.

1.4.2. Issues in Post-secondary Korean Language Education

In this section, I will discuss issues pertaining to curriculum, teaching and learning in the Korean language classroom in North America. In the first sub section, I will depict the current picture and status of a Korean language education at a post-secondary level, and address the problems and issues inherent in this field. In the second sub section, I will examine various solutions that previous studies have proposed to minimize problems in the Korean language education, and explore future directions.

1.4.2.1. The Mixed Classroom

Currently, only a handful of a post-secondary institutions offer a Korean language courses in Canada, mostly through East Asian studies. When the institution does not have an East Asian Studies program, Korean language courses are offered through the language studies track that covers a vast range of other European, Slavic or Arabic languages along with the literature of each respective language. However the situation may vary in each institution, the

---

3 Currently, the Canadian post-secondary institutions that offer Korean language courses are University of British Columbia, University of Toronto, McGill University, York University, University of Western Ontario, Carleton University and University of Waterloo, University of Montreal.
issue is that many of the Korean language courses are mixed in that they include the learners who study Korean as a foreign language as well as those who study Korean as a heritage language.

Numerous studies have addressed challenges and hardships of having both foreign and heritage language learners in the same classroom (Kim, 2001; King, 1998; Shin & Kim, 2000; Sohn, 1995, 1997; Ree, 1998; Yu, 2008). Yu points out a major problem of this mixed classroom as “the NHLs (Non Heritage Learners) not being able to keep up with the pace of the course and feeling intimidated by HLs (Heritage Learners), whereas HLs feel that the course is progressing too slowly and often become too bored and unmotivated to learn” (p. 187). Foreign language learners in the Korean language classroom normally spend enormous amounts of time memorizing vocabulary and grammar patterns in order to reach the level required for the course. However, in a mixed class where heritage language learners are present, oral drills and practices may not be the first priority in class, and consequently, some foreign language learners feel that their communicative skills are nowhere close to their expected level. Frustrated and discouraged, some foreign language learners in Korean language class end up dropping out of the class even if its number is low (Sohn, 1995; Ree, 1998).

By contrast, heritage learners in the mixed class do not benefit as much as their counterparts from oral drills or practices since their oral proficiency has been already established through their regular interactions with their family members or Korean peers in the community based organization. Instead, the skill area that they want to focus on is the written literacy, centering on reading and writing, which they feel that they have not acquired properly from their family members or Korean Saturday school. This written literacy may be of great benefit to heritage learners particularly when they are considering a career opportunity in Korea, expanding
their Korean network in Korea, and therefore, increasing their linguistic and social capital within a Korean society. For this reason, the problem inherent to the mixed class stems from different needs of heritage learners and foreign language learners. To that end, King (1998) argues that what compounds the problem of this mixed group is that “Virtually all textbooks used at the university level were written with the assumption that the target audience was native speakers of English with no prior exposure to Korean language or culture” (p.30).

This mixed classroom can be also troublesome to instructors in that they are aware that their instructions or teaching strategies can not satisfy either of heritage learners or foreign language learners fully. In one school year, I employed a method of having a separate class session for approximately 20 minutes, during which heritage learners read a passage from the short novels or an article from the newspapers, and foreign language learners do the listening exercises in the lab. This method appeared to work well, and yet I soon learned that it also alienates one group from another, thereby heightening dissatisfaction in each group; heritage learners felt that they were disadvantaged in terms of grading by dealing with more difficult materials whereas foreign language learners felt that they did not share the resources that heritage learners otherwise could have offered to them in class. In line with my observation, Lee and Kim (2008) report that more heritage learners want to be in the same class as non-heritage learners rather than being separated. This is mainly because heritage learners are able to gain academic recognition for their linguistic and cultural knowledge, and also because observation of non-heritage learners’ aspirations and zeal to learn instills more pride in the language in heritage learners. Lee and Kim also commented that non-heritage learners can benefit by having peer language models, who can act as linguistic and cultural brokers for them.
In order to rectify various problems inherent in the mixed Korean class, some large institutions such as the University of California at Los Angeles (UCLA) in the US, or the University of British Columbia in Canada have introduced a two track system that separates heritage learners from foreign language learners, and at least initially offer them separate language classes. This two-track system has been advocated by many scholars in the Korean language education who also report on its successful employment (Sohn, 1995, 1997; Ree, 1998). Nevertheless, such a solution is not always tenable, especially, in the case of small institutions as they lack sufficient funding to maintain their program in more than two different levels. Furthermore, as Kondo-Brown (2003) argues, the two-track system is implemented with the assumption that heritage learners and non-heritage learners will achieve the same linguistic abilities after being separated in the beginning and intermediate level, although the assumption has no empirical underpinning.

What follows in the next section is the exploration of curriculum that best suits for the mixed class where both heritage and foreign language learners are present.

1.4.2.2. Curriculum Solutions

For a curriculum that best accommodates the mixed classroom, Ree (1998) suggests a “resource-sharing” approach, by which heritage learners and non-heritage learners are individually paired for listening and speaking practice. He asserts that the implementation of such a method will provide both groups of students with sufficient opportunities to practice their communicative skills as well as interpersonal skills. Others advocate a more individualized method that caters to different needs of the learner groups. Yu (2008) suggests a “Compromise Curriculum” whereby heritage learners can improve their written literacy through a more content based curriculum and assignments such as journal writings, or voluntary readings, whereas non-
heritage learners can enhance four skill areas in an integrative manner with extensive exposure to comprehensible input via natural conversations or media use. Nevertheless, how the “Compromise Curriculum” can be successfully implemented in the mixed group was not very clear.

Recently, Computer Assisted Language Learning (CALL) has been discussed as a means of solving the problems of this mixed group. Choi and Koh (2001) report that the “interactive online exercises” used in the Korean program at the State University of New York at Buffalo fosters a more focused, individualized, and less threatening learning environment for both heritage and non-heritage learners. They argue that CALL enables the learners to work on their weak areas at their convenience, thereby controlling their own pace without being discouraged by more advanced learners. Although, as in the field of language education in general, CALL has a promising future in the mixed class, more research is needed regarding its implementation and values where Korean language is concerned. Also, CALL may not be a feasible solution in the small institutions where there is the lack of financial support from the administration at the post-secondary level. In such an institution, Korean language faculties are likely to be part-time contract members who are not expected to spend extra time incorporating CALL into their curriculum.

My ethnographic research conducted in the mixed Korean language class will shed light on the issues regarding curriculum and teaching. To date, there has been virtually no ethnography conducted to understand this unique learning environment and its learner groups in one learning context. Although many post-secondary Korean classrooms in North America frequently have these mixed classes, previous work has often focused on heritage learners, instructional and curriculum questions pertaining to heritage learners, thereby overlooking the
ways in which the heritage learners interact with foreign language learners, how they are advantaged and disadvantaged by each other, and what curriculum best accommodates both group of learners. The issues in regard to curriculum and instructions in the mixed class will be reexamined and discussed in a later chapter.

1.4.3. The Current Status in Post-secondary Korean Language Education

Enrollment in Korean language programs in the U.S increased by 34% from 1995 to 1998, making it the third largest growth area in foreign language instruction (Brod and Welles, 2000, cit. in Lee and Shin, 2008). Lee and Shin explain that this growth was largely attributed to increasing numbers of heritage language learners voluntarily seeking opportunities to (re)gain fluency in their heritage language through foreign language courses. As such, numerous studies on post-secondary Korean language education have focused on heritage language learners and curriculum issues pertaining to teaching heritage language learners (Cho, 2000; Cho, Cho & Tse, 1997; Lee, 2002; Lee and Kim, 2008). For example, Cho (2000) and Cho, Cho & Tse (1997) found that those who developed Korean proficiency also retained a strong cultural and ethnic identity. Similarly, Lee (2002) reported that those who had high Korean proficiency are more successfully balancing the two cultures, and therefore, maintenance of the heritage language is beneficial in promoting biculturalism and bilingualism. In relation to language attitudes and motivation, Lee and Kim (2008) explain that the driving force behind heritage learners’ motivation to learn Korean mainly lies in what the language can offer them in terms of personal and cultural capital (e.g. connecting with parents, understanding their cultural roots) although heritage learners may perceive Korean as not having high social capital (e.g. low status in US). They show that heritage learners have a desire for more focused and innovative approaches to
increase conversational fluency and cultural literacy, and suggest that a content based curriculum will accommodate heritage learners’ linguistic and sociopsychological needs.

Considering that there has been voluminous research on who heritage learners are, what their needs are, and the relations between their language and identities, I would argue that very little is known about who non-heritage learners are in the post-secondary Korean language class. Contrary to what Lee and Kim (2008) reported in the US context, a majority of students in most Canadian post-secondary Korean language classrooms including my own at the University of Western Ontario have been non-heritage learners for the past five years (email correspondence with Korean instructors at University of British Columbia and University of Toronto). Due to the impact of “Korean Wave” (Hanryu), a social and cultural phenomenon resulting from a rise in popularity of South Korean pop cultural products and celebrities in many parts of Asia in early 2000, Chinese enrolment has seen a significant growth in post-secondary Korean language classroom in Canada. Nevertheless, little has been done to understand this new group of non-heritage learners in the Korean language classroom. Recently, working through questionnaires, Yu (2008) compared heritage learners with non-heritage learners in terms of their curriculum and instructional needs and reported that there are different needs between these two groups of learners in terms of content and skill areas of the language that they want to focus on as well as their desires and motivations. Yu’s study undoubtedly offers us useful and valuable pedagogical implications concerning the mixed class. However, we should not undermine heterogeneity existing within the group of non-heritage language learners in terms of their needs, goals or desires. From this perspective, the investigation about non-heritage learners cannot be fully validated without the consideration of such factors as their first language, nationality or ethnicity.
Here I would argue that the term “non-heritage learners” may be problematic as ‘Non-’ usually signifies a disadvantage or deficit (Holliday, 2005). Therefore, the use of the term ‘non-heritage learners’ in the mixed class may imply that the language classroom itself is originally directed more at heritage language learners’ instructional needs or goals rather than ‘non-heritage language learners’. Moreover, the use of the term ‘heritage language learners’ in the mixed class signals that heritage language learners are the norm, and those who are not heritage language learners may be misfit. Consequently, the identity of non-heritage learners may be further contested by the lack of linguistic, social and cultural ties and resources to Korean language that the term itself suggests. If we take Ndebele’s (1995) statement of “The namer isolates the named, explains them, contains them, and controls them” (p. 4), it is clear that naming is a political act, and has a political force. However, I am not proposing that we should eradicate the term ‘non-heritage language learners’ in the mixed class since naming is inevitable and can be useful particularly from the perspective of policy makers (see Thesen, 1997). Instead, what I am suggesting is that we need to reveal politics and ideologies attached to these names, and to make language educators aware of consequences and effects of this naming act.

1.4.4. The Future of Korean Language Education

Whereas the sociopolitical understandings of language education has drawn much attention in the area of applied Linguistics and across interdisciplinary fields over the recent years (Canagarajah, 1993, 1999; Cummins, 1996, 2000; Goldstein, 1997, 2003; Morgan, 1998; Pennycook, 2000, 2001; Toohey, 2001), little has been known about the sociopolitical aspects of the Korean language classroom. To put it more specifically, very little classroom ethnography has been conducted to show what really goes on inside the Korean language classroom. Issues such as how heritage learners interact with foreign language learners, what kind of symbolic
resources or capitals different learners wish to gain, who is advantaged or disadvantaged by the curriculum or instructions employed in class, how learners’ identities are (re)shaped and enacted through learning Korean language, etc., are all important inquiries to illuminate our understandings about sociopolitical aspects of Korean language education.

Jo’s ethnographic study (2001) is one of the very few publications employing the sociopolitical conceptualization of the Korean language classroom. In a one year longitudinal study in beginner and intermediate Korean classrooms at the University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign, Jo examines 1.5 and second generation Korean American students’ ethnic identity formation process. In her study, she observes students’ struggle to rectify their knowledge of Korean (e.g., the Korean with which they were socialized in informal contexts) and to learn the standard forms of speaking and writing introduced by “native” authorities in/from Korea. Therefore, to these students, learning Korean is a process through which they question and challenge their established identity, and the classroom becomes a locus where the native hegemony and authority from the homeland are reinforced and reproduced, and where the cultural capital of the language learners who are from non-standard language background is devalued (Bourdieu and Passeron, 1990). Jo’s study is invaluable in that it illuminates our understandings of various pedagogical issues, which range from empowering those who do not bring a standard language to the classroom, to helping teachers understand how different varieties of dialect construct and reflect ideologies and power relations.

Moreover, future studies concerning Korean language education should consider the transnational social and cultural flows that now occur around the world. More frequent transnational flows have produced a new type of immigrant family called “goose family” (kiroki kajok), where the father stays behind in Korea to support his wife and children who go overseas
for the children’s education (The Asia Pacific Post, November 3, 2004). The children of this “goose family” construct a new dimension of language learners in regards to Korean language. Their purposes, goals and investments into learning Korean language may differ from those second generation Koreans’ as many of the children in “goose family” plan to return to Korea after their university education in North America is completed. Further studies on this topic will help us understand “goose family” children.

On the other hand, Korean popular cultural products such as movies, pop music or dramas should be dealt with as a topic for research as they are perceived to bring changes in the nature of language learning nowadays. Korean language learners today are able to access Korean popular cultural products created and popularized by native Korean community more effortlessly than ever due to the development of internet and broadcasting overseas. Korean immigrant families residing in Toronto, for example, are able to view all sorts of popular TV programs, from the latest news to an entertainment show, on cable TV in their living room. Furthermore, Korean immigrants can easily watch Korean entertainment shows, dramas, or even movies on the internet due to the fact that there are very well developed and organized online communities in Korean society. Topics such as how these popular cultural products shape and reshape Korean language learners’ experiences should be an important future research agenda in the field of Korean language education.

1.5. Chapter Conclusion

In this chapter, I situated my research in a broad spectrum of the political dimensions of language education, and introduced the research questions that will guide me throughout my research. My doctoral study adopts critical and poststructural perspectives to understand the ways in which a variety of relations based on ethnicity, race, gender, and power are (re)produced
in various discourse practices in the Korean language classroom. Giddens’ (1984) centre/periphery framework serves as a useful tool to investigate ways in which learners’ identities are contested and marginalized by the centre discourses manifested through the course curriculum, and the instructor’s linguistic and teaching practices. To this end, my research will link the very marginalization of the learners on the periphery to the subject of their investments into the Korean language, and unravel how these learners turn their marginal positions to their advantage by constructing a safe place where they enact their identities.

Moving to the field of Korean language education, I examined the issues concerning Korean hyphenated identities in connection with race and ethnicity. The topic of hyphenated identities is very significant in my research as it is basic to understanding Korean 1.5 or second generation students’ investments into their heritage language. To provide background for the study, I discussed the current phase of Korean language education at the post-secondary level, and explored directions for further studies. In a field where comprehensive classroom ethnographic studies are scarce, my critical ethnography will illuminate our understandings about what goes on in the day to day classroom lives of learners learning Korean language at a post-secondary institution. Also, my research will engender useful pedagogical implications ranging from curriculum and instructional issues to empowering language learners on the periphery.
Chapter II: Methodology

In this chapter, I will discuss the research methodology that I have chosen as a means to understand Korean-ness constructed in a variety of discourses, and the interplay of ethnicity, race, gender, and power relations in the context of Korean language classroom. I will first discuss research design centering on critical ethnography and critical discourse analysis, and then explore the disciplinary orientation. Next, I will provide a detailed plan of my study by describing the focal participants and the sites where I collected my data. Third, I will explain each method that I utilized to collect the data and illustrate the procedures of data analysis. In so doing, I will also discuss validity of my study while suggesting ways to enhance it. Lastly, I will examine the relationship between the researcher and the researched, and the principal ethical issues arising from the fact that I take a dual role of a researcher and a teacher in this study.

What follows in the next section is a discussion of critical ethnography to which my research is oriented, and critical discourse analysis by which I analyze the data.

2.0. Research Design: Critical Ethnography and Critical Discourse Analysis

I embrace a critical ethnographic approach in my study as it focuses on the relations of power and other social relationships in language use, and ideological premises which shape and constrain identities of participants. My position on critical ethnography aligns with Giampapa (2004), who argues that a traditional ethnographic perspective does provide useful insights into what people do in different settings and how they understand their surroundings, but it does not fully explain “how meanings are constructed and what the consequences are for speakers as a result of their identity performance” (p. 39). As May (1997) claims, critical ethnography adopts a perspective of social and cultural relations which highlights the role of ideology in sustaining and perpetuating inequality within particular settings. Thus, the goal of critical ethnography is not simply to describe these settings as they appear in traditional ethnography but to improve upon them. I believe that by adopting critical ethnography I can generate a clear blueprint of
what goes on in the foreign language classroom where different ethnic, racial, and gender groups are mixed, and to explore the nature of the intersection between conflicts and constraints faced by the students in that setting. Moreover, I hope that my critical ethnography enables me to engender better education practices through which to customize the curriculum and instructions for this multilingual and multicultural Korean language classroom under investigation.

Whereas critical ethnography provides me with a means to approach my research topic on a macro scale, critical discourse analysis (CDA) offers a means of processing the data. According to Fairclough (1992), discourse constitutes the social identities of and relationships between people in a way that helps to sustain and reproduce the social status quo and transform it. In this view, discourse becomes a “mode of political and ideological practice” (Fairclough, 1992):

Critical discourse analysis sees discourse – the use of language in speech and writing – as a form of ‘social practice’. Describing discourse as social practice implies a dialectical relationship between a particular discursive event and the situation, institution and social structure that frame it: the discursive event is shaped by them, but it also shapes them. That is, discourse is socially constituted, as well as socially conditioned – it constitutes situations, objects of knowledge and the social identities of and relationships between people and groups of people. It is constitutive both in the sense that it helps sustain and reproduce the social status quo, and in the sense that it contributes to transforming it (p. 62).

CDA states that discourse is socially constituted and conditioned, and often becomes an instrument of power. The way that power operates and is operated is not always clear in many cases, and thus CDA aims to make the workings of this instrument of power more visible and transparent by examining the manifestation of ideologies in discourses and denaturalizing ideologies that have become naturalized. Here, I need to define what ideologies mean in order to clarify the relationship between ideologies and discourse. Wodak (1996), one of the best known critical discourse analysts along with Norman Fairclough, claims that discourse does ideological work. She defines ideologies as “particular ways of representing and constructing society which
reproduce unequal relations of power, relations of domination and exploitation” (p.18), and argues that ideologies are frequently produced through discourse although they are often false or ungrounded constructions of society. In this regard, CDA’s goal is to move beyond simple analysis of texts, to consider how texts are interpreted, and to reflect on their social effects.

Fairclough (1992) provides a methodological design for CDA by describing a three dimensional framework for analyzing discourse. The first dimension is discourse as text where the linguistic features (e.g. choices and patterns in vocabulary, wording, metaphor and grammar) and organization of concrete instances of discourse (e.g. text structure, turn taking) are analyzed. The second dimension is discourse as discursive practice where a text should be linked to its wider social context through analysis of speech acts, coherence and intertextuality (e.g. discourse representation). The third dimension is discourse as social practice where the ideological effects and hegemonic processes constructed and (re)produced through discourse, are to be analyzed. It is in the third analytical dimension that the researcher draws on social theory in order to reveal the ideological underpinnings of lay interpretive procedures, and to move from ‘non-critical’ to ‘critical’ discourse analysis (Blommaert, 2004).

In the educational context, educational researchers embracing CDA have investigated the way language constructs and is constructed by a wider variety of social relationships that may reflect and constitute inequitable relations of power in the wider society, on terms that may be defined by ethnicity, race, gender (Norton, 1997b). As Norton (1997b) makes clear, one of the most significant contributions of critical discourse research in language and education is in redefining theories of language and in reconceptualizing theories of identity. With regard to theories of language, some critical discourse researchers have adopted poststructural theories of language while arguing that structuralist theories of language fail to explain the conflicting struggle over the meanings that can be attributed to symbols (McKay and Wong, 1996; Norton, 1995; Pavlenko, 2001; Piller, 2001; Siegal, 1996). Discourse from a poststructural perspective,
therefore, moves beyond the linguistic system that guarantees the meaning of signs, and rather refers to the complexes of signs and practices that organize social existence and social reproduction. A discourse, in other words, becomes a particular way of organizing meaning-making practices (Norton Peirce, 1997b). In fact, researchers such as Pennycook (2001) favor a poststructuralist approach to CDA in that it opens up a space for a CDA’s assumption of an inseparable relationship between discourse and ideologies, and that it allows for more complex and subtle analyses. In other words, the poststructural approach to CDA sees discourses as having multiple and complex origins rather than a basis in some structure of social reality, thereby getting away with the problems of CDA’s claiming to reveal the truth by unmasking the manifestations of ideology (Pennycook, 2001).

Inspired by the poststructural approach to CDA, my study attempts to link various discourses in and outside the classroom with political and ideological practices, and to make transparent any discursively constructed relationships present in and out of the boundary of the language classroom. Furthermore, I believe that CDA helps to explain the language classroom as a place where certain representations of Korean-ness are promoted and (re)produced, and various discursive relationships between different ethnic, race, gender and first language groups are constantly at play.

### 2.1. Practitioner Research

The term that best describes my research would be “practitioner research” since it is a “qualitative research conducted by insiders in educational settings to improve their own practice” (p. XIV) as defined by Zeni (2001). According to Zeni, the term practitioner research broadly includes teacher research, action research and other modes of self-study in education. However, I will stick to the term “practitioner research” to describe my study since neither is my research involved with the collaborations between a teacher and a researcher as in teacher research, nor is its main purpose to improve the quality of action within the specific educational
setting as in action research. Noffke (1997) notes that practitioner research, though sharing a common methodology, can serve three different goals: personal, professional and political. Practitioners who emphasize personal goals would employ reflection, self-knowledge, and growth whereas those with professional goals would talk about team building, career development, and leadership. On the other hand, those with political goals would set their research aim on democratic classrooms, justice and social change. In the case of my doctoral study, I believe that the goals of the thesis are more personal and political rather than professional. On a personal level, my main goal is to reevaluate the curriculum of my own class, and to reflect on my own linguistic and teaching strategies, thereby reestablishing my own teaching practices in the multilingual and multicultural language classroom. On a political level, I wish to aim for a language classroom where students of diverse ethnic, racial, gender and first language backgrounds benefit equally, and the resources and capital that each student brings to class are acknowledged, appreciated and actively utilized. I am hopeful that my study will be useful to language educators in providing insight into the pedagogical choices concerning curriculum, teaching materials, teaching practices, and classroom processes. The point is that language use is inherently ideological, and as Auerbach (2000) reminds us, has significant implications for learners’ language development.

Whatever my research may be termed, it shares common ground with practitioner research in that it collapses the boundary between practice and research as theories emerge and are refined through cycles of practice, thereby generating the confluence between my teaching and my research. Canagarajah’s (1993) study on Tamil students’ opposition to English learning in a Sri Lankan university shows a good example of research and teaching influencing each other:

My daily interaction with the students in negotiating meaning through English and participating in the students’ successes and failures, with the attendant need to revise my own teaching strategy, provided a vantage point to their perspectives (p. 606).
As I will discuss in a later chapter, one of the issues that emerged in relation to the confluence between my teaching and research was that my own linguistic and teaching practices as an instructor of the language classroom legitimize a certain group of learners and impart them proper learnership while marginalizing the other group of learners. I was not aware of the fact that English language was the main instructional language in our classroom, and as a result, I have been imparting the legitimacy to speak to those students whose first language is English. My awareness of this created a vantage point from which I was able to reconsider my teaching practices and to better understand those students who remain silent during class.

In the next section, I will describe the sites where my research was conducted. First, I will describe the post-secondary institution where my research was conducted and then the Korean language classroom under investigation.

### 2.2 The Sites

#### 2.2.1. The University of Western Ontario

The University of Western Ontario has offered two levels of Korean language courses (introductory and intermediate) since 2002 under the department of Modern Languages and Literatures, Faculty of Arts and Humanities. From the onset, the Korean course was popular, and all introductory courses have always been full with the maximum student enrolment of 25. Initially, the Korean courses attracted more students with a Korean background, but from the school year of 2004-5, non-Korean students’ enrolment began to grow, especially Chinese. This is partially linked to the recent popularity of Korean popular cultural products such as dramas, soap operas, movies or fashion in parts of Asian countries in the early 2000. In fact, according to the classroom survey that I informally conducted at the beginning of the school semester (see Appendix B), many Chinese students enrolled in my Korean courses because they wanted to watch Korean soap operas or listen to Korean popular songs without the Chinese subtitles. The
students of European background have always been steady in number, although they remain a minority of the course.

As for the intermediate course, the number of the students may be as low as twelve in some years or as high as twenty two in another. However, the majority of the students have been of Korean origin. This is not because more Korean students continued to study from the introductory course, but because many of second or 1.5 generation Korean students are overqualified for the introductory course. Nevertheless, the course has been multileveled amongst students, resulting in dramatic gaps in their language proficiencies. As a means to minimize this problem, I adopted the strategy of giving extra reading homework to advanced Korean students, and also tested their reading and writing skills while other students are tested for their listening. This method has worked fine, but it is a burden on the instructor who has to prepare two different sets of course materials and tests. In addition, the writing and reading questions that the overqualified students receive on tests are completely based on what the students learn on their own from their assignments, not through the interaction with the teacher during the classroom hours. As a result, in some years, I received a number of complaints from those overqualified students. More recently the situation has improved thanks to placement interviews that allow me to screen out the overqualified students.  

The department of Modern Languages and Literatures at the University of Western Ontario currently offers several language courses including Spanish, German, Italian, Polish, Russian, Arabic, Japanese and Korean. Chinese language courses are not offered because they are offered through one of the affiliated colleges of the UWO. In fact, Japanese courses have been offered through the affiliated college as well, but, the department of Modern Languages

---

4 For the first three years in my teaching at UWO, I accepted any students enrolled in my intermediate Korean courses without administering the placement interviews to get the course going. For this reason, the majority of students were 1.5 generation Koreans for those three years. However, from the school year 2006-7 when I collected my data, I began to adopt placement interviews and to screen out those 1.5ers who came to Canada after age 10.
and Literatures decided to offer Japanese because they received funding from Japan Foundation several years ago. Although overlapping Japanese courses in the affiliated college and the UWO created many tensions and conflicts over the years, the department of Modern Languages and Literatures at UWO still manages to offer two levels of Japanese courses. Students can take the course either in the affiliated college or the main campus because the credits are to be transferable between the affiliated college and the main campus. Korean is only taught on main campus. The department where Korean is offered is extensively European languages oriented, and offers many different sections and levels of language courses in Spanish, Italian, German and others. The department offers major/minor programs where those European languages are concerned, and also has several full time faculty members specializing in Spanish, Italian, and German literatures and languages.

I chose UWO as my research site for two reasons. First, UWO is among the very few Canadian post-secondary institutions to offer Korean language courses. UWO is also in the vicinity of Toronto where I am pursuing a doctoral degree, and is also familiar to me as I had already been working there for several years. Second, the department of Modern languages and Literatures, under which Korean courses are currently being offered, imparts a lot of freedom to instructors in terms of organizing the curriculum. This provides greater latitude for me to discuss questions of Korean culture and language. Finally, due to the short history of offering Korean courses at the department, I was the only instructor teaching two levels of Korean classes, which made conducting research in my own class inevitable.

After deciding on UWO as my research site, I had to choose the classroom to gather my data. I chose the intermediate course because I, as an instructor, got to know the majority of the students in Korean 200 fairly well in terms of their language skills, personality and their

---

5 Others include University of British Columbia, University of Toronto, York University, University of Waterloo, and Carleton University
personal backgrounds by teaching them in the introductory Korean class in the previous year. In fact, twelve out of eighteen enrolled students in Korean 200 moved up from Korean 030 the previous year. Furthermore, the intermediate Korean class at UWO at the school year 2006-7, was dynamic and unique in that fairly diverse groups of students in terms of their race, ethnicity, and gender were mixed together, which ultimately enabled me to examine the diverse classroom interactions (e.g. the students of Korean origin vs. non-Korean origin, the ESL students vs. students speaking English as a first language).

2.2.2. Korean 200 at the University of Western Ontario

Korean 200 had eighteen students in total. The majority of the students were of either Chinese or Korean origin. More specifically, Korean 200 consists of four second generation Koreans, five 1.5 generation Koreans, six Chinese international students, one second generation Hong Kong born Chinese, one English Canadian and one French Canadian. Considering that Korean language courses usually attract more female students than male students, Korean 200 was certainly an exception with only five females out of eighteen students.

Korean 200 builds on the introductory course, Korean 030, and was designed to improve students’ speaking, listening, reading and writing skills in an integrated manner. In 2006-07 when I collected my data, I adopted a new textbook in Korean 030 which I believed could better help the students to improve their communicative language skills, especially listening and speaking. Through the survey that I conducted on the first day of the school semester (See Appendix B), I found that many of my students were interested in Korean popular cultural forms and thus their primary reason for learning Korean was to understand Korean soap operas or dramas without subtitles or to understand the lyrics of Korean popular songs. Moreover, a lot of non-Korean students taking my courses wanted to learn Korean to converse with their Korean friends in Korean. Nevertheless, adopting a new textbook was not feasible in Korean 200 because the course began from where the old textbook used in Korean 030 in the previous year
left off. In order to rectify the grammar oriented textbook in Korean 200, I provided my students with supplementary speaking and listening activities that I had solicited from other textbooks, and gave the students projects where they could do collaborative role play or make a short speeches.

As an instructor for Korean 200, I was responsible for every teaching duty from creating curriculum and syllabus to evaluating students. I had one undergraduate work study student, Lucy, who helped with marking vocabulary quizzes and assignments. Lucy was also my research assistant and videotaped the whole class from November 2006 to April 2007.

The class was held in a so-called “smart classroom”⁶, equipped with computer and audio video facilities. Because I use Powerpoint and internet in my lecture, I made a special request to use the smart classroom to the department in advance. The classroom had two big tables adjacent to each other in the centre so that the two tables form a circle. There was a blackboard and a screen in front, and I usually used a sideboard to explain some grammatical points while using Powerpoint at the same time. The students sat around the table, and they tended to sit at the same seat in every class – typically together with students of same ethnicity. For example, most of 1.5 generation or second generation Korean students sat around the front table, and most of Chinese students sat around the back table. Canadian students of European descent sat between Koreans and Chinese, thereby forming a sort of buffer zone between Koreans and Chinese.

Classes met from 7:00 to 8:50 pm on Tuesdays and Thursdays. Usually there was a ten minute break during one hour and fifty minute class, but sometimes I finished the class ten minutes early without taking a break.

---

⁶ The department of Modern Languages and Literatures has three “smart classrooms” at the University College building where the department office and faculty offices are located. If it is not feasible for an instructor to use one of the three smart classrooms, the department usually assigns the classrooms with computer facilities in other buildings.
2.3. The Focal Participants

Since the main focus of my research is to explore the classroom dynamics and power relations, as well as how the students’ ethnicity, race, and gender come into play, I tried to make the focal participants’ group as varied as possible in terms of ethnicity, race, and gender. However, because there were more male students than female students enrolled in Korean 200, I had no choice but to select more male students than females for my focal participants. Out of eleven focal participants in total, only four were females. I was, however, able to include a diverse body of focal participants in terms of ethnicity and citizenship status.

In this study, I will distinguish second generation from 1.5 generation based on the citizenship status acquired from birth. The 1.5 generation has been generally described as those who are bicultural and bilingual and who immigrated to the adopted country during their formative years whereas second generation refers to those who were born in the adopted country (Danico, 2004). The following table shows the makeup of my focal participant group.

Table 1: Participant profiles (see Appendix A)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Second Generation Koreans</th>
<th>1.5 generation Koreans</th>
<th>Chinese enrolled as international students</th>
<th>Second generation Chinese</th>
<th>Canadians of European origin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daniel (m) – 22 years old</td>
<td>Sohee (f) – 26 years old</td>
<td>Yan (f) – 23 years old</td>
<td>Melissa (f) – 19 years old</td>
<td>John (m) – 30 years old</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jinwoo (m) – 20 years old</td>
<td>Ming (f) – 22 years old</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ray (m) – 23 years old</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis (m) – 20 years old</td>
<td>Ping (m) – 24 years old</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shan (m) – 24 years old</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The table was organized by Koreans, Chinese and Canadians of European origin, and Koreans and Chinese were subcategorized by their citizenship status in Canada. Please note that participants’ names used here are all pseudonyms. The letter in the bracket indicates sex of each participant. I will provide a brief background of each of my participants below. The following information was current in April-May 2007 when the data was gathered through semi-structured interviews at the University of Western Ontario.

1. Daniel

He was born in London, Ontario and lived in Glencoe, Ontario. His parents are Koreans. His father is an engineer but currently semi-retired. His mother works for a school board for grade 8 to 10. Daniel has two older sisters; the oldest sister is married and works in Korea whereas the second older sister works in Toronto. Daniel is 22 years old and in his 2\textsuperscript{nd} year at Huron College, one of the affiliated colleges of the University of Western Ontario. Daniel switched his major from engineering to East Asian studies.

2. Dennis

He was born in Chun-ho dong, Seoul, Korea, but moved to Toronto, Canada when he was four years old. His parents moved to London, Ontario when he was in grade four, and his parents are now running a convenience store. Dennis has one younger brother who is a high school student. Dennis is a first year student in Social Science, and was considering majoring in Sociology the following year. He is also on a basketball team at the University of Western Ontario. He is 20 years old.

3. Sohee

She was born in Seo-cho dong, Seoul, Korea but moved to Paraguay at age 7. In Paraguay her father ran a jewelry business with other Koreans, and her mother was a homemaker. Sohee moved to Vancouver, Canada in grade ten. A couple of years later, she was reunited with her family in Toronto, Canada. Her parents are now running a Korean restaurant.
Sohee has one younger sister, now graduated from the university and working in retail. Sohee is a fourth year student, majoring in Sociology. She is 26 years old.

4. Jinwoo

He was born in Youngju, Kyung Sang province Korea, and went to school in Seoul before moving to Toronto, Canada at age 10. Jinwoo lived in New Zealand briefly before coming to Canada. His family members are landed immigrants in Canada, but his parents are in Korea now because of Jinwoo’s father’s dentistry business. Jinwoo’s mother is a homemaker. He has one older sister, who is a student at the University of Western Ontario. Jinwoo is a second year student majoring in Psychology, but before transferring to the UWO, he went to University of Waterloo for a couple of years. He is 20 years old.

5. Yan

She was born in Changchun, China and then, moved to Shenzhen when she was an elementary school student. Her father is doctor and a head of the hospital. Her mother is an accountant. She is the only child in her family. After graduating from high school in China, she studied English language in London International Academy in London, Ontario for one year, and entered Huron College, one of the affiliated colleges of UWO. She recently switched her major from economics to East Asian studies. She is a second year student and is 23 years old.

6. Ming

She was born in Zhejiang in China, and later moved to Shenzhen. Her father is a businessman who owns two companies and is one of the share holders of a hotel. Her mother and older brother are working together with her father. After graduating from high school, she learned English at Columbia International College, Hamilton, Canada for one and a half years. Then, she entered UWO with a major in Administrative Commercial Study, but later changed her major to Economics. She is a fourth year student and 22 years old.
7. Ping

He was born in Guangzhou in China. His father is an engineer working for government, and his mother is an accountant. He is the only child in his family. After graduating from high school, he learned English in Western Town College in Toronto for ten months, and then entered King’s college with a major in Economics. After one year in King’s college, one of the affiliated colleges of UWO, he was transferred to UWO. He is a third year student and 24 years old.

8. Shan

He was born in Guangzhou in China. His father is an engineer working for a private company, and his mother is a homemaker. He is the only child in his family. He dropped out of Chinese university and decided to come to Canada. He learned English in Western Town College in Toronto for three months, and then entered King’s college with a major in Economics. After two years in King’s college, he was transferred to UWO. He is a third year student and 24 years old.

9. Melissa

She was born in Toronto and grew up in Markham. Her parents are Hong Kong born Chinese. Her father is an electric technician in a telecommunications company, and her mother is a homemaker. Melissa has one younger sister who is in high school now and one younger brother who is in Junior high school. She is a second year student at UWO majoring in Business Management and Organization Studies and hoped to enter Ivey Business School at the UWO. She is 19 years old. She studied Korean in Seoul for one month in 2006.

10. John

He was born and grew up in London, Ontario. His father is working for Ford Co. and his mother is unemployed. He has a married older brother who works for a packaging company. After graduating from high school, he went to a small college that offers a diploma in business,
technology and health care for one year, and went to Korea for three years, teaching English. After coming back from Korea, he was admitted to UWO, and is currently a fourth year student, majoring in English with a History minor. He is 30 years old.

11. Ray

He was born in Timmins, Ontario, where the community is mixed French and English Canadian. His parents were divorced when Ray was three, and he lived with his mother who worked as an administrative assistant in a school board. His stepfather is a police officer. He saw his biological father, working as a construction superintendent, on the weekends. He has one married older brother and one married older sister, and two stepbrothers. He is an MA student in French linguistics and 23 years old.

There were seven other students who were not selected as focal participants; two 1.5 generation Koreans, three second generation Koreans, two Chinese international students. Although all of the eighteen students in Korean 200 gave me a permission to use video clips where they were involved in the classroom, some of the students were reluctant to participate in a further study that involves semi-structured interviews and focus group interviews. Some of the non-focal participants were not approached by me for this reason, and others by their gender, ethnicity or citizenship status. However, the non-focal participants are still considered as participants in my study in that they contributed to the overall classroom dynamics by submitting their written journals and by participating in all sorts of in class activities.

2.4. The Data

My data was gathered through five months of classroom observation, semi structured interviews, focus group interviews, and written journals. In the next section, I will provide detailed accounts of how each measure was used to gather the data, and describe the procedures that I utilized in each step.
2.4.1. Classroom Observations

The classroom observation was conducted in the intermediate Korean language class (Korean 200) at UWO from November 2006 until April 2007. Prior to the classroom observation, my students in Korean 200 were each asked to fill out the consent letter in which they either agreed or disagreed to participate in my thesis research. Due to the fact that I was the course instructor, I was not allowed to access the collected consent letters until the students’ final marks were finalized. In order to manage the consent letters I designated Professor Vladimir Tumanov, Undergraduate Advisor in the department of Modern Languages and Literature at UWO, as a contact person for my doctoral research. As such, the consent letters were collected and kept by Professor Tumanov until April 2007 when the students’ marks were finalized and my role as instructor could not have any effect on the students’ marks due to their participation or non-participation. The participants could, at any time, withdraw from the study by simply indicating to the contact person their intention to withdraw. Presence of the designated contact person enabled the students to withdraw from the study without threat because they, in case of withdrawal, simply had to notify the contact person, not the researcher who is also evaluating their in class performances as a teacher. No evaluative judgment would be made about the students who wished to withdraw as their participation or non-participation remained anonymous until their marks were finalized in April 2007. I also made sure that all the raw data were kept in confidence and that the students participating in my study were identified by pseudonyms in the study.

When the consent letters were handed over to me in May 2007, I found that none of the students chose to withdraw from the study although a few indicated that they would not participate in further studies that involve semi-structured interviews and focus group interviews. In the case where those who I was interested in including as focal participants checked off ‘no’ for participating in further studies, I emailed them and received permission to interview them for
more in depth studies. In fact, two of the participants fell into that category, and it turned out that both had misunderstood the question in the consent letter, and later decided to participate in the future studies.

The five month period of classroom observation allowed me to engage the research in a prolonged and persistent manner, and to observe various classroom interactions and discourses. Because I took a dual role of a teacher and a researcher in that classroom, I had a research assistant, Lucy, video-tape the two hour classes. Although she was not a trained video technician, she had previous experience videotaping the classrooms as a research assistant. Moreover, before each class began, I gave her an explicit instruction about what the focus of the videotaping would be for each day. For example, I utilized a strategy to exclusively videotape a couple of pairs or groups each class, so that at the end of every month, I can capture a general picture of what goes on in each pair/group in class. On the other hand, when there was a whole group interaction in class, the focus was usually on people who were initiating talks and responding to the talks. During the interactions that involved the whole class, Lucy usually moved around the classroom when videotaping each class, so that everyone in the class received equal videotape time. The class was held twice a week and every class from the period of November 2006 to April 2007 was videotaped.

In the class, I tried to keep a low profile as a teacher and a researcher, taking a stance similar to Dyson’s (1997) in her classroom research: a “curious, rather ignorant but very nonthreatening person, who wished to witness their goings on” (p. 25). Although some of my students were conscious of the video camera in the beginning of the classroom observation period, they eventually got used to the presence of the camera, and appeared nonchalant about their actions or words being observed. Since I was not allowed to analyze the videotapes until
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7 I used a work-study student who I hired to assist my course as a research assistant. This student was a mature fourth year undergraduate student at UWO.
my students’ marks were finalized, I kept running field notes of my observation, noted contextual information, described what the students were doing and who they were interacting with. These field notes were very useful when I analyzed the videotapes, helping me to recall what interactions or discussions took place on a certain day. I also used the documents including pedagogical materials, curriculum documents, email correspondence with my students, and any other homework or assignments to analyze the data from the classroom observations more comprehensively.

The videotapes were manually transcribed in English using a Word program (See Appendix E for transcription conventions). The original Korean utterances in the videotapes have been translated into English and will appear in Italics in this thesis. Any additional information needed to make the meaning of the speaker’s words clear to the readers appears in brackets within or right after the translated or English utterances. Nonverbal communication such as laughter is indicated in parentheses. The transcribed data was organized under several discourses (e.g. discourses of pair work, discourses of group work, discourses of classroom discussion), as well as under several interactions that involve a different group of students (e.g. interactions that involve 1.5 generation Koreans, interactions that involve Chinese international students).

2.4.2. Written Journals

Bi-weekly written journals were collected as part of students’ course assignments. They are free of a specific format, and I requested that they be submitted every other week either in English or Korean, whichever students prefer. In the journals, the students were asked to write any new observations that they made about Korea, Koreans, Korean culture and society in general, and any changes that they experience either about themselves or their linguistic or sociolinguistic proficiency in Korean language (see detailed instruction for written journals in Appendix C).
As the bi-weekly journals were part of the course assignments, it was feasible for me to analyze the data in an ongoing fashion throughout the school semesters. On collecting the journals, I photocopied them and kept the photocopied ones in my file for this research purpose. Then, I read the original journals, and wrote my feedback in the bottom of the journals, and returned them to my students next class. Through a total of eleven written journals, I was able to have a personal dialogue with my students and, to a certain extent, got to know them on a personal level. Through the journals, I could understand the kind of Korean popular culture that my students are interested in, the reasons why they are interested in one form of popular culture and not another, their investment in the Korean language, and their feelings about the progress of their learning experience, etc. Furthermore, the written journals enabled me to explore the identities of my students on a more personal level (e.g. identity as Korean), and their understandings about themselves in connection with Korean language and culture.

On returning the journals, I always provided feedback on the content of their journals. By giving them positive and supportive feedback, I attempted to make my students feel comfortable about expressing their ideas, feelings, and thoughts about their personal issues.

2.4.3. Semi-Structured Interviews

The semi-structured interviews began in April 2007 after the students’ marks were finalized. This way, I could ensure that the students’ participation or non-participation in my research would not affect their final marks. The purpose of these semi-structured interviews was to compile information on their personal and academic backgrounds (e.g. family, schools, socialization patterns) and to investigate the conflicts and dilemmas that each participant has faced while learning Korean language in a Canadian foreign language context. To begin, I had to set the dates for interviews with my focal participants. Since these eleven students were among the twelve who took the introductory Korean course in the previous year, I got to know the majority of my focal participants fairly well in terms of their language proficiency, their
likes and dislikes, and their brief personal backgrounds before the semi-structured interviews were conducted. All of the eleven focal participants were very cooperative in engaging in the interviews, and tried to answer my questions sincerely.

The semi-structured interviews were conducted twice with each focal participant, and each interview lasted approximately thirty minutes to one hour. Through the interviews, I could understand my participants’ family and education background, their school experience, experiences related to Korea and Korean language, experiences in our Korean 200 class, and their views on a variety of ethnicity, race, gender issues (see Appendix D for detailed interview questions). Each interview session was videotaped and later transcribed into English. I encouraged my participants to use the language of their preference during the interview. Most interviews were carried out in English, but 1.5 generation Korean participants mainly used Korean throughout the interviews.

2.4.4. Focus Group Interviews

Lastly, focus group interviews were conducted twice; the first in April 2007, and the second in June 2007. These interviews were scheduled after the students’ marks had been finalized. The object of these focus group interviews was to understand what my participants really think about the issues regarding (1) identities, ethnicity, race, and gender (2) Korean language and Korean-ness. Whereas semi-structured interviews were used to gather information on my participants’ personal backgrounds, likes and dislikes, past and present histories or future desires on an individual level, focus group interviews were used to entail as many perspectives, views or opinions on a number of issues mentioned above as possible from my participants. Through the focus group interviews, I followed a dynamics of discussions, and understood different perspectives and views of the diverse groups of participants (e.g. 1.5 generation vs. second generation).
In the first focus group interview, I first asked the participants to define their identities using as many terms as they could (e.g. Korean, Canadian, student, son, brother, member of a certain student club, etc.). Then, I asked a question “What kinds of conflict have you experienced because any of the terms that you use to define yourself act against each other?” Next, the participants looked at segments of the documentary film “First Person Plural”, which depicts one Korean adoptee’s journey to meet with her birth family in Korea and to reconcile with her inner Korean self. After viewing the film clips, the participants expressed briefly what they thought about the film in general. Then, I had the participants consider the following questions: (1) In parallel with the adoptee’s journey to search for her identity in the film, what kind of journey have you gone through to search for your identity? (2) How important is Korean language or culture to your identities? (3) How significant is your ethnicity, race, gender to your identities?

In the second focus group interview, I brought a clip from the newspaper article about the Virginia Tech incident in which the Korean American 23 year old university student, Cho Seung-Hee randomly killed 23 people in the Virginia Tech University. The reason I used this newspaper article was because it raised many problematic issues on Korean immigrants’ lives, intergenerational conflicts and Koreans as model minorities. By raising these issues, I wished to investigate conflicts and dilemmas faced by many second and 1.5 generation Koreans in overseas Korean immigrant communities as these subjects are pertinent to the identities of my Korean participants. These issues are also important to non-Korean participants because they are living as minorities in an English medium speech community, thereby being able to relate these issues to their personal level as a Chinese or a French Canadian, for example.

I was present as a moderator in both focus group interviews. Although I made it obligatory for those eleven focal participants to participate, I also invited other students in Korean 200 to attend the focus group interviews to be able to generate more varied views about
pertinent issues, and to provide a social context for my focal participants to hear the views of others and consider their views accordingly. All the participants present in the interviews were able to freely express their opinions or feelings on the subject under discussion. Each focus group interview lasted about an hour. All interviews were conducted in English in the same classroom where Korean 200 class was held for the year of 2006-7. The contents of interviews were tape-recorded while being videotaped by the research assistant, and then transcribed.

2.5. Analysis and Validity

In this section, I will first describe how I approached and analyzed the collected data. Then, I will discuss issues pertaining to validity of my ethnographic research and to criticism given to critical discourses analysis. Central to the discussion is minimizing observer’s effects that commonly emanate from ethnographic research and decreasing subjective interpretations of the data.

2.5.1. Ethnographic Research

In accordance with ethnographic methodology, I analyzed the data in an ongoing manner throughout the data collection period although for ethical reasons the serious data analysis only began after the students’ marks were finalized. During the analysis, I reflected, refined perceptions, and gained further insights as I read all the transcribed materials several times, noting observations, research questions, and significant incidents, making summaries of my interpretations, and tagging features of the data I considered important (see Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Ramanathan & Atkinson, 1999). I also did some preliminary coding of the material, which included categories such as participant structures based on their ethnicity, race, and citizenship status by birth or pair/group work or whole classroom discussions.

As Day (2002) did in her ethnographic work on identity of the young English language learner in the kindergarten classroom, I also created case profiles for each focal participant as a way of approaching the data. To construct case profiles, I reviewed all the data for each
participant several times, including notes, observations, classroom videotaping, and interview transcriptions. I also made notes and tagged the data for each participant in binders, using color-coded tags. Themes included in the tags were, for example, my participants’ family background, school socialization, transnational trips, Korean language learning, etc. The case profile that I had created became a useful starting point of my ethnographic research as it helped me understand the data, reflect and revise research questions, and delve into some of the theoretical literature with respect to the interpretations that I am getting out of the data. The most difficult, but valuable process in my data analysis was to constantly return to the raw data to develop, refine and confirm my interpretations. Day (2002) follows a similar routine, working in a recursive fashion from data to theory and back again, and this was the most important part of my data analysis.

Given that my ethnographic research is highly dependent on my own observations, the validity of my interpretations might come into question, more so when I am also the teacher of the class under study. Hornberger (1994) argues that over-familiarity with the culture under study may distort interpretation toward shared biases. As demonstrated by Labov’s (1972) well known ‘observer’s paradox’ (a researcher is to find out how people behave when they are not observed, but the data can only be obtained through systematic observation), observers’ effects cannot be disregarded.

In regard to these problems, I took the following measures to enhance the validity of the interpretation and to reduce the observer’s effects: prolonged engagement, persistent observation, triangulation, and member checking (Brown and Rodgers, 2003; Lincoln and Guba, 1985). By prolonged engagement, I invested sufficient time at the classroom besides our
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8 I am aware that there have been contentions regarding the term ‘validity’ when used in judging qualitative research. Although researchers such as Lincoln and Guba (1985) suggest that terminology like validity used in judging quantitative research should be replaced with credibility when applied in qualitative research, I still adopt the conventional use of the term for this thesis. My definition of validity in qualitative studies such as mine refers to the appropriateness, meaningfulness, correctness, and usefulness of any inferences a researcher draws based on data.
classroom hours, learning the culture, getting to know my students better by carrying on informal conversations with them. The technique of persistent observation, by the same token, allowed me as a researcher to identify the characteristics and elements in the situation that are most relevant to the issues being pursued and focusing on them in detail. By observing the classroom for one school year, I engaged in prolonged and persistent contacts with the students and my relationship with some students was even longer than one school year. I participated in as many social gatherings as I could where I can have informal talks with the students, and get to know them better. I went out for lunch or coffee with my class, I went to Karaoke with them, I went to Korean restaurant with them, etc.

Triangulating the data was another important way to enhance the validity of my ethnographic study. Brown and Rodgers (2003) explain triangulation as “the attempt to understand some aspect of human behavior by studying it from more than one standpoint, often making use of both quantitative and qualitative data in doing so” (p. 243). Stated simply, triangulation refers to checking what a researcher observes and hears by comparing other sources of information. For example, Duff (2002), in her ethnographic research on language socialization practices in grade ten high school classrooms in Vancouver, gathers written documents as a means of triangulating her observations. By comparing what she saw and heard in classrooms with written documents such as curriculum guides, assignments, and participants’ course notes, she ensures that her observations are congruent with the information in the written records. Moreover, Duff triangulates her data by using more than one method (classroom observations and interviews), and also by varying the time and locations in which she collects data.
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9 Triangulation can be done in seven different ways, according to Brown and Rodgers (2003), by using multiple sources of information (data triangulation), multiple researchers (investigator triangulation), multiple theoretical framework (theory triangulation), multiple data-gathering procedures (data methodological triangulation), the perspectives of several disciplines (interdisciplinary triangulation), multiple occasions to gather data (time triangulation), multiple sites to gather data (location triangulation). As Brown and Rodgers point out, it is not feasible to use all of these triangulation types and thus, using only several is enough to enhance validity of the study.
her data; she attends a variety of school events such as orientation evenings for parents, assemblies, and school dances to verify her observation and interviews.

Following this example I compared what I saw and heard in classrooms with written documents such as participants’ assignments, and their course notes, thereby ensuring that my observations are congruent with the information in the written records. I also often discussed my observational records with a research assistant to confirm what I observed and heard in the classroom. Having another source of classroom observation from the research assistant was an effective way to generate more objective views of what is going on in the classroom. Lastly, I employed more than one method of data collection (e.g. classroom observation, written journals, interviews, etc.) as a means of triangulating my data. I believe that by using the multiple data collection methods, my ethnographic research will provide the depth and richness that I searched for, simultaneously enhancing its validity.

Lastly, I utilized member checking to ascertain the validity of interpretation in my ethnographic study (Brown and Rodgers, 2003). Member checking, as it is termed, refers to checking a researcher’s presentation of the participants’ perspectives by having the participant review what the researcher has written as a check for accuracy and completeness (Fraenkel and Wallen, 2003). As a means of member checking, I verified my classroom observations by engaging myself in casual conversations with the participants, and also having them review the videotape taken in class when in need of clarification. Semi-structured interviews were critical to understanding and interpreting my participants’ hands-on experiences and identity performances, and also to validating my observational records. Throughout the data collection process, I took detailed observation notes – what Geertz (1973) calls “thick description”. I kept the field notes during the classroom observation period, in which I jotted down any unusual or interesting interactions or discourses in the classroom, and my thoughts or feelings on them. My
careful eye also enabled me to go back to my participants with my observational accounts in order to validate my findings.

2.5.2. Critical Discourse Analysis

There have been a number of criticisms about critical discourse analysis (CDA) as a methodology for analysis. Widdowson (1998), for example, argues that in its actual analyses, CDA provides subjectively biased interpretations of discourse under the guise of critical analysis. According to him, CDA does not analyze how a text can be read in many ways, or under what social circumstances it is produced and consumed. In a similar vein, Schegloff (1997) argues that CDA researchers project their own political biases and prejudices onto their data, and analyze them accordingly. In this way, prefabricated patterns of power relations are sketched, often based on social and political common sense, and then projected onto discourse.

With regard to this problem, Blommaert (2005) argues that understanding contexts where various sense-making practices are developing may help researchers explain the way in which people make sense socially, in real environments. In fact, focusing on contexts builds on Gumperz’s (1982) notion of contextualization that he interpreted that “comprises all activities by participants which make relevant, maintain, revise, cancel… any aspect of context which, in turn, is responsible for the interpretation of an utterance in its particular locus of occurrence” (p.4). In other words, drawing attention to contexts where actions occur enables us to account for the ways in which people make sense of their interactions, and to pick up quite a few unsaid meanings in such interaction. Adding to this, I would also argue that it is important for the researchers to crystallize the context on which their interpretations, arguments or logics are based, and to provide detailed descriptions of the context where the discourses under investigation were said or made. Although it is possible that what one individual understands may be different from what many others understand, as Blommaert (2005) demonstrates, one
can certainly enhance the validity of CDA by crystallizing the contexts where each discourse occurs.

On the other hand, Pennycook (2001) argues that most work in CDA is contradictory because it sits within a modernist emancipatory model of knowledge and the world, and believes that there is a place outside of power, ideology that is somehow neutral or free, a place of ordered discourse and harmony. In his view, however, there is no escape from questions of power, no escape from ideology or discourse, and to claim otherwise is to claim for oneself a position of knowledge that is somehow able to decide for others what is true. Thus, the struggle has to go on within our cultures, discourse or worldviews without claiming an objective truth outside them. With reference to this problem, Pennycook argues that a more poststructuralist approach to CDA may offer a more complex, subtle, and reflexive analysis of a text by pointing to the importance of intertextual and situated meanings. He further goes on to say that CDA moves forward in a productive way when it is combined with a politics such as feminism, antiracism or postcolonialism as in the work of Mills (1997) or Weedon (1987). Poststructuralism allied with these politics addresses a necessary political concern for discourse theory and simultaneously, challenges the essentialism that may underlie other forms of political action.

Following Pennycook’s (2001) suggestion, my doctoral thesis adopts a more poststructuralist approach to CDA. Therefore, my thesis will focus on the discursive nature of discourses as something which produces an effect rather than something which exists in and of itself and which can be analyzed in isolation (Mills, 1997). Moreover, by drawing attention to the ways in which discourses are to be read, received and produced, I hope that I can map out different formations of meanings, representations or ideologies in discourses. To this end, it is my goal to establish language learning as a form of poststructuralist practice, and to explore the
discursive construction of language learners’ identities, investments and other social relations centering on power, ethnicity, race and gender.

2.6. Ethical Issues

In this section, I will discuss two major issues surrounding ethics of the study. First, I will examine relationships between the researcher and the researched and show ways in which I as a researcher tried to work “on, for and with” (Cameron, Frazer, Harvey, Rampton, and Richardson, 1992) my participants in order to capture the complex nature of classroom dynamics as well as intricacies of their identities and positionings. Second, I will address the question of my dual roles as a teacher and a researcher to demonstrate the impacts and benefits of my multiple roles in the study.

2.6.1. Researcher/Researched

As in all ethnographic research, the identity of the researcher influenced the research process. Cameron, Frazer, Harvey, Rampton, and Richardson (1992) state:

We inevitably bring our biographies and our subjectivities to every stage of the research process and this influences the questions we ask and the ways in which we try to find answers. Our view is that the subjectivity of the observer should not be seen as a regrettable disturbance but as one element in the human interactions that comprise our object of study. Similarly, research subjects themselves are active and reflexive beings, who have insights into their situations and experiences. They cannot be observed as if they were asteroids, inanimate lumps of matter: they have to be interacted with (p. 5).

With virtually any student in my class, I had something to share in terms of the labels defining my identity. As a Korean woman, I share an ethnic label with the Korean students, and a Pan-ethnic/racial label with the Chinese students. As a person whose English is not a first language but living in a mainly English speaking society, I also share the status of English as a second language speaker with those Chinese international students. As a woman married to a Canadian man of European descent, I have a common ground with those students of European origin who are or were in a relationship with a Korean. This common ground with my students, in fact,
helped to pave the way for a number of informal conversations where they comfortably and truthfully talked about their relationship with their family members and friends, as well as their thoughts about Korean related issues. Many times, I was able to maintain my status as an insider throughout the research process, and had an easy time developing rapport with my participants. My insider position helped me avoid some of the limitations that detached ethnographers would face in lacking sufficient background information, or in gaining access to socially intimate sites.

However, my status as an outsider was still apparent because I was a first generation Korean in contrast to my 1.5 or second generation Korean students, and also because neither was I Chinese, nor do I have European background. Although I share a common ground with 1.5 generation Koreans, I am much older than they are, at least, by one decade. The Korean popular cultural products that I was growing up with were certainly different from those of 1.5ers. I spent my childhood in economically and politically different time in Korea as compared to 1.5ers. More importantly, my role as a teacher inevitably led me to take on the role of an outsider. Throughout the data collection period, the different levels of insider/outsider positions often created tensions, and accordingly, I needed to negotiate my own subject positions during the research and writing period in terms of the different contexts I encountered. As Canagarajah (1999) noted, this realization is a powerful reminder that “research is itself a form of social practice, and enjoys no immunity from or transcendence of the contextual realities governing any activity” (p. 54)

Nevertheless, I believe that my role as both an insider and an outsider allowed me to make a connection with the students’ lived experiences. Moreover, an impact of my identities on the research process illustrates the constructed nature of ethnographic work. In combining the perspectives gained from ethnography and critical discourses analysis, I was hoping to create a research study that was inclusive and collaborative, where my participants could explore their multiple worlds and reflect on the performance of their identities through various discourse
practices as Giampapa (2004) envisioned in her ethnographic research. Gitlin and Russell (1994) suggest that research conducted in this way “allows both participants (i.e., researcher and researched) to become the changer and changed. Central to a dialogical approach is that it can further the aim of developing voice among those who have been silenced historically. The opportunity to speak, to question and to explore issues is an important aspect of this process” (p. 185).

The questions that I posed to my students about language and identities were questions that I had reflected upon myself. Whenever I heard my students talking about their experiences of juggling multiple cultures, I compared their experiences with my own, my struggles, conflicts and feelings of being alienated that I had as an international university student in a Canadian university. In some ways, my students mirrored the experiences and dilemmas that I had encountered, and some of the marginalization processes that I had gone through in an English medium society. Nevertheless, I tried carefully not to project my own experiences onto those of my students nor to interpret data based on my own personal experiences. Field notes in which I detailed my personal thoughts and reactions throughout the data collection period helped me understand my own preoccupations that may otherwise have led to biased interpretations of the data. Although it is not a formal procedure of the study, I was also able to discuss various aspects of the data with research colleagues who were not involved in the study as a way to guard against researcher bias (Lincoln and Guba, 1985)

2.6.2. **Teacher as a Researcher**

The last, but important issue surrounding my ethnographic study is related to the fact that I took on dual roles as a researcher and a teacher as I was collecting my data in my own Korean language classroom. While the teacher/researcher role did create certain tensions, it was not always detrimental to producing insightful and valuable findings. In fact, much of this line of work (e.g. Canagarajah, 1993, 1999; Morgan, 1997, 1998) follows the tradition of action
research (Nunan, 1990) by which the arbitrary distinction of those who theorize and those who teach is being gradually more challenged. Nunan (1990) characterizes action research by its focus on knowledge “for a particular situation or purpose” (p. 63) and suggests that “teachers need to be able to conceptualize their practice in theoretical terms” (p. 62). Although my research does fit into the description of action research in situating it in the social context where theoretical insights can directly inform teaching, it differs from action research in that I did not orient my research ideas to the conditions and problems that arise in my own classroom.

I would argue that my dual roles as a teacher and a researcher offered numerous advantages in terms of my teaching and researching practices. Having been a teacher for most of the students in my class through introductory and intermediate Korean courses, I have gotten to know my students very well in terms of their personality, family, ethnic, racial backgrounds, their school lives, etc. Moreover, as a teacher, I have enjoyed natural access to my students’ daily work, activities and entertainment without making them feel that they are intruded upon. Although I cannot deny that knowing my students well does not guarantee an accurate or correct understanding of the culture or dynamics of the language classroom, as Canagarajah (1999) suggests “the classroom culture or overall picture that I as a teacher present is no less a construct of the different contextual and discursive forces at play during the research process” (p. 54).

Canagarajah (1999) talks about the advantage of teacher research as “participant observation enables closer involvement in the processes of schooling and community life, providing deeper insights into the participants’ orientations” (p. 53). As such, my daily interactions with the students and observations in and outside of classroom made me reconsider the teaching materials that I was using in my classroom, and revise my teaching strategies. Moreover, findings about the process of legitimizing a certain form of language over another, or about the strategies to utilize Korean related resources in the language classroom provided a vantage point for my own teaching practices. To this end, I am hoping that at the end of my
research project, I would generate theory with which to customize the curriculum for my own particular learning context and circumstances, thereby empowering those who learn Korean language as a foreign or heritage language.
Chapter III: Centre Discourses

In this chapter, I will examine discourses on the centre that define what is to be taught and how it is to be taught in the Korean language classroom. As centre discourses, I will include two discourses for scrutiny; discourses shown in the curriculum and discourses legitimized by an instructor. Although primary investigation in the curriculum lies in the Korean-ness (re)produced in the textbook, I will also include other teaching materials such as educational DVDs provided by Korean government organizations to examine social and cultural representations of Korean-ness embedded in these centre discourses. My main goal in regard to linguistic and teaching practices in the Korean language classroom is to unravel ways in which instructor’s linguistic and teaching practices have an impact on students of diverse racial, ethnic and L1 backgrounds. Principal emphasis is on ways in which instructor’s linguistic and teaching practices impart legitimacy to a certain group of students, while disadvantaging others.

3.0. Backgrounds

When the University of Western Ontario hired me as a Korean instructor, they entrusted me with the full responsibility of creating and revising the curriculum. Although the department of Modern Languages and Literatures has been offering other language courses for many years before the Korean language courses were set up, there were no prefabricated teaching strategies or materials assigned to me, and there was no set allocation for mark breakdowns. This is due to the department’s consensus that every language is different and should be learned with its own pace and principle. Owing to the department’s liberal policy, I was able to practice all sorts of different teaching strategies and techniques in my courses, and make revisions accordingly.

I created a course syllabus in a way that integrates students’ four skills, speaking, listening, reading and writing. I included an oral presentation and an oral test as part of mark
components. Nevertheless, because there were no lab hours assigned for the courses, I was not able to utilize the web activities that the authors of the book had created to complement the written nature of the textbook. Under the textbook authors’ permissions, at one school year, I tried to incorporate the web activities into the course. However, employing the web resources created by a different institution, not by the faculty members at UWO, instantly created a tension, and the coordinator at the language learning centre at UWO suggested that we should create our own web resource site. The apparent problem in doing so was that neither internal nor external funding was available to help to create our own website. To make matters worse, my position at UWO was on a yearly contract. For this reason, the language lab activities were never incorporated into the Korean language program at UWO. The best thing that I could do instead was to make extra handouts or to create speaking activities with which my students could utilize and practice their communicative skills.

Another constraint in my teaching activities at UWO stems from fears of course cancellation. The department reserves the right to cancel the course when it does not meet the minimum requirement of the student enrollment. For this reason, in the beginning of my teaching career at UWO, I accepted everyone who enrolled in the intermediate Korean course including those Korean students who are overqualified, and accordingly, I had to change the course curriculum to accommodate the level of students. As such, from 2003 to 2006, the majority of students in Korean 200 were 1.5 generation Korean Canadian students who range from those who came to Canada prior to formal schooling to those who came to Canada in their teen years. I had to prepare for teaching materials and tests focusing on written literacy for these Korean students, apart from those non-Korean students or second generation Korean students who continue to study from the introductory course. Nevertheless, this method generates less than
satisfactory results as the class time is not enough for me to teach those overqualified separately from the continuing students. Moreover, I realize that with this method, I am stigmatizing both overqualified and continuing students by treating them differently, giving them separate learning materials and testing them differently. In short, I realize how important it is for an instructor to integrate everyone into one class, thereby creating a community and having shared learning experience. The method of separating students to accommodate different learning needs produced a number of complaints from both overqualified and continuing students; overqualified ones are worried about being graded lower than they had expected whereas continuing students tend to be discouraged by the flawless communication skills of those 1.5ers.

As the number of the students who continue to study from the introductory course grew every year, I reached the conclusion that I needed to screen those overqualified students. In 2006-7 when I was collecting data for the thesis, I went through a screening process by interviewing the 1.5 generation Korean Canadian students on the first day. In the end, I decided to accept the five 1.5ers all of whom left Korea before the age of ten. For that year, I still provided those 1.5ers with a different set of tests by getting them to write a short passage instead of giving them listening questions as I have always done in previous years. Moreover, I avoided giving the 1.5ers a separate lecture. If there are some materials that I would like the 1.5ers to study for their writing tests, then I photocopied the materials and asked them to study at home. When they have questions in the handouts that they had self-studied, I always made myself available during my office hours to answer their questions, and to help with their weak areas. Although the intermediate Korean course was still a little too easy for the 1.5ers as far as the level of language is concerned, at least they were telling me that they are getting something out my course (i.e. knowledge of grammar or writing skills). Throughout the course, I did not
receive any complaints or hear any concerns from the 1.5ers in regard to their treatment in the course or the marks that they received.

In the next section, I will begin examining the Korean textbook that I used in my Korean 200 course. My goal is to unravel hidden ideologies and cultural manifestations in the textbook, and to explore Korean-ness (re)produced by those who define what to teach.

3.1. The Korean Textbook

From 2003, the first year that UWO offered an intermediate Korean course to 2006, the year that I was collecting the data, I used the same textbook, Elementary Korean and Continuing Korean, first drafted in the UK, and later published in North America. The Elementary Korean includes 15 lessons in total, and is designed to be covered in one school year if each lesson can be covered in two weeks. I initially followed this schedule, but had to allocate more classroom hours for each lesson due to countless complaints about the course being too fast-paced. As a result, my introductory course covers 12 lessons at the end of the school year, and my intermediate course begins from lesson 13 and carries on to the Continuing Korean. This solved the pace problem, but created other problems, one of which was that the intermediate course ended with half of the Continuing Korean untouched. This becomes problematic because there is no more Korean language course at an advanced level to take up half of the unlearned parts of the textbook. After following this awkward schedule for a couple of years I began to search for a new textbook that could better suit my courses and accommodate my students’ needs. In fact, in the year that I was collecting the data for this research, I was experimentally using the different textbook in the introductory course while still using the same old textbook with the old course schedule in the intermediate course.
I chose to use the series *Elementary Korean* and *Continuing Korean* in my courses mainly due to the familiarity that I gained as a teaching and research assistant during my years as an MA student. The books are currently being used as textbooks in some post-secondary institutions in North America and the UK. This series provides a CD which the students can use to listen to dialogues and do exercises on their own. It also offers an online-textbook, web dialogues through which the students can listen to the dialogues while observing the sequenced animation, a variety of other web exercises covering listening, reading and writing. With the lab facilities, the web also enables the students to practice their pronunciation by getting them to record their paragraphs, or to practice their speaking by answering the pre-recorded questions in Korean. Such web resources are excellent assets for this textbook to complement its grammar orientation. As mentioned earlier, in my UWO courses, I was not able to actively utilize these web resources since there were no lab hours separately assigned for the courses. Occasionally I did some web exercises with the students during the classroom hours, but I mainly asked the students to do the web exercises on their own at home.

In the “Preface”, the authors of the textbook make it clear that the book is structuralist and eclectic in its philosophy and methodology, which may be reminiscent of the grammar translation method and the audio-lingual method. As Canagarajah (1999) points out, this methodology is deeply tied to behaviourist thinking assuming that given sufficient drilling or practice students can be made to display habit-oriented ‘automatic’, ‘correct’ responses. In its concern for ‘correctness’ the book arrogates itself to the authority in the classroom to arbitrate, evaluate and thus define knowledge. From their structuralist point of view, the ‘fundamentals of Korean’ are considered to be autonomous, value free grammatical structures excluding the cultural and ideological values that inform the language. Little consideration is given to how the
students’ own linguistic and cultural backgrounds might affect or enhance their language acquisition. The fact that ‘correct’ Korean is taken to be standard Seoul dialect rather than the “Korean” students bring with them, means that the students are further isolated from their social context.

Furthermore, the dominant pedagogical discourse of structuralism displays what Giroux (1983) has termed instrumental ideology. The possible effect of such an ideology is to discourage students from questioning the ‘reality’ or ‘truth’ presented by the textbook, and to discourage an exploration of the social and political implications of learning. As a result, the dialogues and situations presented in the textbook take the communicative norms and cultural values of urban elite Korean communities for granted, and do little to encourage a critical exploration of such discourses.

3.1.1. How Is Korean-ness Represented In The Textbook?

Although the textbook is mainly organized through grammar, as the authors admit, it also conveys and projects certain aspects of the cultural and social meanings taken for granted by the dominant discourse in Korea. In many of the dialogues, the textbook presents the stereotypical images of gender roles by projecting men as executives in the business settings and reserving the supporting roles such as secretaries or waitresses to women. The dialogue in lesson 12 is a supposedly comical episode between a British male student studying in a Korean university and a Korean woman working in the coffee shop, in which the man tries to ask the woman out on a date. The man asks her out twice, but only receives a negative response from the woman. Taking this rejection as her lack of interest in him, the man is finally about to back off. At the final moment, the woman comes back by saying that as for tomorrow, she is not busy. Her final comment suggests that she has been interested in the British man all along. This dialogue
demonstrates stereotypical images of indecisive, passive, meek, and coy Korean women. While the intention may not have been to convey such an image of Korean women to the students, the message is that if any non-Korean men want to go out with a Korean woman, they should understand that Korean women tend not to show their true intention and want the men to approach them more aggressively and persistently. Such stereotypical representations of gender roles and images of Korean women and men project and facilitate the voices of the dominant group, that is, in this case the Korean men, while conveying the Korean patriarchal gender ideologies to the students and instilling such ideologies in them. In portraying stereotypes of Korean men and women, and using characters taken for granted from the dominant group, the book assumes values of the Korean culture, and engenders patriarchal ideologies.

Along with the gender stereotyping, the textbook’s representation of an urban elite Korean culture needs to be re-examined as many of the dialogues occur in the capital city of Korea, Seoul, featuring famous shopping districts or university areas in the city. Such an urban representation, which many language teaching materials take for granted, serves to promote and facilitate the standard language privileged and favoured in the urban areas while reinforcing the native speech community’s ideology. I have already demonstrated ways in which students’ identities are contested and challenged in the course of learning the standard forms of speaking and writing introduced by ‘native’ authorities in/from Korea, and the classroom becoming a locus where the native hegemony and authority from the homeland are reinforced and reproduced, and where the cultural capital of the language learners who are from non-standard language background is devalued (e.g. Jo, 2001).

Finally, the text also promotes a kind of elitism by including a series of episodes in the, so called, best top five universities in Seoul. While I admit that the authors’ intention is not to
promote a particular set of values, the effect is to legitimize voices of a certain elite group that is defined as graduates from the best schools located in the urban Seoul area, thereby projecting ideologies taken for granted by those core communities as natural and legitimate.

3.1.2. To Which Learners Does the Textbook Impart Legitimacy?

The written part of the book is fairly well organized with portions of dialogues, vocabulary, grammar, and exercises. The dialogues cover the themes of daily academic life in Korea, business and travel, centering on a White English family that consists of a middle-aged father, mother, and their two university aged children. However, including only White learners throughout the book excludes other many non-White learners of Korean. Although some readings deal with 1.5 generation Korean Canadian’s experience in Korea, most dialogues still centre on the White English family members. As I will show in my study, more frequent movements across national borders produce a more diverse population within a globalizing and transnational community. The presence of Chinese international students in the Korean language classroom in a Canada is a good example of this transnational movement, and these transnational human movements challenge the monolingual norms of language learners in the foreign language classroom. However, monolingual and monocultural assumptions of language learners are present throughout this textbook, and thus, this book fails to provide non-White learners with a sense of legitimized learnership. Although my Chinese students can emulate themselves in many of the situations presented in dialogues which cover the universal theme such as shopping, social drinking or discussing one’s studies, etc., interaction presented through the lens of White people may fundamentally differ in nature from the dialogues presented through the lens of other non-Whites.
Moreover, by including only White learners in their book, the authors gave little consideration to learners’ diverse linguistic and cultural backgrounds. In many parts of the book, illustrations are offered about the linguistic and cultural differences between English and Korean with an assumption of learners being a homogeneous group where their language, culture, and social history, etc., are concerned. Furthermore, very little thought is given to how the students’ own linguistic and cultural backgrounds might affect or enhance their language acquisition. Given that a majority of the students in my Korean course are not White, and their first language is not English, this textbook may further marginalize the learners of other languages, establishing White and English language as a norm.

3.1.3. Other Visual Teaching Materials

Besides the textbook, the curriculum includes two DVDs that I acquired from one of the Korean government organizations; “The Korean Alphabet Hangeul” and “Taste of Korea”. The former concerns the Korean alphabets, Hangeul, how they were created and how they are used, etc. The latter demonstrates a variety of Korean foods that centre around three basic “jang”;

*kanjang* (soy sauce), *twonjang* (soy bean paste), *kochujang* (spicy soy bean paste). I use both DVDs in my courses because they are useful and educational in terms of introducing basic features of Korean letters and foods to the students who do not have much knowledge on Korean culture. Nevertheless, I am aware that those DVDs were made by Ministry of Culture and Tourism of Korea for the purpose of promoting Korean cultures overseas, and thus I cannot deny that the DVDs express a certain sense of Korean centre community’s self-pride rooted in ego-centric national superiority. Such a scene as illiterate people in other countries borrowing the Korean alphabet to write their spoken language or the claim that Korean Kimchi is effective in
cleansing one’s colon and preventing a cancer is a good example of a Korean centre discourse that takes a pride in Korean culture and language to the point of propagandizing Korean-ness.

3.1.4. Who are the Legitimate Learners?

In this section, I will discuss ways in which the textbook that we are using in Korean 200 imparts legitimate learnership to a certain group of students while marginalizing others. Dissatisfaction with the textbook was more prevalent amongst the Chinese students whose first language is not English. Some complain that the book uses too much technical English to explain grammar, thereby making it less comprehensible to the learners. Moreover, localized English expressions that are often seen in parts of the textbook (e.g. cheesy) worsen the problem that many ESL learners already have. Let us look at the following interview excerpt with Ping and Shan:

J: Any comments on the textbook?
Shan: It’s too big. I think this year, we will change the new textbook, right?
J: Yah.
Ping: It’s better than the old one.
J: Why do you think so?
Ping: Because I can’t understand it. The explanation is too hard. I don’t know. Maybe it’s because my English is not that good.
Shan: Yes, too many vocabularies. Even names are difficult.
J: You mean characters’ names in the dialogue?
Shan: Yah. When the English names are written in Korean, then they become more difficult to read.

This interview excerpt shows my Chinese students’ dissatisfaction with the textbook, which mainly stems from having to deal with the English language that this textbook uses as a means to explain grammar, vocabularies or cultures. The fact that this textbook uses many technical grammatical terms such as causatives or subjectives surely exacerbates the difficulties that these students already have as ESL speakers. To many of these ESL students, learning Korean language through the medium of English does not deem as a truly fair play. Instead it brings
a double burden to them as they have to know specialized and, at times, localized English well enough to learn Korean language.

On the other hand, other Chinese students indicate that the book does not cater to their needs to learn functional and practical Korean with which they can converse with their Korean friends, watch Korean soap operas or movies and listen to Korean popular music. In their opinions, the book emphasizes too much grammar, thereby leaving very little room to practice their communication skills. Ming states her opinion about the textbook as follows:

J: Do you have any input about the textbook or website?
Ming: From beginning of learning Korean to the end, I learned a lot about grammar and verbs. But I tried to remember the verbs but after long time, now you are to review again. You forget most verbs you learned before. I think we lack of speaking in class. We just studied grammar and writing. We have few times to practice speaking Korean. Also listening. I think listening is the most important part. Although Korean people speak in Korean, if they speak very slowly we can understand, but if they speak quickly, we totally confuse about what they are talking about. So I think we should have more practice in speaking and listening part.

J: So do you think that the textbook didn’t do a good job in helping you to improve your listening and speaking.
Ming: Yeah. Also grammar is important but I don’t think so. Like you learned a lot of grammar but it’s not that helpful for you to communicate with Korean people. It’s most important to practice speaking. It’s like kind of like learning English. [When I were in Shenzhen], all the students were required to study English. We have an English textbook every year. We are good at writing for sure, and we can understand grammar but for the speaking, we are not that good.

In the interview excerpt above, Ming argues that her particular dissatisfaction with the textbook stems from its grammar oriented nature. She feels that she knows a lot of grammar, but she feels that her knowledge of grammar does not help her to be an effective communicator due to her self perceived limited skills in listening and speaking. Nevertheless, her dissatisfaction with the textbook is, after all, extended to the criticism about the course as a whole for not catering to the students’ functional needs with the language, and also to the instructor as not being an effective
mediator to offset the weaknesses of the textbook. My student’s criticism is after all interlocking with my teaching and my course organization.

Even among the Korean students, there was dissatisfaction with the book. Some of the Korean heritage learners found that this textbook is more geared toward non-heritage learners.

The following interview excerpt shows how Dennis thinks of the textbook:

J: What do you think about the textbook?
Dennis: I read it, a couple of them, just before the test and stuff. They seemed pretty fun. I just don’t like how they say subject and all that. I don’t like that.
J: Grammar?
Dennis: I just speak it, right? When you’re on the test, you’re like subject and all that. Oh my Gosh. So I just go by the two symbols – Korean symbols, and make sentences out of those symbols and see if I get them.
J: What do you mean by Korean symbols?
Dennis: In the test, you always ask us to make sentences using such and such Korean symbols like...
J: like Future presumptives –겠습니까? [I will]?
Dennis: …Yah. I don’t know what future presumptives are. I just make sentences using the Korean symbols.

Certainly the textbook was created for non-heritage language learners, which is why the authors provide lengthy grammatical explanations. In fact, Lee and Kim (2008) report that content based instruction integrating academic content with language-teaching objectives best suits heritage language learners as these learners already possess a certain level of communicative proficiency from the interactions with their family members or Saturday heritage class. Dennis is a good example of this heritage language learner. Having already been exposed to Korean language, Dennis thinks that he knows how to listen, speak, read and even write in Korean although it is likely that his writing is full of spelling mistakes as is the common case with heritage language learners. However, when he comes to Korean classroom and has to learn Korean with the textbook targeted toward non-heritage language learners, he becomes puzzled and overwhelmed.
by all these elaborate technical terminologies. The use of the textbook created for non-heritage language learner makes what heritage learners already know more difficult and alien, thereby hampering their learning experience. To Dennis, therefore, the act of learning Korean language at a post-secondary institution becomes an ineffective long journey where he has to constantly mediate his knowledge on heritage language.

Interestingly, I hardly observed any negative feedback about the textbook from those students of European background. John, who is an older and more mature student, raises this point on the textbook:

J: How did you find the textbook?
John: I think I said it before, I think it’s fine. I don’t mind it at all, but who’s to say the other books are better, maybe the other books are better. I just haven’t learned from it so I don’t know but I didn’t mind books at all. You said in class, it’s always hard to accommodate everybody. It was the same one when I was in Korea. Some of the books there are hard, but you’ve got to do it. Just some parts are good in some books and bad in others.

John simply believes that there is no textbook to well accommodate different needs of a diverse group of language learners. When every textbook has its strengths and weaknesses, John firmly believes that learners should deal with the weaknesses of the textbook while focusing on its strengths. John’s comments are partly due to his maturity coming from his older age than other students, but also can be interpreted as his fair satisfaction with the textbook. Apparently, the textbook successfully imparts legitimate learnership to White students who speak English as a first language.

What follows in the next section is the investigation of my own linguistic and teaching practices as an instructor. As the authors of the textbook claim, the book does not teach the course in the classroom, and I would argue that the construction of power dynamics in the language classroom is deeply tied into how the instructor utilizes his/her language, and what type
of teaching practices he/she exercises. Therefore, my focus in the next section is how classroom interactions are at play and ways in which the instructor’s linguistic and teaching practices have an impact on students.

3.2. Instructor’s Linguistic and Teaching Practices

In the first sub-section, I will begin to examine ways in which my use of language as an instructor plays out in the Korean language classroom, and has an impact on my students. In the second sub-section, my investigation focuses on my resource-sharing practices, which I commonly utilized in the Korean language classroom to integrate those students who are more proficient in Korean with those who are less proficient. In the last sub-section, I will explore my management of knowledge on Korean language and culture that my Korean students bring to the Korean language classroom, and how it influences Korean students’ experiences of learning their heritage language.

3.2.1. Linguistic Practices

While analyzing the data, I discovered that the primary language of instruction in Korean 200 is English. I use English not only when I explain certain features of the Korean language but also when I am elaborating on any cultural topics or interesting episodes that concern Korean language and culture. Although my teaching philosophy follows the principle that the language classroom benefits from more input in the target language, I spoke English because I feared that my Korean would be too difficult for my non-Korean students to understand. Nevertheless, in a whole group situation, I consciously tried to speak as much Korean as I could whenever and wherever I considered my non-Korean students to be able to understand me. When speaking Korean, I did my best to utilize accessible vocabulary in the simplest sentence structures.
Despite my efforts, it is obvious that I as an instructor indirectly and unintentionally acknowledged the use of English as natural and legitimate in class. One of the most common things that I asked my students to do was to read a list of Korean sentences one by one and then to provide me with an English meaning. The following excerpt is a good example of such a classroom routine, where I officially acknowledged English as a legitimate language of our classroom communications:

(January 11)
Ping:     Number 4? 바쁘도 // 바쁘도 먼저 가야겠습니다. [Although busy... although busy, I will have to go first].
J:        Meaning?
Ping:     The meaning is // You mean an English meaning?
J:        Well, I don’t want a Chinese meaning.
(Students laugh)
Ping:     Uh m// Although I’m busy, I have to go.

For those who speak English as their first language, the use of English is a taken for granted classroom routine in a foreign language classroom. In fact, a lot of foreign language learners go through a stage where they process information pertaining to a foreign language in their first language at least in the beginning period of language learning. However, for those who speak languages other than English as their first language, the use of English burdens them twice as much as those whose first language is English in that they have to process information through two different layers – first in English, second in their first language. Therefore, the act of learning Korean through another language becomes, to my Chinese participants, like wearing two different pairs of glasses to see objects through. How well they see through two different glasses depends on the degrees of lenses, and yet, wearing one good pair of glasses unquestionably helps them see better than wearing two. This comparison suggests that
instructor’s legitimization of English in Korean language classroom disadvantages those whose first language is not English, thereby hampering their learning experience.

Besides the classroom routine above, I am legitimizing those who speak English as a first language by acknowledging their English responses to my Korean questions. The following classroom excerpt took place between the other Korean students and me. Although I continued to use Korean language to get the students to switch into Korean, the Korean students continued to carry on a conversation in English.

(November 21)
J: [짝하고 같이 하세요 / 짝을 / Please do it with your partners].
Student A: I wanna watch movie today.
J: (laughing)
Student A: It’s so true I brought some movie everyday. You promised.
J: 어, 샀어요? [Did you buy it?].
Dennis: 맥속 했으면서 [You promised ].
Student A: [등을 돌려 가방에서 DVD 를 꺼낸다] [Turning his back, A takes out a DVD from his bag].
J: 근데 어떤 영화예요? [By the way, what kind of movie is it?]. If you can explain it in Korean.
Student A: This? This movie? OK.
J: 한국말로 [In Korean] 한국말로 [In Korean] Please.
Student A: //Ah // Wait, that’s not part of the deal. You promised if we could watch it next day. (pointing his DVD towards the teacher)
J: In Korean culture it is really not polite to do this (pointing finger) to a person.
Student A: I wanna say // I wanna /.
J: 근데 몇분짜리예요? [By the way, how long is the movie?]. How long?
Student A: An hour and half.
J: 시간 늦었잖아요 [It’s too late].
Dennis: Let’s just start it.
Student A: Finish half today and half Tuesday.
J: 그러면 여러분 다 동의해요? [Then, do you all agree?]. 근데 저 영화 본사람 없어요? [Did anybody see this movie?]. 못봤어요? [Haven’t you watched it?].
Well / 근데 / [By the way] well // you can explain.
Student A: ----- (tells the summary of the movie to the class in English)
J: It is released this year?
Student A: I don’t know / 2 years ago?
J: 여러분이 오지 오늘 영화볼래요? [Everyone, do you want to watch a movie today?].
Students: 네 [Yes].
J: 근데 숙제있어요. 그럼 숙제 가져가세요 [Then, I will give this as homework. Bring your homework home].

Previously, I mentioned that if anyone brings a good Korean movie, I will let the students watch it in our class. In the class above, student A, one of the second generation Korean students brought a movie and asked me to watch it in class. In this long classroom excerpt, student A did not speak any Korean, and kept having a conversation with me in English. Rather, his continuous use of English made me switch into English from Korean several times. When I asked him to explain the synopsis of the movie in Korean, he escaped this difficulty by saying that his story telling in Korean was not a part of the deal. Later when I asked him to tell the story of the movie again, he would do so in English, which I did not object to. I would argue that this is the very moment that I as an instructor legitimize the use of English in the Korean language classroom. If the same situation occurred to my Chinese students, they would not dare think of telling the story in Chinese.

It should be noted that I did not set up a Korean only policy in the classroom because I believed that the use of L1 is beneficial to the learning of L2. Also I wanted to make a healthy environment where the students felt at ease when speaking L2. In fact, my students’ responses to my questions or comments in English were very common due to my acknowledgement of students’ L1. Although I let my Chinese students use Chinese in class the same way that I did to those students who speak English as their first language, use of Chinese did not produce a legitimacy effect as I as an instructor do not understand Chinese. Instead, if there were informal discussions occurring amongst Chinese students in their L1, I nicely asked them to share their discussions with the class. I did not specify in which language they could share the discussions, but apparently, English was a nominal communication means in our Korean language classroom, which everyone in class has taken for granted.
3.2.2. Resource Sharing Practices

In this section, I will examine how I as an instructor seek input from the students on Korean-related topics for discussion, and how I utilize the resources that students bring to the classroom when engaging them in pair or group work. The common strategy that I implemented to discuss Korean related topics was to use the resources and experiences that either Korean students or those who have been to Korea has about Korean language, culture, and people, etc. I actively engaged them in the classroom discussions and encouraged them to share any Korean related resources that they can contribute to, from their childhood memories or experiences to their recent visits to Korea. The following classroom excerpt demonstrates my usual pattern of leading a class discussion:

(February 2)
J: But you celebrate mother’s day. 철수는 어머니한테 사랑해 얘기해요?
   [Student B, Do you say “I love you” to your mom?].
Student B: 말로는 안하는데요 / [I don’t say it in a word but].
J: 어머니는 사랑해 얘기하세요? [Does your mother say “I love you” to you?].
Student B: 그냥 다 알아요, [We all know it].
Sohee: Korean parents don’t say that. We wanna say that, but we are not just used to. 사랑한다 [I love you] is just assumed between family members.
J: But I start to say it to my child directly nowadays. 어때요?철수는 사랑한다 얘기 안해요? [How about you?, student B, don’t you say “I love you?”].
Student B: 음 // [uhm].
J: But then, here, in Canada, everything has to be said in order for others to understand you. Otherwise you can’t really understand what the person is trying to say. Don’t you agree? 영희는 어때요? [How about Student C?].
Student C: -----.

The discussion above concerns the Korean phrase “I love you”. I was explaining that the phrase “I love you” is not as expressively and directly used between family members in Korea as in
Canada. In order to show an example, I was trying to extract some of the experiences that my Korean students have within their Korean immigrant family. First, I asked Student B who is a second generation Korean student about how much his Korean family overtly says “I love you” to one another. Then, Sohee who is a 1.5 generation Korean, explains why Koreans do not say “I love you” to other family members. Here Sohee contributed to this discussion without being called on by me. In fact, such contributions by 1.5ers were very common throughout the class. Although some 1.5ers were more vocal than others, students like Sohee often further went on to elaborate on the teacher’s linguistic or cultural interpretations of Korea, Korean language or culture.

After seeking input from the Korean students, student B and C, I called on Melissa and John, who are a second generation Chinese and a student of European background respectively, but both of whom have been to Korea. Although this resource sharing practice was not always fixed, I usually called on Korean students first and then those students who have been to Korea or who have a Korean social network. By utilizing the Korean resources in my particular way, I unconsciously and unintentionally imparted an opportunity to speak to either Korean students or those students who have been to Korea. Those who are disadvantaged by my method of employing Korean resources are clearly Chinese international students. The instructor’s method of utilizing Korean resources provides an impetus for the Chinese students to keep silent throughout the course.

My resource sharing practice not only positioned my Chinese students to be silent in a whole class discussion situation, but also in pair/group work. In the classroom pair work, I intentionally paired the less proficient students with more proficient students so that they can help each other and no one particular pair is better than other pairs. Therefore, the Chinese
international students and the students of European background were likely to be paired up with Korean students whenever they had to do some written exercises or get into speaking activities.

However, Shan and Ping state that such pair work was not very helpful. They state in an interview as follows:

J: Is there any student who feels more close to you in our class?
Ping/ Shan: Yan
J: How come?
Ping: She likes to help other people.
Shan: She is generous and she is kind.
J: Did she help you with your Korean?
Shan/Ping: Yeah yeah.
Shan: Yan teaches us Korean.
J: What about other Koreans? Do they ever help you with your Koreans?
Shan: We spend most time with Yan. We don’t have too much time with Koreans. They help if they have a chance.
J: What about pair work? I usually pair the Chinese students with the Korean students? Was it helpful?
Ping: I think, how do you say? I think they speak Korean very quickly so sometimes their help is no useful. We can’t understand.
Shan: (laughing) very different levels.
Ping: Yeah yeah yeah.

In this interview, Ping and Shan explain that they prefer to work with another Chinese student, Yan, whose Korean is better than theirs. They did not find the Korean-Chinese pair work useful because their Korean partners usually talked too fast for them to understand. Instead, they liked to work with Yan because she was able to teach Korean in their L1. Their opinion about the pair work with Koreans is shared by other Chinese students as well. Ming states:

J: Was the pair work helpful? I grouped Korean students with Chinese students. And then worked some project together, right?
Ming: Uhm.
J: Was that work helpful in terms of your language?
Ming: Yes, I think so. But I think Chinese students prefer to work with Chinese students because when they have some problem, they can use Chinese to discuss (laughing). But when we worked with second generation Koreans, because they are better in their Korean, they can answer all the questions. When we have some
problems, they can do them by / on their own. So sometimes it feels more stressful.

J: Is that right?
Ming: Yes, because they can answer all the questions, things are easy for them. But for us, it’s a little difficult.

Ming states that although she agrees that the pair work with her Korean peers was useful to a certain extent, she also states that she still prefers to work with Chinese students. Rather she perceive interactions with Koreans stressful as the teamwork is not built on equal footing, but rather resembles an expert-apprentice relationship; the Korean students end up either solving all these exercise questions by themselves without soliciting any input from their Chinese partners or they, whether intentionally or unintentionally, treat their Chinese partners as a linguistic and cultural novice, ending up taking a role as a resource carrier. Clearly pair work not only worked against my well intended purposes, but also did it construct invisible power relations between Korean and Chinese pairs. Due to this power asymmetry that this pair work has constructed in the Korean language classroom, the Chinese international students whose English and Korean are not as good as their Korean partners’ become marginalized and struggle, thereby being placed on the periphery.

My Chinese students’ marginalization is not only visible in pair work, but also in group work too. One of the good examples where the Chinese students are positioned to be reticent is in a role play. When grouping the students into a team, I purposefully mixed students based on their Korean proficiency and ethnic backgrounds. As a result, Ming was grouped with one second generation Korean, Daniel, and one 1.5 generation Korean, student D, to prepare for her role play. For this group project, I provided several topics with the students beforehand and asked each group to create a dialogue that covers the topic. Ming talks about her experience of preparing for the role play below:
J: What about that role play? Was that a pleasant experience working with Korean students?
Ming: Honestly, honestly no experience for me.
J: No experience?
Ming: Like we practiced and we just practiced on the day that we did a presentation and the day before the presentation we just met together to discuss the topic about the presentation. After we finished talking about the topic, and student D?
J: Uhmm.
Ming: Student D, he wrote down all the sentences in Korean and sent to us. I tried to remember all the words. We practiced the presentation on the day.
J: So student D was the one who wrote a script?
Ming: Yes. She, sorry (laughing) student D is better at writing than me or Daniel.
J: Of course, he is a 1.5 generation Korean.

The interview above seems to show that Ming did not benefit much from the role play project because the Korean student D whose Korean proficiency is better than hers ended up writing an entire script for the group. The problem is that the script written by the Korean student usually incorporates too many difficult words and sentence structures and consequently, non-Korean students like Ming end up memorizing their lines without understanding the meanings of their sentences. Clearly the interview excerpt shows that Ming was not happy with her Korean peer doing all the work for her, which, in turn, alludes to her intention to participate in writing the script and to practice her Korean. When her Korean peer volunteered to write the script for the group, she kept silent. Although her Korean peer took Ming’s silence as an acknowledgement of his action, Ming wished that everyone in the group would divide up the writing work so that the whole process of preparing for the role-play can turn into useful and valuable learning experience. This finding cannot be too useful in terms of engendering an educational practice that fosters equal participation from everyone involved in pair/group work, and that makes the whole working process as a learning experience for both Korean and non-Korean students.

I would argue that Ming’s silence in the role-play is strongly tied into the issue of power relations that Norton (1995) placed in the heart of her participants’ ambivalence to speak in the
target language. Norton argues that her ESL participants’ situational silence can be attributable to their lack of legitimacy as an ESL speaker as well as the power dynamics between them and the target language speaker. In a similar fashion, Ming’s silence is not mere a passive acknowledgement of her Korean interlocutor’s action, but a form of attentive silence (Cheung, 1993) characterized as acute listening, quiet understanding, awareness of the subtlest signs from a speaker. Cheung argues that such a mode of silence is empowering and thus the antithesis of passivity. As Bourdieu (1977) argues, discourse always owes a major part of its value to the value of the person who utters it, and from this view, Ming and her Korean peer obviously carry different “rights to speech” or “power to impose reception” (p. 652) in the economic market of Korean language classroom.

Then, how would my students of European backgrounds perceive the work with their Korean peers? Would there be a similar power asymmetry observed between Korean students and students of European backgrounds? Interestingly, both John and Ray thought that their Korean peers were very helpful and useful. John talks about the Korean students as follows:

John: --- I talked to Dennis, Daniel. Some of the guys, I don’t even know their names. The one in higher level guy, who sat by Sohee a lot.
J: Jinwoo?
John: Jinwoo? Yah. He came a little bit later, I think. I was talking to him in the beginning.
J: Talking to them is helpful in your Korean?
John: Well, in Korean // just we have a conversation in English, but when I did have problem, they helped me a lot. When we handed a sheet, we were trying to talk about and ask questions about this and that. I would be just lost. What’s this? So they can explain it and helped a lot. I am actually glad that they were there.

Unlike the Chinese international students, John clearly benefited from working with Korean students. He did not feel that Korean students’ higher proficiency in the language comes back as a stress trigger. Rather he thought that their Korean was an asset to the class in that they can help the students less proficient in Korean language like him. Nevertheless, he alludes to his belief
that not every Korean student is helpful in the same way. He mentioned particular Korean
students who were especially helpful to him. The same goes with Ray in that he only mentions a
few who he particularly hung out with from the Korean class. He comments in an interview:

J: --- Did you have meaningful interactions with Koreans in our class? Did you hang out
with Koreans in our class?
Ray: Not really. I try. We watched a lot of Korean shows and movies and stuff, and I’ve tried
hanging out with Dennis and student A and Daniel from Korean class. I think they’re
cool guys but unfortunately, I didn’t. I wish I did. I get along with them well, especially
Dennis. But I don’t really (?)
J: Did you speak English with them?
Ray: Yeah, even though we speak English, I think there’s a little bond between us, I feel from
my point of view because I’ve met them through Korean class. I’m half inside, I have a
foot on inside and the other in outside. Not a complete outsider, but I’m not a Korean, so
I feel a bit awkward hanging out with them. I feel as though Koreans are very community
and it takes a lot for an outsider to come in and really feel like they’re included. So with
them, I feel as though given a fact that they’re grown up here, being in Korean class, we
can relate in certain ways, and I’ve hung out with Daniel outside of class, we’ve had
drinks, talked about school, and so on. I’m just so much older than them, too. So it
changes as well.

In the interview, Ray states that he did not hang out much with Korean students from the Korean
classroom. However, this is interpreted as not as much as he had hoped he would, but it does not
mean that he did not hang out with Korean students at all. In the interview, Ray mentions several
second generation students that he occasionally hung out with, and got along with well. At the
same time, he expresses a sense of isolation from the Korean students due to the self perceived
little bond between himself and them. Such a sense of isolation is mainly due to his awareness of
Koreans’ distinction of insiders and outsiders. As he is not ethnically Korean, he is aware that he
cannot be one of them, and yet, he is also self-perceived as an insider because he has cultivated
his lens through which he understands Korean language and culture, and has developed a Korean
tie by having a relationship with his Korean girlfriend. His self-perceived insider status is what
helps Ray to compensate for his marginal positions. Interestingly, neither his marginal status as a
non-native speaker of both English and Korean, nor his racial and ethnic minority status in the Korean language classroom place him on the periphery in the same way as the Chinese international students.

One striking commonality between John and Ray in terms of their socialization pattern in the Korean language classroom is that they both maintained a closer relationship with second generation Korean students than 1.5ers. In fact, Ray states that he can relate himself better to the second generations than 1.5ers because they have shared experiences as Canadians while growing up in Canada. He states as follows:

J: What about those 1.5 generation students in our class?
Ray: Well, I don’t know. Sohee is just older and they just seem different. I don’t know but I think it’s always has to do with the fact where we sit because I sat with Dennis, Daniel, and student A. In that corner, we’ve got to chat and stuff whereas Sohee and Jinwoo are on the other side. I get along well with student D and student E. Student D’s actually supposed to come play soccer with my soccer team and I tried to live with him in the summer because he had an open room but things got complicated. Schooling, and he was not going to take summer school anymore so it got so complicated. So I didn’t have a chance to hang out with him much. But if he sticks around, I think we’ll hang out because he’s a good guy.

J: What do you think about the differences between 1.5 and second generation students?
Ray: I don’t know. They’re / more Korean? I think it’s because Dennis’s such a character. So is student A. They have their things, they draw attention to themselves, student A with writing and Dennis has such a big mouth. He says the things that are wrong all the time but it’s funny, coming from him whereas 1.5 seems that they don’t want to make mistakes because they don’t want to be socially unaccepted by you, I think. They’re more of traditional/.

In this interview excerpt, Ray states that he did not have many interactions with 1.5ers because of the age differences with some, and because of physical distances in the classroom with the others. As Ray mentions in the interview, students of European backgrounds always sat close to second generation Koreans in front of the classroom. Telling stories and joking to one another in English between students of European backgrounds and second generation Korean students was the common scene observed in the Korean class. On the other hand, 1.5 generation Korean
students such as Sohee and Jinwoo always sat close to the Chinese students in the back of the classroom. As I will examine 1.5ers further in detail in the later chapter, these 1.5ers are bicultural and bilingual between a native speech community and an adopted country, and have a stronger identity as Koreans while feeling more comfortable with Asian people who are racially close. As the findings of Lee’s (2005) study on second generation vs. 1.5 generation Hmong youths demonstrate, Ray, in the interview, pinpoints that 1.5 generation Koreans are more traditional and more conscious of the authority figures than the second generation counterparts. It was apparent that the second generation Korean students who are well emulating the image of a ‘cool kid’ in the mainstream Canadian society, and also not afraid of speaking up in Korean class are certainly more appealing for these students of European backgrounds to emulate. In addition, Korean-ness expressed by second generation Korean students’ hip-hop clothes, localized English, slang and jokes surely comes as more approachable to the students of European backgrounds, thereby making it easier for them to assimilate and adopt. Unlike the Chinese students constructing their own space in the Korean language classroom, students of European backgrounds balance off their linguistically, ethnically and racially marginal positions in the Korean language classroom by allying with second generation Korean students and emulating Korean-ness that these second generations show in connection with their Canadian-ness.

3.2.3. Managing the Knowledge that Heritage Learners Bring

Although Korean students as resource carriers of Korean language and culture are often placed in the centre of the Korean language classroom, and become agents of which Korean-ness my students of European backgrounds wish to emulate, Korean language classroom is also a site where their resources are contested and challenged. Given that these Korean students primarily acquire Korean language from the informal interactions with their family members or people
from the same origins at Korean organizations, the act of learning heritage language in a formal academic setting is, to them, described as a process of (re)negotiating their linguistic and cultural knowledge on their heritage language. Therefore, what is explored in this section is the ways in which the linguistic and cultural knowledge that my Korean students bring and contribute to the lectures or discussions is mediated through an instructor. The following classroom discourse shows that some linguistic forms that my Korean students bring to the class conflict with the ‘standard’ Korean I teach in Korean language classroom:

(March 8)
J: 응 [Yes], I plan to live in Seoul.
Daniel: 서울에 살으려고 해요 [I plan to live in Seoul].
J: 살려고. (correcting the form). 서울에서 살려고 해요. [I plan to live in Seoul].
Dennis: Do you always have to use it like that though? Can’t you just say 살으려고?
J: Although you might hear 살으려고 in real speech, in writing, you have to use this form, 살려고.
Dennis: What about 살라고?
J: That’s non-standard. But you might hear the form spoken in some parts of Korea, but it is a dialect.
Dennis: Can we use that though?
J: Yes, in spoken form, but if you write it in a test, you will get a deduction in mark.

In this classroom discourse, I provide an English sentence with my students, and ask them to come up with an equivalent Korean sentence. This is my usual way of getting my students to try out the new structures introduced in each lesson. The verb ‘살다’ (to live) in Korean is an irregular verb that conjugates like a vowel stem verb. Thus the verb conjugates to 살려고, not 살으려고 when combined with the intensive –으려고(intending to). However, the verb is often mistakenly treated as a consonant stem verb, even by some native speakers of Korean, thereby generating an occasional hearing of 살으려고. Dennis’ parents were apparently one of the Koreans who adopted this informal use of the verb and consequently, their son Dennis has naturally considered this form as correct. However, Dennis’ informal linguistic variation loses its
authority as a ‘legitimate’ Korean language once the teacher who represents ‘native authority’ declares that his variation is not standard Korean. Dennis’ knowledge of Korean language, in other words, is deconstructed and contested in the formal academic setting where the teacher draws a firm distinction between standard and non-standard Korean language, and accepts only the standard version as a norm. Given Bourdieu’s (1991) notion that speakers can only be authorized if they are recognized by others, Dennis’ Korean not only loses its legitimacy, but also becomes a source for his struggle as he has to (re)negotiate the knowledge that he has established as a norm in the past.

Korean language which Korean students bring to the class also reflects their parents’ life trajectories. In the classroom discourses, students sometimes employ Koreanized Japanese words, which were used to be spoken under the influence of Japanese colonialism in Korea. Let us examine the following classroom discourse:

(January 11)
J: In the swimming pool, 수영장에는, 뭐 입어야 해요? 여러분? [In the swimming pool, what do you have to wear? Everyone?].
Student A: XXX
Student A: 빼쓰. [underwear].
수영복 [swimming suits]. 수영장에서는 수영복을 입어야 해요 [In the swimming pool, you have to wear a swimming suit].

The word ‘빼쓰’ is how Japanese used to write an English word ‘pants’. It was adopted by Koreans during Japanese colonial period with a meaning of ‘underwear’. Korean immigrant parents, some of whom left Korea during the 60s or 70s, have continued to use Japanese written forms of English words without being conscious of the effects that these mistakenly used linguistic forms might bring to their children. When Korean immigrant children are exposed to their parents’ Korean through daily informal interactions, they have naturally taken on some of
the Japanized English words. ‘빤쓰’ is one of the good examples of Japanized English words. In the classroom excerpts above, Student A uses ‘빤쓰’ to indicate ‘men’s swimming pants’. I, as an instructor, although not directly, corrected the student A’s Japanized English word by providing him with, what I consider, a proper term ‘수영복’ for swimsuits.

On the other hand, some of the classroom discourses show that my Korean students’ struggles arise from the Korean words replaced more often by an English equivalent. In the following classroom discourse, I was asking students about what they did on the weekend in the beginning of the class:

(November 28)
J: 주말에 뭐 했어요? [What did you do on the weekend?].
Daniel: 응 //토요일에 / 파티가 한국말로 뭐죠? [Uhm... on Saturday... what is party in Korean?].
Student A: 잔치 [party].
Daniel: 친구가 잔치를 했어요. 그래서 술 많이 마셨어요. [My friend had a party so I had lots of drinks].
J: 어떤 잔치? 잔치 is usually for 생일잔치 아니면 돌잔치, 환갑잔치…
[What kind of party? 잔치 is usually for birthday or one year birthday, sixty one year old birthday].
Daniel: 그냥 [just], it was just a party.
J: 그러면 잔치는 좀 이상한 것 같다. [Then, 잔치 seems a bit strange in that context] Usually 잔치 is used when someone is having a birthday, wedding / 요즘 한국사람들은 그냥 파티라고 많이 해요. [Nowadays, Koreans just use ‘party’].

Assuming that there is a Korean equivalent to an English word ‘party’, Daniel asks help from his classmates. Another second generation Korean student, Student A, provides the Korean equivalent word for Daniel, and yet, Daniel’s use of the Korean word in reference to a casual informal weekend party brings out an unexpected response from the teacher; the word ‘잔치’ usually refers to a party to celebrate special occasions such as birthdays or weddings. In fact, contemporary Koreans adopt an English word ‘party’ to refer to a casual and an informal party.
This excerpt reflects a changing nature of language, often under influence of other languages, in the modern Korean society, that is to be English. In fact, contemporary Korean language contains countless English loanwords (e.g. computer, piano, roommate), which in some cases, replace Korean equivalent words. Therefore, as Jo (2001) persuasively shows in her study, Korean American students’ use of a Korean word often represents a less ‘Korean’ expression than the English words prevalently adopted in native Korean speech community. The problem is that these Korean students not only have to relearn the English loanwords, but also relearn the different ways of pronunciation. They have to recontextualize these English words from the Korean class. Due to the Korean language as continuously reflecting contextual and historical changes and variations, learning Korean language, to these heritage language learners, no longer means “heading towards mastery or hitting a fixed target” (Jo 2001, p. 38), but is a dialogic meaning making practice through which they can relentlessly (re)negotiate their linguistic and cultural knowledge, and (re)construct their Korean-ness. As demonstrated in this section, classroom practices in the Korean language classroom complicate Korean students’ diverse oral language experiences and knowledge in multiple ways rather than monolithically homogenizing them. This in turn raises an important point that heritage language learners’ life trajectories and identities should be taken into critical consideration in their heritage language learning experience as they are deeply tied into the current status of their heritage language proficiency.

### 3.2.4. Who Holds the Floor in the Korean Language Classroom?

As I showed in the previous section, those most disadvantaged by the linguistic and teaching practices are Chinese international students. From the beginning of the course, these Chinese international students sat at the back of the classroom while Korean students occupied
the front seats. When I asked my Chinese participants why they sat at the back, Yan answered thus:

J: But how come did you sit at the back? All the Chinese sat at the back and all the Korean sat in front. And the Canadians sat at the middle.
Yan: I think we are scared because first, our Korean is not better than the Koreans. Our English is poor. So, when I speak to, or talk when there are many native in English, I feel scared. So, I couldn’t join the speech contest.
J: Umm Yeah, why not?
Yan: Actually. I hope I can join the speech contest. So maybe they will tell me to speak English. My English is poor.
J: Well you don’t have to speak any English. It is a Korean speech contest.
Yan: So I am scared they ask me questions, I can’t understand.
J: Uhm. Ask questions in English?
Yan: In Korean or English.

Yan’s answer indicates that the Chinese international students sat at the back of the classroom because they were not confident in either their English or Korean. Interestingly, although my class was a Korean language class, Yan’s answer offers further evidence that the language accepted as official and legitimate in the Korean class is English. Yan’s identity that she already perceives herself as an incompetent speaker of English is marginalized once again due to her status as a non-Korean whose Korean language is not as good as that of Korean students in class.

Unlike Yan, other Chinese students such as Ping and Shan attribute their physical distance from the centre of the class to cultures. Shan states in the interview:

J: In our class, you always sit together. Chinese students and then Korean students in front. Why do you think that is the case?
Shan: I think that’s the case everywhere. Just like Ray, he went to Korea how long? He was always sitting together with Canadian people.
J: Ray?
Shan: No, no, John, John.
J: Yeah, John.
Shan: Yeah, he is Canadian. As he was talking before, he went to Korea and studied there. But he is always sitting together with Canadian people. I think that’s the culture thing. People like to sit together with the people from the same culture.
J: Do you feel more comfortable with Chinese than Canadians or Koreans?
Shan: Of course. When you sit together, Chinese can talk in Chinese and they can understand each other. That’s why, I think that’s human nature. I mean whenever you can sit beside the person who can understand you and who have the same background.

For Shan, his less than perfect English does not seem to provide a fundamental reason for him to sit back with other Chinese students in class. He did so because he felt more comfortable with the Chinese students who share L1, L1 culture and ethnicity. Nevertheless, Shan is quick to point out that “he (John) was always sitting together with Canadian people”. Given that there was only one more student of European background other than John in class, Shan’s comment alludes to his view of authentic Canadians as being native speakers of English. What he really meant by his remark was thus that John prefers to sit with the students whose first language is English including those second generation Koreans. This interview excerpt once again supports that the primary language for informal interactions in the Korean language classroom was English.

Although Shan attributes sitting with other Chinese students in class to their shared culture, his interview remarks show that Chinese students’ insecurity as an ESL speaker is a primary reason for the construction of their little Chinese community in the back of the classroom.

The very marginalization of the Chinese international students is also easily witnessed in the classroom discourses. The following classroom excerpt is a classic example of the classroom discourses being frequently controlled by Korean Canadian students. On this particular day, the class was taking up the reading passage titled “happiness”. As a way of getting as many ideas about happiness as possible, I wrote the word “happiness” on the blackboard and got the class to brainstorm it, and jotted down whatever words the students said.

(March 8)

Dennis: Jane.
Ray: I didn’t say that. I don’t know // 자는거 [to sleep].
J: 자는거? 잘때? 잘때. OK, 그 다음, 산세, 행복. [To sleep? OK, next Shan, what can you think about happiness?].
Dennis: Going back to China.
Students: (Hissing and booing and laughing)
Dennis: Sorry, I mean //
Shan: // 집 [home].

When the class ran out of the associated words to “happiness”, I began to call out individuals’ names to seek more associated words. Dennis who always talks loud and makes jokes in class teasingly guesses an associated word for the student called out. When I asked Ray who has a girlfriend named Jane about his associated word for happiness, Dennis jokingly says “Jane”. Likewise, when I asked the same question to Shan, Dennis sarcastically says “Go back to China”.

Although Dennis came up with this guessed answer rather impulsively, the message that he brings out from this blurted phrase is strong and powerful; Shan who is perceived as FOB (fresh off the boat) should go back to China in order to lead a happy life. Dennis’s comment reflects the work of MaKay and Wong (1996) who argue that in multiethnic and multilingual schools, immigrant status and limited English proficiency are considered states of deficiency and backwardness. In the same fashion, Dennis’s word for Shan’s happiness invokes a type of colonialist discourse by which people believe that English speaking ability is not only associated with academic success but is also an indication of cognitive maturity and sophistication, and degree of “Canadianization”. Interesting is that this type of colonialist discourse is continuously sustained and supported by a certain number of immigrant population perceived to have gotten into the centre of the adopted speech community. Dennis is a 1.5er who came to Canada at the age of four and who was positioned to be FOB at the time of arrival. Growing up in an immigrant family, Dennis who would supposedly understand Shan’s situation better than the dominant group in Canada, becomes a dominant member himself who performs and utilizes colonialist discourses to other new comers in the society. Kibria’s (2002) study on second generation Korean Americans suggests that these second generations could become a group from
which to establish distance and at times even to blame when the FOB seemed to threaten their achievement of “American-ness”. From Kibria’s view, Dennis’ remarks in the classroom discourse above may reflect his insecurities about his affiliation and belonging as a racial and ethnic minority in Canada. For Dennis, Shan acts as a mirror, reflecting back an image of how others see him as “Asians” and “foreign” rather than how he sees himself.

### 3.3. Chapter Conclusion

In this chapter, I examined the centre discourses manifested in the curriculum, as well as in the instructor’s linguistic and teaching practices. For the curriculum, I examined the textbook and other visual teaching materials, and looked at how these teaching materials impart legitimate learnership to a certain group of students in the Korean language classroom. In regard to the instructor’s linguistic practices, my particular interest was to look at how language instruction that legitimizes the use of English can possibly benefit some students but disadvantage others. This finding is important as it will help to engender useful pedagogy where multilingual and multicultural language classroom is concerned.

As for the instructor’s teaching practices, I investigated resource sharing practices engaged in the whole group discussions as well as in pair/group work. My finding suggests that it is the Chinese international students that are primarily disadvantaged by the instructor’s particular resource sharing practices. Lastly, I examined ways in which the instructor manages the linguistic and cultural knowledge that Korean heritage language learners bring to the classroom as part of centre discourses. My finding shows that Korean heritage learners’ life trajectories and identities should be considered important in their heritage language development as they are inextricably intertwined.
What follows in the next chapter is to examine ways in which the students on the periphery cope with their marginal positions, and invest themselves into a certain aspect of Korean language in order to turn their marginal positions into their benefits.
Chapter IV: Discourses on the Periphery

In this chapter, I will examine the discourses on the periphery. I will first investigate how the students marginalized by centre discourses in the Korean language classroom cope with their marginality, and what aspects of Korean language they invest themselves into to turn their peripheral positions into their benefits. In the earlier chapter, my findings suggest that it is Chinese international students who get disadvantaged and marginalized by the centre group of the students and the centre pedagogy. As such, I will first examine who the Chinese international students are in the Korean language classroom, and what kind of strategies they utilize to deal with their peripheral positions. After discussing my Chinese international students, I will turn my attention to students of European backgrounds. Although they are not directly marginalized in the way my Chinese international students are, their racial and ethnic minority status unquestionably locates them on the periphery in the Korean language classroom. Therefore, my discussions with the students of European backgrounds will focus on ways in which their minority status is at play in the classroom, and why they invest themselves into learning Korean language.

4.0. Who are the Chinese International Students in the Korean Language Classroom?

The Chinese international students who occupy one third of my Korean 200 class are all from economically affluent families considered to be from upper-middle to high class in China. The group of Chinese international students serves a very important role in my study as they comprise a new clientele in the business of learning Korean language in the Canadian university context. In a way, the emergence of this new clientele in post-secondary Korean language classrooms reflects the impacts of transnationalism. Frequent movements across national borders produce a more diverse population within a globalizing and transnational community, and these transnational human movements challenge the monolingual norms of language learners in the Korean language classroom. I included four Chinese international students as
focal participants of my study. These students came to Canada with a student visa after finishing their high schools. Prior to entering UWO, they attended a private English school for about a year in Canada to study English and to take the credits that they need to get into a Canadian university (e.g. grade 12 English). Most of the Chinese focal participants passed a TOFEL test to enter the university in Canada. Ping is the only one who did not take a TOFEL because he attended the English program of one of UWO’s affiliated colleges, after which students can enter the affiliated college without any other requirements. After studying at the college for two years, Ping applied to transfer to the main campus simply because his average marks were higher than 60%. Although he succeeded in entering UWO, his English was obviously a major hurdle. Ping was not the only international student who suffered from the self-perceived lack of English skills. In fact, all my international focal participants perceived their lack of English skills as an obstacle to achieving academic success and to forming a broader social network.

Shan describes his university life as an international student as follows:

J: What was your experience as international students like?
Shan: I think to be an international student is quite hard. We need to consider our study, need to work hard on our school, need to find a job to finance our life. We don’t have many Canadian friends here.
J: Did you try to make friends with Canadians or was it your choice of not making friends?
Shan: It’s half and half. We don’t have time because we go to school and at the school, we need to work. And of course our language is not that good to make friends with Canadians. I think that’s the main two reasons.

While describing how hard the international students’ lives can be academically and financially, Shan expresses his wish to make Canadian friends. Nevertheless, such a wish does not come true due to his perceived lack of English proficiency. Shan’s status as an ESL speaker brought him another layer of what comprises his identities that he never had in China. How this new layer of identities functions for each international student may vary depending on their personalities, experiences, and English proficiency. Nevertheless, virtually all of my Chinese
focal participants found their less than perfect English as a negative force that holds them back, and narrows their social network. As Zhu’s (2005) study of Chinese immigrants' struggles to transform their capital to a Canadian context shows, my Chinese participants lost their linguistic and cultural capital as a Chinese language speaker when crossing the border from China to Canada. Instead, they were positioned as an incompetent speaker who cannot deliver themselves in English as efficiently as other Canadians who speak English as a first language. Interesting to note is that the construct of Canadians, for the Chinese international students, is more of a native speaker of English. In other words, unlike a 1.5 and second generation Korean students’ racialized perception of what it takes to be a Canadian, to these Chinese international students, the construct of Canadian is represented as a linguistically and culturally person assimilated to the English medium speech community. My Chinese international focal participants felt that although they speak and write English on a level sufficient to carry a conversation and to compose an academic paper, they are outcasts and strangers in Canada due to their unfamiliarity with Canadian culture not to mention the self-perceived lack of English communication skills. Canadian holidays are one of the examples that show their unfamiliarity of this Western culture. Ming states as follows:

Oct 9th is Western’s Thanksgiving Day. I usually don’t celebrate on that day even if I am staying in Canada because my family is not here and I still feel unfamiliar with Western’s festivals. I always feel myself like outsider in this country. Maybe I can’t get accustomed to live here or I innerly dislike living here. I don’t mean it’s a bad here. Just it’s not the place I belong to (written journal on October 17).

Her statement of being an outsider in Canada is deeply tied into her family’s absence in this new country. This is, in a way, directly related to the fact that Chinese holidays are after all family gatherings where all the extended family members get together, share the holiday foods and practice Chinese customs such as eating moon cakes and enjoying the full moon. Thus, Canadian holidays that she has to spend without her family’s presence only compound her
isolated and alienated feelings. The similar kind of alienation is also witnessed in Shan’s journal.

He writes:

Next Monday will be Thanksgiving day in Canada. I don’t know actually what kind of holiday the Thanksgiving day is, but I still feel good that school are close at that day. That’s the only reason I love Thanksgiving day. I hope one day in the future that all the countries share their own holidays together in the year. That must be a good news rather than a news than world is in a peace. Anyway, Happy Mid-Autumn Day and Thanksgiving day (written journal on October 17).

Shan still shows his isolated feelings as an international student by stating that he is not familiar with Canadian Thanksgiving day, and yet he turns his unfamiliarity into a positive force whereby he still feels good by not having to go to school. As a way of extending his positive thinking, he hopes that the world will celebrate the same holidays in the future so that he can participate in any speech community. This in turn shows Shan’s hopes for a globalized world where he can cross the borders without going through the feelings of uncertainty or isolation as he was at the time of writing this journal. However, when finishing his journal, he writes “Happy Mid-Autumn day” which is the nearest Chinese equivalent, suggesting that he still retains the Chinese identity on which his world is still based.

4.1. Strategies to Cope With Marginality

In Chapter III, I demonstrated that it is the Chinese international students largely marginalized by the centre discourses represented in the teacher’s speech, in the textbook and classroom interactions. They are positioned on the periphery because of their few resources about Korea and Korean language, because of the textbook’s assumed learnership, and because of their status as an ESL international student. Few Korean resources mean that those on the periphery are not seen to have proper cultural capital valued in the Korean language classroom and thus are likely to receive less attention from the teacher. The textbook’s assumed learnership considers those in the periphery as illegitimate learners of the language due to their non-Western backgrounds. Being ESL international students means that those on the periphery
are not perceived as confident and articulate speakers. To cope with their marginal status in a foreign language classroom, the Chinese international students utilize two different strategies; first is to remain silent in class, and second is to build a safe space where their agencies can be acted out in full motion. In this chapter, I will further discuss these two measures that the Chinese international students took to enact their agencies and perform their Chinese identities.

4.1.1. Silence

Having crossed a border between China and Canada, my Chinese international focal participants had to adapt themselves to a new speech community where their cultural capital as Chinese speakers is less valued and less appreciated. One shared experience while adapting to the new speech community is that the English language came as the biggest hurdle that the Chinese students had to deal with. In the interview, Ming states as follows:

J: So you said you became quieter since you came here. Why is that?
Ming: It’s so boring here. You can’t get into the Canadian people’s society. And almost spend your time at home or school. After class, just go back home and go to your room. So when you are used to this lifestyle, you will become like nothing to say, like you don’t like to talk to any people. You just stay in your room. And just playing with your computer, watch movie, drama, and talk with your friend in your country.
J: Have you tried to adapt to a Canadian society?
Ming: No.
J: Like joining the club / you also said you don’t like socializing with people.
Ming: I don’t know how to socialize with people so I am afraid of making friends here.
J: But do you desire?
Ming: Yes sure.
J: You want to have Canadian friends and want to know more about this culture.
Ming: Yes. Sure I want to, but because my English is not that good, so I don’t feel confident about making any Canadian friends.

This excerpt demonstrates Ming’s rather passive attitudes toward becoming a valued member of a new speech community. Once she finds a life in a new speech community rather boring and different, she quickly gives up being immersed into the new community, and purposefully presents herself as a silent person. What needs to be pointed out here is that Ming’s silence does not come from her lack of interest in acquiring a membership of the new speech community. As Ming states in the interview, her desire to belong has been always there, and yet her self
perceived lack of English proficiency and her confidence were too grand a problem for her to build a meaningful relationship with the members in the new speech community.

Unlike Ming’s silence primarily stemming from her self perceived lack of language skills and confidence, Yan’s silence rather shows her racialized views. She states in the interview as follows:

J: So how do you like your school life? It’s very different from Chinese school life
Yan: Yes. And because I didn’t have school life in China until University. Just compare the high school and the university here. (making a funny face) Because we are international students, I don’t think we talk to native students.
J: Did you try to talk to them?
Yan: No.
J: Why not?
Yan: Because the appearance is different. So when I meet a Canadian, he or she won’t talk to me then I won’t talk to him.
J: So you haven’t made any Canadian friends for your two years at Western?
Yan: Uhm. I think John. Most of them were born in China and grew up in Canada so they can speak Mandarin, Cantonese and English.
J: So most of your student friends are second generation Chinese?
Yan: Yes. Yes.
J: How did you get along with the second generation Chinese so well? Well I mean, you found some gaps with Canadian students but you got along with second generation Chinese students. Is there any reason?
Yan: But because the second generation can speak some Mandarin so we can communicate better than English. We communicated in Mandarin.
J: Oh so I guess you hang out with those second generation Chinese that speak fluent Mandarin. Is that correct?
Yan: (giggling) Yes.
J: Oh I see. Do you have second generation Chinese friends who don’t speak Mandarin and only speak English?
Yan: No.
J: Do you like the second generation Chinese friends?
Yan: Yes. They can speak two languages and they can speak well. I think it’s good.

Like my Korean Canadian participants in the earlier chapter, the excerpt above shows Yan’s unconscious internalization of equating Canadians with non-Asians, supposedly Whites. To her, legitimate Canadians are deemed as Whites who speak English as a first language. Because Canadians have a different appearance and speak a different language, Yan personally feels
more comfortable socializing with Chinese Canadian students who do not look too much different from her and also know how to speak Mandarin. Interactions with her Chinese Canadian peers enable Yan to be who she is and to perform her Chinese identity. However, she avoids the situation where her identity as an ESL international student is switched on due to her worries about dealing with people of different race with her second language, in this case English.

On a macro level, I would argue that Yan’s and Ming’s choice of silences is tied into the questions of linguistic and cultural capital that many researchers such as Monica Heller, Bonny Norton, Angel Lin and Tara Goldstein have placed at the centre of understanding a person’s language choices and desires. In discussing the relationship between choice of silence, identity, and political economy, I draw upon the economic metaphors found in the work of Pierre Bourdieu. Bourdieu has theorized that people make choices about what language to use in particular kinds of “markets”, which he defines as places where different kinds of resources or “capital” are distributed. Bourdieu sees markets as sites of struggle in which individuals seek to maintain or alter the distribution of the forms of capital specific to it. In the case of my Chinese participants, the struggle was over converting their cultural capitals in their home countries to a capital of similar market values in a Canadian university community. In order to maintain the forms of capital specific to a Canadian university community, they were well aware that they had to speak English like native speakers of English, and yet, they also fear that their English skills are not good enough to increase their capitals. Such awareness eventually made them choose to be silent with target language speakers. In other words, the silence of these Chinese students can be attributable to their fears that their English pronunciation and Chinese accent would be laughed at, which they think will decrease their linguistic capitals.

When analyzing the data, I found that my Chinese students’ silence has also prevailed in class throughout the classroom observation period. Although they were articulate about their
views and thoughts in their own right through a written journal or in an informal meeting with me, the Chinese students kept silent in a whole group discussion while sitting in the back of the classroom. If one takes a Korean language class as an economic market where certain capitals are more valued than others, the choice of silence by Chinese students can be their efforts not to decrease their linguistic capitals. As Ming and Yan put it earlier, the Chinese participants are not fluent in English; they are not “Canadians”; they do not possess “symbolic resources” pertaining to Korean language and culture. To speak under such conditions would have constituted “what Bourdieu (1977) calls heretical usage” (cit. in Norton 1995, p. 24). The Chinese students felt uncomfortable speaking up in class where their linguistic capital values are not the same as other Korean-Canadian students where Korean language is concerned, and where their linguistic capital values are not the same as other White Canadian students where English language is concerned.

4.1.2. The Safe House Styles of Negotiation

Although the Chinese students’ marginalization is obvious in the context of Korean language classroom, the Chinese students do not always concede to the power dynamics of the class. Borrowing Weedon’s (1987) subjectivity defined as “the conscious and unconscious thoughts and emotions of the individual, her sense of herself and her ways of understanding her relation to the world” (p. 32), Norton (1995) stresses three qualities of subjectivity to highlight the discursive construction of identity: “the multiple nature of subjectivity; subjectivity as a site of struggle; and subjectivity as changing over time” (p. 15). From this view, not only do language learners acquire multiple identities across places and contexts, but they also become active agents who use their target language as a means to position and reposition themselves (McKay and Wong, 1996; Pavlenko, 2001; Siegal, 1996). As active agents, the Chinese students in the Korean language class built a space where they could perform their Chinese identities in a safe manner and to increase their cultural capitals, thereby turning their marginal positions to
their benefits. As a means of constructing the safe space, the Chinese students resorted to the use of Mandarin when interacting with other Chinese students in class, and continuously developed and extended their interest in Korean popular cultures, to be specific, Korean soap operas and Korean popular songs. The use of Mandarin in Korean language class enabled them to build friendship with other Chinese students, which, I will discuss in the next section, will bring them academic success. Developing knowledge and interest in Korean soap operas, on the other hand, brought them the symbolic resources pertaining to Korean language and culture which will increase their cultural capital in the end.

4.1.2.1. The Use of Mandarin in Korean Language Class

The ESL learners’ choice of their first language over English has been previously examined in the studies by Heller (2001) and Goldstein (2003). Discussing Franco-Ontarian resistance to English through her ethnographic work, Heller argues that Francophone’s resistance to English symbolizes their efforts to create a Francophone space from which to more easily enter the Anglophone world. In a similar fashion, demonstrating Hong Kong born ESL speakers’ use of Cantonese in an English speaking Canadian high school, Goldstein interprets it as a way for them to create a Cantonese space from which they could move more easily into the Anglophone world in their school. Goldstein argues that the use of Cantonese by Hong Kong born Chinese students provides a path to gain membership in the Cantonese speaking community at the school, and that the membership is important to these Cantonese students in that it enables them to access to friendship and assistance which will help them achieve good marks in the course.

The Chinese students in my Korean language course show a similar pattern of their L1 use as Franco-Ontarians in Heller’s study or Cantonese students in Goldstein’s study. It is an every day practice that the Chinese students sit back in class, and talk to one another in Mandarin whenever the opportunity arises, from what I can tell, whether it is about the grammar
taken up in class, or about further clarifications about what other students or a teacher have said. Most of the time, they talk in quiet voices so that they would not interrupt the whole classroom discussion or a lecture going on at the time. I as a teacher often demanded that they share their discussion in Mandarin with the class, but most of the time, they told me their private talk regards nothing important. Ming talks about the English only policy that she had in her ESL class and compares it with her use of Mandarin in Korean class:

J: How did you like to study English in a Canadian college? Was it a difficult year for you? 
Ming: Yes, very difficult. When I was in that college, like it’s so weird when you speak you are speaking English with Chinese friends in classes in school because the school doesn’t allow the students to speak Chinese in school. It’s so, I feel so weird. Although we speak Chinese, but the teacher stop, you can’t speak Chinese you should speak English. And the teacher doesn’t allow us to use an electric dictionary in class. He just asked us to use a dictionary.

J: Do you think it would have been better if the teacher allowed you to speak Chinese in that school? 
Ming: I don’t know but I think it’s good for students to speak English in class if you have more chance to practice speaking English, but in a way, I felt very stressed…

J: about not being able to speak your own language? 
Ming: …Yah. Because sometimes you want to express something, but you can’t use your language, and also you don’t know how to use English to express it. You just feel upset.

J: Then, how did you like to use your own language in the Korean language class? 
Ming: I liked the Korean class because you (teacher) didn’t say anything about our use of Chinese. It would be weird to speak English or Korean with other Chinese students.

In the interview excerpt above, Ming compares her experience in an ESL class of the Canadian college where she studied English prior to entering the UWO with her experience in the Korean language class in terms of her L1 use. Although she admits that the English only policy in her ESL class may have been beneficial to her own English, she also expresses that she was feeling stressed by not being able to express herself freely in her L1. She liked the Korean language class because her L1 use was not restricted by her teacher or other classmates, and she could exchange resources in L1 with other Chinese students in class. In fact, my Chinese students’ use of Mandarin in my Korean class was never overtly criticized or penalized. Rather it was covertly acknowledged due to my personal teaching philosophy that L1 is beneficial in L2 learning. Because of this, the Chinese students’ marginalization in the Korean language classroom did not
directly come as a big hurdle that they have to cope with. Instead, many of my Chinese students
turn the Korean language classroom into a safe haven to perform their Chinese identities and to
exchange resources in their L1.

Following Heller and Goldstein, I understand my Chinese students’ use of Mandarin in
my Korean language classroom as a way of creating a space from which to more easily enter the
Korean-English bilingual world. By using Mandarin, the Chinese students acquire membership
in the Mandarin speaking community in the Korean language classroom. Such membership will
provide them with friendship with other Chinese students in class, which will eventually lead
them to academic assistance that they need to obtain good marks in the Korean language course.

In the earlier chapter, it was already discussed that the Chinese students feel more comfortable
working with other Chinese students who have similar linguistic and cultural backgrounds in the
Korean language class rather than working with the students of other ethnic groups. Ping and
Shan’s interview excerpt supports this:

J: Do you feel more comfortable with Chinese than Canadians or Koreans?
Shan: Of course. When you sit together, Chinese can talk in Chinese and they can
understand each other. That’s why. I think that’s human nature. I mean whenever
you can sit beside the person who can understand you and who have the same
background.
J: Is there any Chinese student who feels more close to you in our class?
Ping/Shan: Yan.
J: How come?
Ping: [She like] to help other people.
Shan: She is generous and she is kind.
J: Did she help you with your Korean?
Shan/Ping: Yeah yeah.
Shan: Yan teaches us Korean.
J: What about other Koreans? Do they ever help you with your Koreans?
Shan: We spend most time with Yan. We don’t have too much time with Koreans. They
help if they have a chance.
J: What about pair work? I usually pair the Chinese students with the Korean
students? Was it helpful?
Ping: I think, how do you say? I think they speak Korean very quickly so sometimes
their help is no useful. We can’t understand.
S: (laughing) very different levels.
Ping: Yeah yeah yeah.
As English was the primary language of instruction in the Korean language classroom, some of the grammar points introduced in class may have been too difficult for Ping and Shan for whom neither Korean nor English was especially strong. Having another Chinese friend, Yan, in class is very important to both Ping and Shan because a good Korean language learner like Yan can help them to learn difficult grammar points or sentence structures in their L1. In this regard, the use of Mandarin makes an academic path to success and to increase the cultural capital that they need to cope with marginalization as a group.

Having discussed the Chinese students’ L1 use as a way of coping with their marginal positions in the Korean language classroom, I will begin examining the Chinese students’ enthusiasm about Korean popular cultures, Korean dramas and popular songs in particular, as a way of building a safe place where they are able to construct more complex identities.

### 4.1.2.2. Female Students and Korean TV Dramas

According to the survey that I collect from my students as part of the class routine in the beginning of the school year (See Appendix B), the major purpose of my Chinese students’ learning Korean language is a functional and practical one, that is, to watch a Korean drama without Korean subtitles or to understand the lyrics of Korean pop songs. It should be noted that the Chinese students’ enthusiasm on Korean popular cultures differs from that of Korean students or Canadian students of European backgrounds in that the former’s investment in Korean language is primarily rooted in their fascination with Korean popular culture whereas the latter’s interest in Korean popular culture is just one of the many motivators to learn Korean language. Melissa, a second generation Chinese student who was born in Toronto talks about how much she likes to watch Korean dramas and how her fascination about Korean dramas motivated her to go to Korea and learn the language. Let us look at the following excerpt:

J: When did you start watching Korean dramas?
Melissa: Grade 9. My mom brought home 가을 동화 [Autumn Story]. I started to watch more and more.
J: Where did your mom go and rent dramas?
Melissa: It was a Chinese mall. It was big back then. For a while, it (Autumn Story) was really big, and then it went China HK area so all the Chinese people buy it and watch it. My mom enjoyed it so she kept buying more and more.

J: So there was your mom’s influence.
Melissa: Oh yeah. She still watches Korean dramas once in a while.

J: When did you go to Korea?
Melissa: In summer last year. After the first year.

J: Why did you choose to go to Korea?
Melissa: I went to travel. I was not really into Korea until university cause // I thought there was a Korean course, but I didn’t take it. I didn’t know if it fits into my program. But I was like I want to learn Korean now and I want to be really good at it. I wanted to learn another language. Cause back in high school, I wasn’t sure. I watched Korean dramas and I liked it a lot but it wasn’t like I didn’t meet enough Koreans I guess or it didn’t really influence me to learn the language yet. At that time I guess. Like really learn it. But after start watching more and more Korean dramas, I started falling in love with characters and country, like I wanted to visit all the scenes in the dramas. I wanted to travel as well and I thought Korean is a really good place. And then I searched on line. Later I thought going with a program and learning something is better than going by myself and not knowing. That’s why I joined the program to learn Korean.

Melissa’s investment in Korean language was initiated by watching the Korean drama titled “Autumn Story”. The Greater Toronto Area where Melissa grew up has one of the largest Chinese populations in North America so that one can easily get access to all sorts of Chinese commodities, as well as current popular culture from China or Hong Kong. The Korean drama “Autumn Story” aired in Korea in 2000 was very popular in Asian countries such as in China and Hong Kong when the phenomenon called “Korean Wave” (Hanryu) was still in progress. The term “Korean Wave” was coined by the Chinese mass media in 2001 responding to a rise in popularity of South Korean pop culture products and stars (Jang, 2004). It refers to the varied and uneven reception process of South Korean cultural/media products and images in Asia as well as particular forms of media and cultural representations in the transborder flows of South Korean popular culture (Lee, 2008). Starting with Korean drama “A Star in My Heart” in 1997, Hanryu’s popularity began to be detected in China, subsequently including various cultural genres: popular drama, music, film, games, etc. (Jang, 2004). The exporting of Korean pop culture reached new heights in 2004 with the “Winter Sonata” boom in Japan and subsequently
“Dae Jang Geum” (A Jewel in the Palace) became a hit in Hong Kong. The popularity of Korean dramas in parts of Asia does not only have a big impact on people in Asia regions, but also on overseas Asian populations attracting Chinese fans of Korean dramas such as Melissa and her mother in Canada.

Fascination with Korean dramas is also easily observed amongst the Chinese international students in Korean language class. Yan explains the reason why she became interested in learning the Korean language as is in the following:

J: So what was your experience like, having Korean friends in China? Were you close to them?
Yan: Not that close. If we meet each other, we will just say hi to each other. Or we can go out for dinner, or lunch.
J: So you picked up the Korean language from them?
Yan: No, I think the dramas and the songs and the T.V. shows make me REALLY REALLY like Korean.
J: Can you remember any phrases? Do you remember any of the phrases that you learned at that time?
Yan: Korean? Oh uhm, because they (Yan’s Korean friends) lent me some CDs from Korean singers, fashions. Maybe they live close to Korea, so they receive some knowledge, some fashion, some CDs from there. The first drama I saw was /겨울 연가 (Winter Sonata). Uh // 배용준 (Bae Young Jun) and 최지우 (Choi Jee Woo) were the main characters. This is the first drama I saw. It is really good and then I love Korean language and want to study Korean.

Yan’s interview excerpt shows how the “Korean Wave” had an impact on Chinese youths residing in China on a micro scale, in later years, on their investment in Korean language.

Owing to the Korean friends that Yan met in China, she was introduced to Korean dramas and pop songs, which later became a reason for her to study Korean language. The popularity of South Korean dramas in China is due both to South Korea's ways of packaging traditional values with modern aesthetics, and to its relatively close cultural affinity with China. Many Chinese find Korean dramas appealing because they present enduring Confucian-rooted values in their emphasis on family relations, love and filial piety while offering Chinese both a
reminder of what was lost during the Cultural Revolution and an example of an Asian country that has modernized and retained its traditions (*International Herald Tribune*, January 2, 2006).

Interestingly, Korean fashion is one of the reasons why Yan fell in love with Korea. Not only TV dramas or pop songs, Korean fashion that she was introduced by her Korean friends, but also the Korean actresses, singers and other celebrities in Korean TV shows were, to Yan, symbols of sophistication and prototypes of a beautiful and modern women that she wants to identify with in a socially and economically changing Chinese society. The image of Korean woman as beautiful, fashionable and modern has been redefining a beauty standard of many Chinese women, in some cases, causing them to look more like Korean women with a help of cosmetic surgery. Ming, one of the Chinese participants in my study, expresses her wish to go to Korea and have cosmetic surgery in order to fit into this imaginary of modern and beautiful women that she internalized through Korean dramas and TV shows. Ming writes in her written journal below:

Several days ago, I talked with my mother through phone and was told that my brother’s girlfriend went to Korea for doing the plastic surgery!!! I surprised for her action, actually she is a very pretty girl. I don’t know why she still feels unsatisfied with her looking. --- Although I decided to go to Korea for doing the plastic surgery many years ago, I am hesitant for that decision for a long time. I am a kind of person who has no confidence. I always consider my nose is too ugly and my face is too wide. --- It’s true that the beauty of your interior or your spirit is the most important. Nowadays, not all people but most of them will judge a person by his/her looking, especially when you are applying a job. --- I eagerly want to become more beautiful and confident, so I will probably go to Korea to do the plastic surgery after I graduating from university. It’s my long-standing dream. (Written journal on January 23)

Ming’s journal writing shows her desire to present herself better in this modern world where, in her opinion, one’s appearance is more and more important and in some cases can make a difference in a competitive job market. To respond to this modern society that puts more emphasis on one’s appearance, she wants to go to Korea and improve her look by having cosmetic surgery. Undoubtedly, behind her wish lies her imaginary of modern and beautiful
Korean women that she was continuously exposed to by watching Korean dramas and TV shows.

Here the term ‘modern’ needs to be examined further. Although it is true that the term “modern” has often been used as a code word for ‘Western’, Asians cannot emulate the practices of Western societies without considering their own needs. Ang (2004) argues that Asian idealized cultural modernity is associated with material affluence, consumerism, female emancipation and individualism. Lin and Tong’s (2008) study of Chinese women’s Korean drama consumption practices shows that the kind of ‘Asian modernity’ desired by Chinese women seems to be based on a hybridization of both modern and traditional values while representing a dream of alternative modernities that can embrace both modern and traditional values. Based on such a concept of “Asian Modernity”, it can be understandable that the imaginary of modern and beautiful women observed and projected through Korean dramas was absorbed by young Chinese women such as Ming and Yan, thereby redefining their beauty standards.

It is interesting to note that the investment in Korean popular cultures by Chinese students shows a certain gendered pattern. Whereas Chinese female students express their fascination with Korean dramas, pop songs or TV shows, Chinese male students prefer watching Korean action movies. Melissa, a second generation female Chinese student, talks about her fascination in Korean romantic comedies as follows:

**J:** What kind of American TV dramas do you enjoy watching?
**Melissa:** Oh, well, I like the show “Sex and The City”. I think it’s really funny it’really good. I like to watch that. But all other ones, Western dramas, I don’t watch any of them. “24”, “Prison Break”? All kinds of stuff, like survivors, Lost, I never saw any episodes of it. I don’t watch any of it. The only thing I see is the “Sex and the City”.

**J:** Do you think you like romantics?
**Melissa:** I like romantics. Dreaming me? Got the guy, loving the girl so much, girls don’t know what to do with other guys. I love watching that.

**J:** Like in the drama “Desperate Housewives”?
**Melissa:** No, I don’t watch it. I don’t watch any Western dramas at all.
J: So when you watch dramas, do you only watch romantic comedies?
Melissa: I usually watch a romantic comedy one. I haven’t watched the really serious one so I don’t know. Back then, it was really popular, girl dying, everyone is sad. Really sad melodramas. Back then, those were the popular ones so I watched them all the time. 천국의 계단 [Steps to the Heaven]. Those are so sad. 가을동화 [Autumn Story]. What was it? 겨울연가? [Winter Sonata]?
Those were all the sad ones in that period of time. And then you did 풀하우스 [Full House], which is a romantic comedy. And from then on, everything was a romantic comedy. I think I like a romantic comedy because it’s funny, it’s sweet, it’s dreamy. It’s sad, but not too sad, it’s not like sad that I stop crying //
J: Do you relate yourself to one of the characters in the drama?
Melissa: I don’t think I relate to them. I wish my life is like them. Some super guy, some hot looking guy likes me or something.

In line with Lin and Tong’s (2008) findings about Chinese women’s preference of Korean dramas to Western dramas, Melissa shows a preference for Korean dramas over Western dramas. The only Western drama she watches is “Sex and the City”, a romantic comedy about four young New York single women and their ever changing and confusing sex lives. What’s appealing about this show to Melissa is its imaginary of modern and liberal women and their love relationships, a similar feature that she finds interesting in Korean dramas. Interestingly, other Chinese participants in the study such as Ming and Yan do not enjoy watching any of the Western dramas, not to mention “Sex and the City” due to the drama’s characters’ overly liberated sex lives. However, for Melissa, “Sex and the City” is still appealing because she was born in Canada, and understands both Chinese and Western dating cultures. Nevertheless, she admits that she does not watch other Western dramas.

Lin and Tong (2008) argue that Chinese women’s preference for Korean dramas over Western dramas can be understood through the notion of qing, a Chinese word referring to compassion for family members, friends, spouses, colleagues and people of different relations. Many Chinese women appreciate the description of qing in Korean dramas which was not confined to heterosexual love but also extended to qing of a family, qing between friends, and qing between teacher and student, ‘Asian’ ways of expressing various kinds of relationships and
emotional attachments among the characters. In this regard, it is perfectly understandable why the South Korea's homegrown version of the American television show "Sex and the City," titled "The Marrying Type" about three single professional women in their 30s looking for love in Seoul became so popular in China that episodes were illegally downloaded or sold on pirated DVDs. In a way, the Korean drama “The Marrying Type” filters out all the alien elements that can be found in “Sex and the City” such as Western values, dating practices, making the drama more palatable to Chinese women who are yearning for qing.

Another important interpretive practice of drama audiences is personalization, that is, putting oneself in the drama scenario and identifying with the situation and characters (Baym, 2000). This process of identification or personalization implies a sense of fantasy that expresses the desire for fullness bridging the gap between reality and wish. (Hinderman, 1992). In the interview, Melissa states that the good looking male protagonists and the plots dealing with not so serious, love relationships are the primary reason why she enjoys watching Korean romantic comedies. By watching Korean romantic comedies, Melissa fantasizes about good looking male protagonists in the drama hitting on her, falling in love with her and pursuing her. Through this personalization process, Melissa bridges the gap between men in reality and her ideal male imaginaries embodied through Korean romantic comedies. As Lin and Tong’s study (2008) examines the Chinese female viewers’ personalization process in connection with the female characters in Korean dramas, I would argue that a similar personalization process also takes place with the male characters in the dramas. To put it another way, watching Korean dramas enables my Chinese female participants to embody some idealistic masculinities desired by them, and to constitute a kind of identifiable image of the male that they are longing for.

Here, it should be noted that the ideal male imaginaries that my Chinese participants envision are neither liberalized ones as seen in many Western TV dramas, nor are they the
dominant types that have been traditionally valued in East Asian countries where Confucian\textsuperscript{10} attitudes regarding women’s subordinate position to men have been deeply inscribed for a long period of time. It is true that the binary of women’s roles as domestic subordinates and men’s roles as leaders promoted by Confucian ideologies has been somewhat destabilized in the current East Asian societies, especially in urban, cosmopolitan Asian cities such as Hong Kong. But as Lin and Tong (2008) show in their study, the female Chinese participants simultaneously wish to recover the lost traditional feminine virtues in the female protagonists in Korean dramas. In other words, the female protagonists characterized as being attractive, soft, tender, humble, considerate, delicate and touching remind the modern Chinese women, whose identities are no longer dependent on or derivative of men’s identities, of what has been lost in the representation of modern Chinese women. The same applies to love relations. Many of the Chinese participants in Lin and Tong’s study described the female protagonists as ‘single-minded’, ‘faithful to love’, and ‘willing to sacrifice’ for their partners. They always put their lovers first and orient themselves to their male partners. In this regard, the female protagonists in the Korean TV dramas affirm the traditional femininities as well as the sentiments of qing that have been forgotten and lost amongst Chinese women and Chinese culture respectively.

To the modern Chinese women who move beyond the traditional division of labor and gender roles ascribed to them, but at the same time, who also wish to recover the traditional feminine virtues, male protagonists in the Korean TV dramas are a perfect fit for their ideal male imaginaries. Put it simply, they seem to fulfill the criteria of ‘good men’, who Fiske (1989) describes as caring, nurturing and sweet, rather feminized and unlikely to express their masculinity in direct action. Melissa talks about the qualities of the male protagonists in Korean romantic comedies as follows:

\footnote{Confucianism defines women’s social positions according to the submissive relationship with their male family members, the principle of ‘thrice Following’ – a woman should follow her father when young, her husband when married, and her son when old (Ko, 2004).}
J: Do you think you will date a Korean man one day?
Melissa: Who knows? Most Korean guys that I meet, they don’t really match the Korean guys in the dramas. I always imagined them to be.

J: Like 권상우 (Kwon Sang-Woo, one of famous male Korean actors)?
Melissa: Yah. 권상우 (Kwon Sang-woo) or someone like sweet. All the guys in Korean dramas are so sweet and caring, you know. But I haven’t met any Korean guy like that so I don’t know if Korean dramas are lying to me. Maybe, I am looking for too much. Asking for too much. Some of them try to be, but they don’t really // (laughing)

J: Do you like Korean men?
Melissa: I don’t know. If it is Korean, I will be listening to them more to see if they are real Korean drama kind of guys. But if not, then I am disappointed.

J: Do you think you have positive attitudes toward Korean men?
Melissa: Not all of them. Some of them. Some of them can be very rude and male chauvinistic like I am a guy and I am the powerful. I don’t like it. But it’s same for Chinese culture too. A lot of guys are like I am the male. I dominate you know.

As Melissa explained in the interview, sensitivity and sweetness observed in male characters in Korean dramas are the most appealing and attracting points to her and to her idealized male imagineries. Of course such male imaginaries are only alive and real in a fantasy world represented through the TV programs, but this is the key to the appeal of the dramas. Korean dramas offer channels where women can express their desires – desires for a pure society, for pure romance, for being pampered and loved by men. For Melissa, this can be seen as an escape from every day school environments. By constructing ideal male imaginaries through male protagonists in Korean dramas, Melissa constitutes an important imaginary space which provides an alternative to the Western modern male imaginary, and affirms the commitment to certain traditional values in a White dominant Canadian society.

In the same fashion, for my female Chinese participants, Korean TV dramas offers a safe space where their marginal status in the Korean language classroom is not questioned or ridiculed, and their true subjectivities can be performed and activitated in full motion. The act of watching Korean TV dramas enables them to be as Chinese as they wish to be, and also to create and re-create a social imaginary where they are able to fantasize about being pampered
and loved by a good looking male protagonist. Furthermore, the act of watching Korean TV dramas can be seen as enacting and performing their identities as modern, urban and globalized Chinese women who can judiciously accept relatively Westernized and urbanized life styles.

In relation to these Chinese international students’ marginality, I would argue that the fantasy world that they construct through Korean TV dramas can serve as ‘Safe Houses’, to use Canagarajah’s (2004) term. Canagarajah uses this term as synonymously with underlife in institutional contexts, as a site relatively free from surveillance, especially by authority figures because these are considered unofficial, off-task, or extrapedagogical. The fantasy worlds that my Chinese international students have built up through watching Korean TV dramas are, according to Canagarajah, ‘Safe Houses’ where they can construct more complex subjectivities and enact their agencies as Chinese modern and urban women.

4.1.2.3. Male Students and Korean Popular Culture

Interestingly, there is a certain gendered pattern in my Chinese students’ fascination with Korean popular culture. As I examined in the previous section, female Chinese students showed a deep enthusiasm about Korean TV dramas or Korean pop songs such as ballad or TV dramas’ soundtrack. On the contrary, my male Chinese students’ interests lie in Korean popular cultures that show political, social and cultural issues pertaining to Korea or between Korea and China.

Ping and Shan, the Chinese male participants in my study, express their interest in Korean popular culture as follows:

J: (to Shan) you said that you don’t like to watch Korean dramas (laughing)
Shan: No, Sometimes I have many friends who watch Korean dramas and they told me that one is very good. You can watch it. So I tried to watch some, but too long for me. I can’t wait for twenty four periods (episode, I think) of the dramas. But we watch some Korean movies like sueidao (in Chinese pronunciation) How do you say it? (to Ping)
Ping: I don’t know how to say it in English.
J: Is that a name of the Korean drama?
Shan: No, it’s a movie. Sueidao is talking about forty soldiers. They are forced to go to North Korea and kill the //
J: Oh, 실미도 (Silmi Island)11.
Shan/Ping: Yah 실미도 (Silmi Island).
J: So you are not really into love stories or romantic stories…
Shan: …Oh, no no. It’s nothing about culture. It’s a love story. It doesn’t make sense for us. Yah // For men, we don’t need to, I mean, pay more attention to romantic stories. For Ping and me, we just want to know Korean culture. So we have our own choice of Korean movies. We don’t watch romantic dramas. Just watch movies, the one you showed us, that was really good…
J: 축제 [Festival]?
Shan: …Yes. About the funeral. It was really good to know because we have the same thing, the similar thing in China. I mean Korea and China they almost have the same history period. We are moving together. That’s why we watch. Since now, many Korean companies they go to China many Korean people in China. I mean it’s better to know Korean culture how to communicate with those people. Probably in future, we will do some business with Korean people.
J: Do you see yourself getting a job where Korean is used?
Shan/Ping: Tour guide.
J: Huh?
Ping: In China, Korean tour guide makes big money.
J: Are there many Chinese who speak fluent Korean?
Shan/Ping: Not so many.
Shan: That’s why they make big money.
Ping: Just now not many Chinese people speak Korean.

First of all, Ping and Shan think that Korean dramas are too long to watch. They do not have enough patience to watch more than twenty episodes to follow the storyline. Second, plots of Korean TV dramas which most centre on love relationships or family matters are not appealing to them. Instead, they prefer Korean popular culture through which they are able to gain some knowledge about cultural, social and political issues pertaining to Korea. For these reasons, they enjoy watching movies dealing with traditional Korean cultural topics such as a funeral or Korean historical events such as Silmido. Historically, Korea has adopted many Chinese traditional customs and practices, and yet, over the years, the adopted customs have changed on their own in accordance with Korea’s strong Confucian movements during Cho-sun period. As a

11 Silmido is a 2003 South Korean film directed by Kang Woo-suk. It is loosely based on a military uprising from the island of Silmido in the 1970s. At the end of its run, the film was the most watched film ever in South Korea, and the first film to attract an audience of 10 million viewers in the country.
result, Korea has retained traditional Confucian customs and practices such as a funeral more closely as it was before than Chinese, and in my opinion, these traditional Confucian elements depicted in the Korean movie seem to be appealing to Ping and Shan.

As Ping and Shan stated in the interview, their investment in Korean language is functional and practical in that they wish to communicate with Korean people in the business setting. It is interesting that Ping and Shan see tour guiding as a profitable way to use Korean language skills. Due to the steady economic rise of Korean society, there have been growing transnational tourist flows from Korea, and China has been one of the popular tourist destinations due to its close proximity and many cultural remnants. To Ping and Shan who think that there are not many Chinese speaking fluent Korean in China, becoming a tour guide seems to be a good idea. This is a good indication of how the Chinese free economic market has shaped mentalities. Ping and Shan further state as follows:

J: What is your general impression about Korean people?
Ping: In China we just know Korean football.
Ping: Yes, soccer team. You know Korean soccer team is very strong. Korean people, how do you say? Same as Japanese people. Very love their country.
Shan: I think Korean people keep their tradition very well. Now in some field they are doing better than Chinese. First, traditional. Second, [very teamwork]. And their // (looking for words) their more, I don’t know how to say //
Ping: They are more comfortable by their culture
Shan: (agreeing) by their culture. Just like, I mean, to your country. They love their country so much. They see their country and themselves as one.
J: like collective national identity?
Shan: Yah, collective national identity.
J: Does China have that?
Ping: Some. Now China is an open market so lots of people want to make money. They don’t care about country or people.

The Korean soccer team that Ping and Shan got to know from the FIFA World Cup soccer symbolizes Korean national identity to many Koreans. During the World Cup, Koreans become one nation/country and cheer for their team. By contrast, China’s national team is the subject of embarrassment owing to poor international performance and ongoing scandals - Ping and Shan
are to a certain extent envious of Korea’s soccer success and despair about the perceived loss of a Chinese collective national identity.

Beyond seemingly different gendered patterns in approaching the Korean popular cultures, both male and female Chinese students construct their ideal social imaginary through Korean popular culture. The social imaginary that they construct by watching Korean TV dramas, movies or sports, serves a reminder of what was lost or forgotten by their rapidly changing society; for women, for example, the sentiment of qing and for men, traditional customs and collective national identity. Media representations about various Korean popular cultures satisfy the Chinese youths’ modern, global and urban needs portrayed as consumerism and materialism. At the same time, they are appealing to Chinese youths by demonstrating disappearing Chinese tradition and customs and their national identities.

4.2. Who are the Students of European Backgrounds in the Korean Language Classroom?

I had two students of European backgrounds in my Korean language class, both of whom continued from the beginning Korean class, and also participated in my study. John is a fourth year student, majoring in English. He was in Korea for three years before starting the university and plans to go back after his graduation. He is a London Ontario native English Canadian and a mature student at age 30. Ray is also a mature student at age 23. He is a French Canadian from Timmins, Ontario, and is an MA student in French linguistics at the University of Western Ontario.

These students’ positions are not as marginal as those of Chinese international students in the Korean language classroom as they are Canadian citizens, and their English is certainly better than Chinese international students. Timmins Ontario where Ray was growing up is a bilingual community in English and French. Although his family spoke French at home, and he went to the French schools for his elementary and high school education, he has had constant and regular contacts with English language through kids’ TV programs such as ‘Sesame Street’
as well as with English speaking people within the community. As such, his communicative skills in English are at a near native level, and yet, his written abilities are not. As a matter of fact, he was writing his MA thesis in French at the time of this study.

Although these students’ linguistic backgrounds do not come as an obstacle in the Korean language classroom where English and Korean languages are legitimised, their races certainly marked them as a minority. John states how he felt being in the Korean language classroom as follows:

J: Going back to our Korean class, how did you feel being a minority in the class?
John: I thought it was a joke more than anything. People joked about it. Me and Ray joked, you know, oh, White guys should stay together because we are minorities. But we didn’t really care. It really doesn’t matter, which I think it was good. I often had problems with minorities like I said before, when I worked at a grocery store, minorities didn’t speak English. I will be like uhhh / I don’t know what they are saying. But now, I understand it a lot more because it is hard. I didn’t have any problems with minorities in class.

Being ethnically and racially different from the rest of the class certainly signified John and Ray as minorities in the Korean language class, and yet, John mentions that he did not let his marginal status get in his way. Instead, the minority position provided John who has always been placed in a dominant group within a Canadian society with an opportunity to place himself in other minorities’ shoes. In other words, being in a minority position in the Korean language class enabled John to be more understanding toward minorities as well as their struggle with the language. Here, John is well aware that his mediocre Korean language proficiency, which is not superior to the rest of the other group of the students, obviously does not help to improve his marginal position in the Korean language class. Nevertheless, he strives not to be discouraged by his minimal Korean proficiency. In the interview, he further goes on to say:

J: So did you get along with everyone in class?
John: Yah. I think so // Another thing that has been always weird is because I’ve been there (Korea) and lived there, but most of them haven’t, so I know more about culture than they do, but then they know the language more. Like a lot of students they probably travelled there or something, but really they haven’t been there.
Here, John emphasizes the fact that he has been to Korea and lived there for several years while the other classmates have not been to the country. The hands on experience that he gained during his stay in Korea brought him solid working knowledge about the country and its culture, which, in his opinion, enables him to understand Korea, people and society in general better than the rest of the classmates. Although his classmates have better skills in the Korean language than he does, he supposes that his cultural and social knowledge about Korea is superior to his classmates’. Such a conceptualization, in a way, shows John’s will to refuse to stay in the marginal position in class. Instead, he becomes an active agent, and is actively performing his identity negotiation work by bringing out the symbolic resources (e.g. cultural knowledge) that he acquired in Korea and utilizing them to his benefit.

The symbolic resources that John is trying to turn to his own advantages in the Korean language classroom are not only limited to social or cultural knowledge about Korea or hands on experiences that he gained while staying in the country. John, indirectly and unconsciously, is very much conscious of the fact that he is a mature student and a lot older than other classmates. He states as follows:

J: What was it like for you to come back to university after three years in Korea? Did you feel any gaps because of your age?
John: Yah. A lot. I remember first year, people ahead of me are talking about getting a driver’s license and fake IDs to go to the bar, and for me, that was seven years earlier you know. Because I did travel, like after Korea, I travelled around the world too. I think that experience is a lot different than these kids. Even the university environment is not for me. I don’t like it. I’d rather be travelling or something like that. I am just here because I had to be.

In this interview excerpt, John differentiates himself from the younger classmates who just graduated from high school. In fact, he is not hesitant to call them kids. His position is that he has already moved beyond that “kids” stage, and that he has done all those things that these “kids” are currently interested in doing. Therefore, his current identity is a more mature, unique
and thus complex one, which, in turn, enables him to conceive of his minority status in conjunction with his more mature and therefore, unique self. In other words, John’s consciousness of his age helps to distance himself from other classmates, and by so doing, his marginal position in class does not come as a serious obstacle as it should have when he was not a more mature and older student. This positioning based on one’s age is also observed in Ray, another student of European background in the Korean language classroom. Let us look at the following interview excerpt:

J: Did you hang out with Korean students in class?
Ray: Not really. I tried. We watched a lot of Korean shows and movies and stuff, and I’ve tried hanging out with Dennis and Sam and the guys from Korean classes. I think they’re cool guys but unfortunately, I don’t. I wish I did. I get along with them well, especially Dennis. But I don’t really (?)
J: It’s not that you have a language problem with them because you speak English with them.
Ray: Yeah, even though we speak English, I think there’s a little bond between us, I feel from my point of view because I’ve met them through Korean class. I’m half inside, I have a foot on inside and the other in outside. Not a complete outsider, but I’m not a Korean, so I feel so awkward hanging out with them. I feel as though Koreans are very community and it takes a lot for an outsider to come in and really feel like they’re included. So with them, I feel as though given a fact that they’re grown up here, being in Korean class, we can relate in certain ways, and I’ve hung out with Daniel outside of class, we’ve had drinks, talked about school, and so on. I’m just so much older than them too. I am also in graduate school, so it changes as well.

Toward the end of the excerpt, Ray talks about his older age as well as a graduate student status, two of which are primary sources for him to distant himself from the rest of the classmates. Put it simply, such a positioning enables Ray to conceptualize that his distance from the other classmates do not simply stem from his race, ethnicity or language barriers, but are also due to his older, more mature self and thus his more complex identities. John and Ray’s identity conception based on their older ages allows us to depict them not just as passive language learners who concede to their classmates’ power as legitimate speakers of Korean, racially, ethnically or linguistically, but as active agents who successfully turn their relations
with the classmates to their own advantages as was the case in the ESL participants in Norton Peirce’s study (1995) on five female immigrants in Canada.

Unlike the similar conceptions about being a minority in relation to one’s age, the interview excerpt above demonstrates that Ray’s understanding about being in a minority position in the Korean language class differs from John’s. In Ray’s conception of a dominant group in the Korean language class obviously lie in Korean students. His perceived close ties amongst the Korean students make an invisible boundary that sets him aside as an outsider. However, as is observed in his statement of “I have a foot on inside and the other in outside”, he simultaneously feels that he is not a complete outsider either in a Korean circle due to his knowledge and resources gained through the formal language learning in Korean classes over the two years. Moreover, his Korean girlfriend provided him with an opportunity to have closer connections with Korea, Korean language and people although he has never made a trip to Korea. As a result, the Korean resources obtained through the Korean language courses as well as through his Korean girlfriend grant Ray, what he calls, a half insider status in the Korean language class. The Korean resources that Ray equipped himself with also impart Ray a new dimension of his identities that differentiate himself from other racially White Canadians who do not have any connections to or resources about Korea. However, Ray’s half insider position does not help him to become a legitimate insider within the Korean community because of his racial, ethnic, and linguistic positions. Such a realization often came to him as a source for frustration.

Having examined the marginal positions of these students of European backgrounds in the Korean language classroom, I will begin discussing their investments in the Korean language in the next section. Although their investments in the Korean language will not be analyzed as their strategies to cope with their marginal status as was the case with my Chinese participants, their investments in the Korean language are strongly tied with their aspiration for
the insider status as well as for the legitimate membership within the Korean community. In the case of John, going to Korea to teach English language provided him with the initial impetus to invest himself in the business of learning Korean language. In the case of Ray, having a Korean girlfriend prompted him to learn Korean language and culture. Outwardly, their investments are rather sporadic, stemming from unrelated sources. Nevertheless, their investments in the language share common characteristics in that they are by-products of global cultural flows and transnationalism between Korea and Canada. In the next section, I will discuss what I mean by “by-products of global cultural flows and transnationalism” more in detail in connection with my participants’ investments in the Korean language as well as the symbolic resources that they achieve by learning the language.

4.3. Investments in the Korean Language

4.3.1. Trip to Korea

As is clear from the interview excerpt below, John’s primary investment in the business of learning Korean language is to go back to Korea in order to teach English language. Prior to his university studies, he taught English in Korea for three years, during which time he taught himself a survival Korean. He picked up some slang words from his students and got to know Hangul (the Korean alphabets), but he never studied Korean in a formal educational setting. When John came to take my beginning Korean in 2003, he had a rudimentary level of Korean language, mostly spoken. John describes his investment in learning Korean language as follows:

J: What is your biggest investment in learning Korean? What’s the motivation?
John: Because I actually wanted to speak when I go back. I could have done that in my first, second and third year in Korea too. I kept trying to learn it. I think it’s because I knew the people came to Canada they didn’t speak any English. I hated it. So when I go there, I am living in Korea, and I should at least try to learn the language. At least some. People who go there and don’t learn anything, it’s kind of waste. You know, why would you go there, just watch American movies, and eat fast foods, and go to TGI Friday all the time and why would do you that in another country? It’s just part of learning about Korea.
This interview excerpt shows John’s desire to communicate with and understand Koreans better when he goes back to Korea. He also wishes to learn the language because he personally does not like those immigrants in Canada who are ignorant of either of the official languages in Canada. At the time of this interview, John was in the fourth year with English major, and was struggling to graduate due to his low averages. He did not enjoy his university life or a Canadian life for that matter. As a matter of fact, the only reason why he was staying in the university, according to him, is to get a Bachelor’s degree and to go back to teach English in Korea.\textsuperscript{12}

Interestingly, during the interview, I found that he had very little knowledge about what kind of country Korea was prior to his transnational trip to Korea. He states in an interview as follows:

\begin{itemize}
  \item J: Did you know anything about Korea before going there?
  \item John: The only thing, really the only thing that I knew up until I was going to Korea is MASH on TV. That was all. That’s all I knew.
  \item J: When did you start watching it?
  \item John: MASH was on when I was born. It was starting on TV. With my family, we ate dinner, we always eat dinner in a rec room. We have a finished rec room. And TV was there. And MASH was on during dinner time. So I would have been in elementary school. I don’t know ten years old maybe. I loved it. I have all the movies, programs on DVD, every season.
  \item J: What did you like about the show?
  \item John: I don’t know. It’s different. It’s funny.
  \item J: So the image that you had about Korea was more like a war stricken poor country?
  \item John: Yah. Like my first year I taught in Mokpo (a town located in South West of Korea), I honestly thought that there will be all dirty roads. I honestly thought that. So I decide to go on internet and it’s going to be a little surprise. I was surprised. I don’t know why I thought that.
\end{itemize}

John who was born in the 70s grew up as a consumer of the TV series MASH which portrayed a team of doctors and support staff stationed at the Mobile Army Surgical Hospital in Uijeongbu, South Korea during the Korean war. The social imaginary about Korea that has dominated

\footnote{12 The Korean government made it a rule that foreign English teachers should have a Bachelor’s degree in order to teach English at all levels. This is in part due to improve the quality of English education and also to get rid of an incident of uneducated foreign labor workers happening to be employed as an English teacher (The National Assembly of The Republic of Korea, 2009).}
John’s mind prior to his first visit, therefore, was a war torn and poverty stricken country as depicted in MASH. This interview excerpt demonstrates that travel was a breakthrough experience that changed John’s life while equipping him with new lens through which to observe and evaluate the world around him. The internet, viewed as the most distinctive feature of the current phrase of globalization (Kumaravadivelu, 2008) also enabled him to understand social and cultural representations of the country Korea, moving away from the social imaginary portrayed through the TV series.

While living in Korea for three years, one year in Mokpo, two years in Seoul, John remained open-minded toward Korean culture and people and adapted to Korea in a number of ways. He states in the interview as follows:

J: When you went to Korea, did you have to adopt some kind of male roles expected of Korean men?
John: You mean like fit in more like Korean men?
J: Yes.
John: I think I changed myself more like Korean. You know how you give things with two hands, hold things with two hands, you pour the bottle for your boss or whatever.
J: You turn yourself away when you are drinking with your boss.
John: (Smiling) yeah. I think I did that too much. But you know things like that. Just doing what they will do, I will do. But at the same time, I would still be different in a way. Still be Canadian obviously so certain things like I said, if you see something bad happening between man and woman, in Canada man will do something whereas in Korea, you let them solve their own problems. Generally I adopted to be more Korean not just man.
J: So was it difficult to change yourself more like Korean?
John: Not really. Once you get into a group of things, it’s fine, I guess. Just there is a lot to remember. Like I said, some people don’t even care, Westerners don’t care. But because I went to Mokpo first, people there the Westerners there try to adapt more than Westerners in Seoul will do because in Mokpo you don’t really have a choice. You know you can’t really go out and meet foreigners all the time. You can never go to a place like Koreans, and things are not adapted to foreign presence. In Seoul, you can go to a bar all the time and you don’t have to say a word in Korean because everyone speaks English even Koreans do whereas in Mokpo you have to adapt (XX).

In this interview excerpt, John explains that one year living in a mid-sized town located in the South West of Korea forced him to adapt to the local culture to a certain extent in order to survive or to have a social life. On the contrary, in Seoul John did not even feel the need to
speak or behave Korean since Seoulites have already had massive exposure to Western culture and commodities, and had more frequent interactions with Westerners and access to Western media – especially Hollywood movies.

Nevertheless, even though Koreans in Seoul are able to accommodate Westerners’ needs, tastes or desires relatively better than local Koreans in a place like Mokpo, there is also a heightened animosity toward Americans in Seoul. John further goes on to say:

J: What do you think about Korean people in general?
John: Surprisingly, some of them are really closed into foreigners. Some people really like foreigners. See in Seoul, people are more closed off. I think they are more experienced with foreigners and probably more negative experiences especially from soldiers. American military being there. That was one of the biggest problems that I didn’t like because Koreans generally put all the White people as Americans. Like especially with my haircut, I kind of do have an American soldier’s haircut. So often I was mistaken as a soldier. People tell me F-off like middle school girls or high school girls. Like group of them like a subway station, I remember they yelled at me so I got a Canadian flag and put it on all my bags. And I was like Canadians (with hand gesture). And then they were fine. But at the same time, I understand why they hate them. Like Canadians don’t really like Americans either. So I can understand why. But they shouldn’t lump all the foreigners together quite so much. It’s kind of like Canadians calling you Chinese or Japanese. You probably don’t like it too much.

Anti-American movements or attitudes have been present in Korean society since the American government decided to establish American army bases throughout South Korea (Robertson, 2003). John was in Korea between 2000 and 2003 when anti-American movements peaked after two U.S soldiers accidentally ran over two schoolgirls with a tank north of Seoul in 2002. In the aftermath some restaurants refused service to Americans, thousands of Koreans staged protests against American soldiers, and some elements of the Korean media suggested that the girl's death was no accident. At the heart of such anti-American movements John was positioned as an American soldier, being racially White and having a short army haircut.

Robertson (2003) argues that such anti-American movements are due in part to perceived threats to a national identity weakened by reliance on an external power. As I mentioned earlier, if there is a certain extent of cultural homogenization occurring in urban areas
such as Seoul by the flows of Western commodities and media, I would argue that some kind of cultural heterogenization is also taking place in which local cultural identities are being strengthened in response to the threat to Korean national identity. This is a good example of sociologist Roland Robertson’s theory of the impact of globalization on culture in that both homogenization and heterogenization are taking place at the same time, plunging the world in a creative as well as chaotic tension that results in “glocalization” where the global is localized and the local is globalized (Kumaravadivelu, 2008). “Glocalization” is a two-way process in which cultures in contact shape and reshape each other directly or indirectly as the global is brought in conjunction with the local, and the local is modified to accommodate the global (Kumaravadivelu, 2008). Caught in the midst of glocalization, John benefits from commodities and accommodation available for Westerners in Seoul, and yet, he is also viewed as a threat to many Korean locals.

In Seoul John could access the byproducts of Western society (e.g. Macdonald, Starbucks), and enjoyed a fast paced city life imbued with the fancy technology tools. But on the other hand he was distanced from indiginous practices and customs. John’s next interview excerpt demonstrates that his understanding of Korean culture and people has changed due to the effects of globalization:

J: What are the differences between Korean-ness in our class and Korean-ness that you experienced in Korea?
John: I think in Korean class, things that I never see though. Like funerals, I have never seen it in Korea // I think it’s a lot different. It’s almost like somebody’s point of view rather than what you might have noticed when you are actually there. Experiencing it is a little bit different.
J: But traditionally that’s how we had a funeral.
John: Traditionally, but what about now?
J: But isn’t it still nice to know what the funeral was like in the old days?
John: See I always wondered though if it was actually true. It’s so bizarre. Jut the way that they made it though. I found out a lot of movies, though, they are trying to almost overdo it. So it doesn’t look real. You know it just doesn’t look serious enough // But once again, I really don’t know. I haven’t seen it in a real life because I think it’s a fake. It’s not serious enough.
J: Do you think they should have made it simpler to look real?
John: Oh, yah. They had all these people coming. They had drunk business men. They had a singer who passed out, and couldn’t sing. You know they had people who were gambling and drinking.

J: But I think basic things in the funeral like drinking, gambling have still carried on nowadays, but the days of funeral, or procedures got simpler.

John: See, that’s kind of my ideal of what Korea is. I don’t think, to me that video just doesn’t seem like Korea. I think that’s because just observing so many funerals in Canada I always think it’s all serious, sad and solemn. So I just assume that’s the way it should everywhere else.

J: Isn’t that a Western notion of funeral though?

John: Yah, that’s why I think if it is real or not. The way it’s done in that movie. So it’s almost my view of how it might be. Like I can see all of them gathering together, families and friends, foods, drinking. I can see all of that but it seemed to be overdone and if they actually gambled or if the singer actually gets drunk because he plays an important part. Then he gets drunk and passed out.

In this interview excerpt, John frankly expresses his opinions about the Korean movie “Festival” that we watched in our Korean class. This movie, directed by one of the acclaimed Korean directors, Im Kwon-Taek in 2006, depicts family relations and conflicts revolving around a grandmother’s funeral taking place in a small Korean town. The funeral portrayed in the movie is very traditional in the sense that it follows all the funeral rules and customs and despite some exaggerations all the procedures performed in the film are representative of actual Korean customs.

However, to John, the traditional and localized funeral culture depicted in the Korean movie is rather unreal and thus, seems to reflect a particular group’s point of view rather than reality. John who has observed and experienced the process of globalization within the Korean society is no longer able to conceive of traditional and localized Korean culture as an appropriate representation of a Korean society or culture. If John had never traveled to Korea, he likely would not have questioned the film’s veracity, but having gained experience in Korea his observations of an ongoing process of cultural globalization within the Korean society have allowed him to conceive of Korea as socially and culturally globalized society that shares many commonalities with Western culture and societies. Having experienced globalization in Korea,
John’s view of a Korean funeral drew on his imaginary of Western funerals experienced as quiet, sad and solemn affairs.

After coming back to Canada from this transnational trip to Korea, John enrolled in a post-secondary Korean language course feeling that his experience with Korea would offer cultural resources and capital to do well in Korean class. Conversely, his investments into the Korean language would, in turn, lead him to have more successful transnational trip to Korea in the future. In the next section, I will explore the case of my other participant, Ray, and his investments into Korean language.

4.3.2. Korean Girlfriend

One of the key investments of my participants of European backgrounds in learning Korean language is their love interest in Korean women. John had previously been in relationships with Korean women but was not involved at the time of this research. Ray had a Korean girlfriend, Jane, whose relationship he considered as serious. He was learning Korean primarily because he wished to communicate with his girlfriend’s family members, and to better understand Jane’s culture. With regard to the reason why they were attracted to Korean women, Ray states as follows in the interview:

J:  Do you think that you were partially attracted to Jane because she is Korean?
Ray: I think Korean women in particular, I don’t know why I think Korean women are very good looking and very attractive and definitely it did attract me to her (X) By looking at (XX) We’ve watched movies and dramas and all that things and I know a lot of those actresses are very worked on, they’re very fake but at the same time in comparing Korean women with what I’ve seen to the other Asian cultures, I just found that Korean women are a lot prettier. Not the ones that I all met up but real Korean women, I think they are prettier than Japanese or Chinese or Philippinos.

In Ray’s personal opinion, Korean women are physically attractive, and in fact, he thinks that real Korean women he runs into in reality are indeed prettier than the Chinese or Japanese or Filipino counterparts. John shares Ray’s opinion about Korean women, but his reason for being attracted to Korean women goes beyond their physical appearance:
J: Would you say that having a Korean girlfriend would be one of the reasons why you learn Korean?
John: Yeah, for sure.
J: Why Korean? (laughing)
John: Honestly, I don’t know if it would matter too much if they are Korean or not. It never really has. I don’t know I think they are good looking, they are nice. They are a little bit different than Canadian girls because Canadian girls can be kind of sleazy at times. That’s not kind of what I like. I like somebody who’s more honesty, trustworthy something like that. You know a lot of girls in Western culture, they don’t care they go to a bar, meet a guy and go home. I don’t think that really happens in Korea. Obviously it does, but not nearly and nearly as much.
J: So you are more in the conservative side.
John: I think now I am. Maybe when I was younger, I was the same. I was partying who cares but now it’s a little bit different.
J: Because you are more mature?
John: Yes (with a mature voice, laughing). I think so. I am kind of beyond all of that, partying and stuff like that. But at the same time, while I am in Canada, and I know I am not going to stay here, I don’t really expect to meet anybody. I am careless. I am almost at a point where I don’t want to meet people, girls, because if I start liking somebody, I probably want to stay here. They are going to hold me back from traveling. I’d honestly rather travel.

As observed in this interview excerpt, as a mature and conservative 30 year old, John is looking for honesty and trustworthiness. In his opinion, such qualities are more often found amongst Korean women than Canadians who he perceives as sleazy at times. Besides this, his fondness for travel also keeps him from having a relationship with Canadian women since he is well aware that the relationship in Canada will hold him back from traveling.

The question now turns to what it meant for these participants to have a Korean girlfriend, and how their Korean girlfriends have shaped and reshaped who they are and how they view their world around them. Since John did not have a Korean girlfriend at the time of this research, I will explore these issues by examining Ray’s case.

Ray’s girlfriend, Jane, was a Canadian born second generation Korean. In the interview, Ray explains how Korean Jane is even though she was born in Canada, not only in performing Korean traditional women’s roles but also in her thought processing patterns. Ray talks about Jane as follows:
J: How traditional is Jane?
Ray: Well, the more I spend time with her and her family, so when she’s with me there’s a lot of things that she does and that I’m used to, and it’s not different but when she’s with her family it’s kind of different the way she acts with her family even when she acts with my family, it’s VERY different. She’s very family-oriented. I find that there’s a lot of this stereotypical Korean women roles in her, she likes to help out with all the cooking and dishes because she can’t just stand still while my mother’s doing something or while her mother’s doing something. She always has to be helping, she always has to be doing something, helping around house, she always has to be catering to someone or she always has to be doing something so that she doesn’t feel that she’s not giving in. She’s told me that daughter-in-law’s very important in Korean culture that if you’re daughter-in-law and your mother-in-law doesn’t like you then you have big problems.

This interview excerpt suggests that Jane possesses traditional qualities as a Korean woman, which she possibly learned through gender roles, customs and daily routines practiced and exercised within her Korean family. According to Ray, Jane’s priority is always on family. She performs Korean women’s duties very well around the household, helping her mother in the kitchen, and cleaning and such. Her behavior is very much Korean judging from the fact that there is a distinctive labor division based on gender within the Korean society; women as insiders and men as outsiders. Such a gender performance by Jane is not only restricted to her own parents’ house, but also extended to Ray’s parents’ house. Jane, whether unconsciously or consciously, performs a nice Korean daughter in law’s roles in Ray’s parents’ house, which she perceives important in establishing a good relationship with her future mother in law.

However, Jane’s gender role performance is not always imparting positive cultural and social influences to Ray. Jane has been especially keen about performing a nice daughter’s role that, more or less, meets her Korean parents’ rather conservative expectations of her. Ray’s story below portrays what it means to be a good daughter in a Korean family.

J: Korean parents don’t let their children be on their way till they get married.
Ray: And that’s another thing that’s very Korean in our relationship, even the fact that we’re staying together right now is very wrong. Her parents aren’t aware of it.
J: Really? How long have you been living together?
Ray: Just this one year. We lived apart last year and we lived together for two years before that in a house with six people.
J: So all those years, you’ve been hiding?
Ray: Yeah.
J: Really? And are you okay with it?
Ray: Well, it’s starting to get to me. We had to hide first few years that we’d been dating because of the fact that we were roommates and they’re aware of that we’re roommates. We couldn’t tell them we were dating. My parents knew it right away. They knew what my plans were they knew how I felt and they can’t really have a choice what I was doing because I pay for my own rent and they have no control over my decisions but hers is a little different. She still wants to please them. So we had to live apart for a year for us to be able to tell her parents that we’re actually dating and even after knowing for three years, it was a surprise to them that she was dating me because I’m not Korean and I’m not from inside of the community. And now we’ve moved back in together but they don’t know where I live. They just think I live in somewhere else. It’s frustrating for me because of the fact that we’ve been together for almost four, almost five years now and in her parents’ view, we’ve been only together for a year and half. So when it comes time for me to want to marry her, it might be too soon for her parents whereas my parents are accepting. They told me to marry this girl, you go ahead because she’s a great girl why not whereas for her parents it’s only been two years. I wish it could be open whereas my parents are a lot easier on this. But I’m willing to do that to be with her. It’s just a little thing that I have to sacrifice.

As my second generation Korean participant, Daniel, suffered from his Korean parents’ perspectives that their children’s lives are akin to their extended lives, and consequently his parents and Daniel had struggles over a lot of personal matters in Daniel’s life such as his university life or his White girlfriend, Ray suffers from Jane’s parents’ conservative expectations of their daughter, and from Jane’s role performance to meet their social imaginary of “nice daughter”. For several years, Jane has been hiding the fact that she has been living with her boyfriend because in Korean culture, living together is not normally accepted and legitimized by one’s parents unless there is some kind of pledge between boyfriend and girlfriend that they will eventually get married. Moreover, for a couple of years, Jane has been hiding the fact that she is dating Ray because she is well aware that her parents wanted her to find a decent partner within a Korean community. Although expressing a sense of frustration from Jane’s nice daughter role performance as well as from conservative expectations of her parents, Ray is still striving to look at the bright side. He is making efforts to accept Jane and her parents as who they are, and also to acknowledge and understand cultural and social
elements in Korean society that prompt Jane to perform traditional gender roles and that equipped her parents with rather conservative mindsets and values. This is also a fundamental reason behind Ray’s investments in Korean language.

Such a gender performance by Jane, interestingly, is in stark contrast to my second generation participant Daniel, who has rather cynical attitudes about performing traditional Korean male roles, examples of which being an academic success and thereafter becoming a financially capable breadwinner of one’s family. More permeable qualities of Korean women’s roles amongst female Korean Canadian second generations are quite interesting and may be interpreted as traditional Korean women’s roles being more appealing and accepting across different cultures than traditional Korean men’s roles. On the flip side, it means that Ray who is having a serious relationship with a Korean woman is expected to perform a successful man’s role by Jane’s family. Ray talks about Jane’s parents’ expectations of him as follows:

J: Do you see a marriage with Jane in the future?
Ray: Yeah, so I’m starting to think about my future, about being a police officer, where I’m going to be, where I’m going to live, where she’s going to be, if she going to live with me, then we have to get married. So it’s very complicated in that sense. For the last years, Jane’s parents have been asking me, “Are you going to go to the law school? “No, I’m going to do my masters.” “Okay.” And Jane told her parents I want to be a police officer. I get the same reaction by everyone when I tell them I want to be a police officer because of the fact that I don’t just want to be a police officer. So when Jane told her parents that I want to be a police officer they thought it was a step back. Everyone thinks what do you need a master’s if you want to be a police officer? But after explaining to them exactly what my desires are in life, I think that they don’t just see me as a being officer arresting drunk people on the street. They know that I’m not going to do that for the rest of my life that I want to go up and I want to do white collar crime stuff. So I still haven’t talked to them about it. It’d be interesting next time we talk how they’re going to bring it up. I’m kind of curious to know how they feel about it because they’re very big on education and having white collar job, being successful.

Like any other Korean parents, Jane’s parents think of good education as an important path to success. As such, they were pleased to hear that Jane’s White boyfriend is doing a master’s degree in French linguistics. However, when Ray expressed a desire to become a police officer after completing his degree, Jane’s parents were disappointed. If one recalls my second
generation Korean participant, Daniel’s earlier comment on his parents’ selective acknowledgment of jobs such as doctors, lawyers and teachers and nothing else, Jane’s parents’ frustration is very much understandable. As Ray stated in the interview, to Jane’s parents, police work is a blue collar occupation dealing with seemingly dangerous matters and criminals on a daily basis.

Although there is an obvious tension between Ray and Jane’s family, Ray is still striving to stay positive and willing to accommodate and to understand Korean male gender roles and societal expectation driven to men in Korea. The next interview excerpt where Ray describes his first meeting with Jane’s father demonstrates his efforts to unravel commonalities with this seemingly intimidating and aloof stereotypical Korean man. He describes his first meeting with Mr. Park as follows:

J: What was your first meeting with Jane’s Dad like?
Ray: It’s actually pretty funny because I went up to him and I went to him to shake his hands, “Hi, Mr. Park. I’m Ray and I’m Jane’s friend. And he looked at my hands and he looked in my eye and just walked away.
J: Really?
Ray: Yeah, and Jane said it’s not necessarily a personal thing. He does that to everyone until he likes them because he doesn’t like letting people in unless he likes them. But now he and I, through conversations with her uncles and cousins, I’ve realized that we have a lot of things in common. So it’s a little awkward not because he’s not supposed to like me but I think he does. I love golf just like him and I’ve done a lot of hunting and camping and fishing when I was a kid, I know a lot about it and I have a lot of experience and he loves it as well. So there’re a lot of things that we can talk about. But it’s never been to talk to each other because we’re not at that stage yet. With him, it’s a long process to get to know him but I know that once I get there, he’s going to be a great person. It’s funny because my father loves you until you do something stupid, and then he’ll hate you for the rest of your life whereas her father hates you until you’d be proven to him that you’re a nice person and he’ll love you for the rest of your life.

According to Ray’s description, Mr. Park is representative of a Korean father social imaginary that has been legitimized in a patriarchal and Confucian Korean society over the past years. Whether unconsciously or consciously, such a social imaginary has taught Korean men to be strong, resolute and determined where relationships are concerned. As a result, a lot of Korean
fathers have projected their images as strict, conservative and authoritarian. Obviously intimidates, Ray, at first, conceived of Mr. Park as one of the typical Korean fathers who is aloof, stern and unfriendly, and most of all, not accepting of his daughter’s White male friend. However, as time passes, Ray begins to recognize warmth, affection and amiability after he understands that Mr. Park requires time to build a relationship with people, a pattern that is thought to be typical amongst many Koreans. Furthermore, Ray notices that he has much in common with Mr. Park such as their shared interest in hunting, fishing and camping, which will serve as great topics for conversations when they establish a certain level of relationship. In the end, Ray positively expresses his own understandings about a Korean father imaginary making a comparison to his French Canadian father. He states as “It’s funny because my father loves you until you do something stupid, and then he’ll hate you for the rest of your life whereas her father hates you until you’d be proven to him that you’re a nice person and he’ll love you for the rest of your life”. Although he is aware that he cannot become a complete insider within a Korean community due to his ethnic, racial and linguistic backgrounds, this interview excerpt suggests that Ray’s general understandings about Korean people, culture and society are positively developing and proceeding forward, and he gets better connected to his girlfriend’s family.

In the next interview excerpt, Ray explains ways in which he nurtures and fertilizes Korean-ness growing in him whether it is concerned with Korean language or a Korean community. Let us look at the following excerpt:

**J:** You wrote in your journal, “Whether it’d be practicing as much possible with my 여자친구 [girlfriend] or 한국 사람 [Korean person] I meet to watch 한국영화 [Korean film] or 드라마 [drama] on TV with Jane, I feel more and more connected with my Korean-ness” (Written Journal, Jan 23, 07). What do you think you meant by Korean-ness in this context?

**Ray:** Well, I catch myself saying 아이구 [Oops] sometimes for no reason where in French, my initial reaction would be to say in French if I would fall, “Oh, God”. Instead, I say 아이구 [Oops] and I don’t even catching myself saying it.

**J:** Really?
Ray: Yeah, it’s just because Jane always says those things. So I just picked it up and I do some things without noticing it, like I’ll pick where is in Korean over other words in English when I talk to Jane just because it’s easier for me to say it. I don’t know why, it just makes more sense for me to say it. Or, we’ll interact and I try to use as much Korean as I can, every time I do, I just feel like there’s part of me that starting to understand and starting to feel Korean. It’s just the fact that I’m with Korean that there’s part of me that’s kind of with it, completely immersed in it. I feel that there’s a part of me that wouldn’t be there until I learn Korean or if I weren’t going out with Jane (X).

J: Do you act or think like Korean?
Ray: Sometimes. Yeah. Especially when I’m around with her family because I want to be accepted, I want to blend in with them. Even though it’s impossible for me to do it, at least I want to act like it, like calling her older cousins 형님 [older brother for males] just because I know that’s how it goes and it makes me feel more comfortable doing that. And to them, they appreciate it. And to me it makes me appreciate when she’s got an older cousin then say 형님 [older brother for males]. That’s cool. I appreciate that because I’m showing that they’re respected and they don’t expect it from me. I feel good that they appreciate that.

This interview excerpt demonstrates that Ray is deeply immersed in Korean language to the point where he blurts out Korean without being conscious of it. This, in a way, denotes his strong mental connections to Korean language, people and culture, and his Korean-ness that has been growing within himself owing to the Korean connections that he established through Jane and her family. Although he is well aware that he cannot fully belong to a Korean community, or become a Korean for that matter, he feels that there is part of him starting to feel like a Korean and to understand Korean culture. In other words, the Korean connections that he built through Korean people as well as Korean-ness that he has been nurturing from his Korean interactions or influences in his daily life all came together to construct another dimension of Ray’s identities while equipping him with another lens through which he is able to view the world around him. In the end of the interview, Ray, without any hesitancy, admits that his experience of learning Korean language as well as having a Korean girlfriend has changed his life forever, not to mention his identity. Moving beyond ethnic, racial and linguistic differences, Ray finally discovered his own way to better connect to Jane, Jane’s family and their localized family culture.
Surprisingly, Ray’s feeling of inclusion is not only limited to Jane’s family, but extended to an outside Korean world. Ray tells me a story about how he met up with a Korean man in Toronto as follows:

Ray: I went to a bachelor party on Friday in Toronto. We’re about 50 guys going around Toronto, going to different bars and there was a couple of Asian guys and I thought to myself that I’m pretty sure they’re Korean. So we started talking about soccer and he was talking about how much he was (someone’s) fan and how he only cheers for soccer team when they’re doing their hockey teams. He yelled at me 대한민국 [Republic of Korea] and I yelled him back, he looked at me, you know what? For the rest of the night he and I were hanging around we had a great time together and buying each other drinks, getting food and he was yelling at me in Korean, you know just having a great time. I feel /  
J: You feel connected to a Korean community?  
Ray: Yeah.

This interview excerpt demonstrates that Ray’s general understandings about Korean people, language and culture through his Korean connections became a stepping stone to establish further bonds with a complete stranger. Sharing a common interest in the World Cup soccer, Korean’s passion about the World Cup soccer, and the cheering songs for a Korean team, Ray and the Korean man in a bar were instantly able to build a bond and to become best friends for a night. Although racially, ethnically and linguistically different, Ray learned to connect himself with Korean people, culture and language, thereby acquiring more perspectives and thus, more complex identities.

Ray’s investments in Korean language do not seem related to transnationalism between Korea and Canada on the same level as John. However, considering that Jane’s family are immigrants in Canada, and that they brought Korean culture and language with them, Ray’s investments in Korean language can be seen as a by-product of Jane’s family’s transnational movement. If we consider a growing number of Korean immigrants or of goose families such as my 1.5 generation Korean participant, Jinwoo’s family, in Canada, the impacts of transnational
cultural, social and linguistic flows should be dealt with as an important subject for research in the disciplines where language education is concerned.

4.4. Chapter Conclusion

In this chapter, I examined the discourses on the periphery by looking at two different groups of students in the Korean language classroom; Chinese international students and the students of European origin. As their marginal positions stem from various sources including race, ethnicity or L1 status, their strategies to cope with their marginal positions vary; Chinese international students employed silence and their L1 to perform their identities apart from the centre group of students and from the centre discourses, whereas students of European backgrounds showed a tendency to ally with and identify themselves with second generation Korean students. My findings also demonstrate differences in the students’ investments into the Korean language; Chinese students invested themselves into Korean popular cultural products such as Korean soap operas, dramas, movies or fashion as a way of performing their identities and turning their marginal positions to their benefits, whereas the primary investments of my participants of European backgrounds into the Korean language depended deeply on their past or future transnational trips to Korea and their personal Korean social connections. Although these two groups of students invested into the Korean language with seemingly different reasons, their investments found a common perspective on globalization.
Chapter V: Korean Heritage Language Learners

5.0. Introduction

In this chapter, I will examine ways in which my Korean Canadian students construct their hyphenated identities and what it means for them to maintain and further develop Korean language in their bi/multilingual and bi/multicultural world. The rationale behind the investigation of Korean Canadian students’ identities is to form better understandings about their investments into learning Korean language and to link the question of identities with learners’ language learning practice. The issue of identity construction will be primarily explored in relation to my participants’ Korean family, Korean church, and the schools that they attended in Canada, from elementary to university. Based on a concrete understanding of how my Korean Canadian participants negotiate and construct their hyphenated identities, I will then begin my discussion about what brought these Korean Canadian students to the business of (re)learning Korean language as a heritage language, and what it means for them to maintain bi/multilingual in their bi/multilingual world.

My data include three 1.5ers, and one second generation Korean participant. The Korean 1.5 generation (ilchom ose) has been generally described as those who are bicultural and bilingual and who immigrated to the adopted country during their formative years (Cho, 2000; Danico, 2004). They are socialized in both Korean and Canadian cultures and consequently express both cultural values and beliefs. Nevertheless, the 1.5 Korean Canadians (hereafter 1.5ers) differ from the first and second generational groups in that they are Korean born children immigrants but are able to speak English with little or no accent. With regard to the level of bilingualism, Danico (2004) explains that it is contingent on such factors as “whether the child immigrant was raised in an ethnic community, the role of the family in sustaining the native
language at home, the relationships established with peers, and personal views about other Koreans” (p. 3). Although location and environment play a role in the level of bilingualism, teen immigrants are more likely to have difficulty passing as native born than child immigrants. Thus, the Korean Canadian 1.5 generation is conceptualized in this paper as those who immigrated with their family before teen years\textsuperscript{13}, have memories of Korea, and are consciously bilingual and bicultural.

Although three of the participants are identified as 1.5ers, their life trajectories differ from one another, thereby proving that 1.5 generations are a heterogeneous group shaped by their experiences, perceptions, values and geography. Dennis came to Canada when he was four. He feels more comfortable speaking English than Korean although he is capable of understanding conversations and reading paragraphs in Korean without too much trouble. Sohee came to Canada when she was in grade ten. Strictly speaking, moving to Canada in grade ten does not qualify her as 1.5er. However, because Sohee’s family moved to Paraguay when she was six, and she had most of her formal education in Paraguay, I decided to include her as 1.5er in my study. Sohee is trilingual across three speech communities; she is proficient in Spanish, Korean and English. Jinwoo came to Canada when he was ten. His family originally moved to New Zealand, but due to perceived racism present in that society, they decided to come to Canada. Jinwoo is fully bilingual in English and Korean.

My data also include one second generation Korean participant. Daniel was born in Glenco, Ontario but his family moved to London, Ontario when he was still young. Therefore, he received most of his public education in London. He has an adequate level of Korean, but as is often the case with second generations, his receptive and communicative skills in Korean

\footnote{While emphasizing unimportance of the minimum age in defining 1.5 generation due to more determinant factors such as an immediate surroundings and support system, Danico (2004) indicates the maximum age of 1.5 generation as 13 years old.}
language are better than written literacy skills such as reading or writing. Second generations differ from 1.5ers in that the former inherit all of the basic legal rights of being a “Canadian” ascribed from the birth, including the eligibility to vote at a civic, provincial and national level. For this reason, second generations have an inherent sense of hyphenated identities, and are likely to accept English language (French in some cases) and Canadian culture as primary, and Korean language and culture as secondary (Danico, 2004). More often than not, they cannot relate themselves to being immigrants as they were born in Canada, and thus have generational and cultural clashes with their first generation parents. Nevertheless, levels of bilingualism and biculturalism of second generation Korean Canadians vary depending on their perception, attitudes or other surrounding factors such as location, ethnic communities, gender, or geography.

5.1. Construction of Korean Canadian Identities

What I will investigate in this section is two fold; ways in which my Korean Canadian participants have constructed Korean-ness or Korean-Canadian-ness or Canadian-ness or other foreignness as part of their hyphenated identities, and how they negotiate their identities through a continuous self-identification. Discussion of identity construction will revolve around the three important locations; Korean family, Korean church, and Canadian elementary, high schools and universities that my participants attended, and are attending. Here, one may question the usefulness and relevance of this discussion when the focus of my research is to scrutinize 1.5 or second generation Korean Canadian students’ investments into their heritage language. With regard to this, I would like to make it clear that heritage language learners’ investments into their heritage language do not spring from one single incident and therefore, are not easily explicated and described from their performances or actions in class. Rather I believe that their investments are by-products of an ongoing and continued journey between self and their surroundings, and of
constant negotiations between self and the factors that shape their surroundings such as their past, present or future histories, experiences, desires, goals or perceptions (Canagarajah, 1999; Morgan, 1998; Norton Peirce, 1995; Pennycook, 2000). If many of the previous studies in Korean heritage language education have attempted to explain the question of investments from the single learning context, it is my intention that investments of heritage language learners would be better described with considerations of learners’ identities, histories, desires, goals or perceptions.

5.1.1. Korean Family

In this section, I will examine ways in which my Korean Canadian participants negotiate their identities in their Korean home by interacting with their family members. It is a common belief that the family plays a crucial role in shaping the identities of Korean 1.5 or second generation (Danico, 2004; Kibria, 2002; Lew, 2006; Min, 1995; Park, 2003). My Korean Canadian participants commonly identify themselves with the mainstream cultures of Canada, and simultaneously they are fully conscious of their Korean-ness and/or Korean Canadian-ness in varying situations. As children of first-generation immigrants, they are continually exposed to Korean influences from their families, while perceiving home as the primary place where their Korean identity is reinforced and maintained. All of them speak Korean with their family members, eat Korean food, watch Korean television, and read Korean books at home although in Daniel’s case, he responds to his parents mostly in English. Not only exercising Korean-ness through these daily practices and customs, my participants also agree that the passing of Korean values and traditions based on Confucian ideology is reinforced and sustained by their parents within their family. For example, according to Confucian ideology, there is a one-sided obedience of the child to the parents although parents and children have a mutual benevolence
(Kihl, 2005). The male child, unlike the female child who lives with her husband’s family after she marries, is expected to care and provide for the parents in their older years although many young Koreans in Korea currently do not live with their parents due to increased parental financial and emotional independence.

Through a series of interviews, I found that my 1.5 generation participants have preserved Korean values and thoughts based on Confucian ideology even though they grew up in an adopted country. Dennis, for example, declares a sense of filial piety toward his parents:

Dennis: My dad always jokes and says, ‘cause he’s spending a lot of money these days, and then he says “when you grow up, you’re supporting me and your mom”.
J: But you think it’s a joke?
Dennis: Yeah, they meant it – “You’re taking care of us.”
J: So you don’t mind living with them?
Dennis: No.
J: Are you close to them?
Dennis: Yeah. Well, I am not going to // after I marry, I am not going to be living with my parents. I’d probably nearby, but I am not going to live in a same house with them when I start a family.

As the oldest son in his family, Dennis cares about his parents’ well-beings when they are old, and likewise, his parents, whether consciously or unconsciously, also expect to be taken care of by their oldest child. Dennis expresses a sense of responsibility for his parents by stating that he will live near his parents even after his marriage, so that he can rush to his parents’ house to take care of any important business for them.

Unlike Dennis who absorbed Korean values passed down from his parents, Daniel, a second generation Korean Canadian participant, has very critical opinions about the Korean-ness facilitated and encouraged by his first generation Korean parents. The main source for his conflict with his parents is their emphasis on his education. An extraordinary passion for education among Korean immigrant parents has been documented by studies of Korean immigrant families as parents perceive education as a means of their children succeeding in the
mainstream society (Danico, 2004; Kibria, 2002; Lew, 2006; Min, 1995; Park, 2003). In the case of Daniel, he believes his father’s less than perfect career experience in Canada results from his father’s inadequate level of English, and this may have caused Daniel’s father to conceive of education as the main avenue for social mobility. In fact, Daniel’s father recently got laid off in the small engineering company that he has worked for the last 15 years. Daniel describes pressure to succeed academically and professionally as in the following:

J: Any pressure to be successful as a male child in your family?
Daniel: Oh yeah. For sure I know because I know that I have been taught in school that’s how Asian culture is. My Dad said like I only knew the five jobs in the world (counting it with his fingers) teacher, doctor, lawyer, dentist / Sometime, I don’t know what I want to do after I graduate because I don’t know any other jobs.

J: You mentioned in your journal that you are average compared to other Canadian friends, but in a Korean standard, you felt like you are a failure. Do you still feel that way?
Daniel: Yeah.

J: Because you don’t meet your parents’ expectation?
Daniel: Yeah definitely. Most Korean kids, normal kids do go to science right? I am not in science. I am writing an essay and stuff.

As Daniel expresses in this interview, he suffers from his parents’ high expectations. Although he feels that he is an average son and a decent student as compared to his mainstream Canadian friends, he feels that he is a failure in the Korean world because he has not met his parents’ expectations that he succeed academically and thereafter professionally. It is as though Daniel’s parents try to mold their son for their preconceived version of success by pushing him into a profession such as teacher, doctor, dentist or lawyer. Of course, as sensed in this interview excerpt, it seems that the more they realize that their only son may not fulfill their expectations, the more they get frustrated and disappointed.

Daniel entered university because his parents wanted him to even though he was not particularly motivated to pursue a university degree. He knew that he is not good at science or math, so he could not get into a science program to become a doctor or a dentist, the occupation which most Korean parents encourage their children to have because of its high salary and status.
Daniel chose to go into an engineering program but he dropped out of the university after six months. When his parents found out about it, they were furious and tried to hide the truth from their acquaintances, telling them their son was in Korea. Feeling too much conflict with his parents, Daniel decided to move out of his parents’ house. Given that Korean children usually stay with their parents until they get married unless they move to another city to go to college or to work, the news of their son moving out of their house compounded the conflicts between Daniel and his parents.

To make matters worse, the fact that Daniel has been dating a White girl, Lori, comprised another source of conflict between Daniel and his parents. In his journal, he writes about his relationship with Lori and his anger and frustration that he is going through as follows:

I met Lori at work and then one of my friend’s little sister is good friends with her --- The thing is that she has a child, which, I mean, I think it’s fine, no problem. And I really like them both. It’s just my parents. My dad hates that I’m spending too much time with a girl. Obviously he thinks I should concentrate on school only. He even wants me to quit my job --- There is no way I am only doing school. I can’t stand school. My mom used to ask me about girls, but now she hates that I am with Lori all the time. I think it’s because of Jay, her son. It pisses me off. I am not going to just leave someone I like just because she has a child. --- Anyway, an example of the cultural separation – expectations of school and relationships. I hate it so much. Maybe I said this before but if they wanted me to be Korean, they should have kept me there. Since they didn’t, they should try to be a little more reasonable. They don’t even know Lori. Haven’t even talked to her. Just ridiculous

(Written journal on February 20)

Depicted by Daniel as being conservative, Daniel’s parents felt that it is inappropriate for their young son to date a girl with a child to support. Daniel’s parents are worried that his son’s relationship will eventually lead to marriage, thereby keeping him from obtaining a university degree and having a successful career in mainstream Canadian society. Daniel is attributing conflicts with his parents to their Korean cultural expectations of school and relationship. It is after all his Korean parents who brought him to a society where norms and values differ from their homeland, but it is also his parents who continuously denounce the Canadian-ness that his
son has absorbed in the new adopted country. Danico (2004) points out that Korean immigrants who immigrated in the 70s and 80s are likely to retain more traditional values and thoughts as compared to Koreans residing in Korea because their Korean-ness is based on expressions of being Korean during that time period. Daniel describes his parents as follows:

J: Your parents still imparted Korean values to you, right?
Daniel: Yeah. But that doesn’t necessarily display things about Korea. You know like in class we saw a video like there was a city boy and a rural girl, right? They don’t see a city boy. They only see a rural girl. They think that most Koreans are like that. They don’t know. I see lots of things like how they taught.
J: So do you think that you are going through a lot of intergenerational conflicts because of their traditional values and thoughts?
Daniel: Is it intergenerational or cultural? I think it’s cultural. Even when we go back to Korea, my mom says she wouldn’t move to Korea because it’s so different now and she doesn’t feel right here. Because it changed. What they pictured is what they left // I definitely think that it’s a cultural aspect. Like my dad doesn’t say no to his mom or grandpa. Doesn’t say no he always says yes, right?

When Daniel’s parents left Korea in the early 70s, they brought a form of Korean-ness valued and legitimized in the 70s to their adopted country. Daniel’s parents want to impart a sense of Korean-ness from the 70’s to their children who were born, raised and thus retained a lot of Canadian-ness in them in their way of thinking and acting. Conflict between Korean parents and their Canadian born children seems inevitable. It is interesting to note that Daniel attributes the conflict with his parents as cultural rather than intergenerational. This in turn tends to accentuate the fact that the conflicts stem from Daniel’s parents’ long-established and fixed values and thoughts that they constructed from their own experiences in the pre 70’s Korea, rather than simply differences in age.

On the other hand, Dennis’s parents immigrated to Canada in the early 90s. They left their homeland after having tasted democracy, and benefited from economic growth in the late 80s and early 90s. Although Dennis thinks that his parents are fairly traditional, his parents are
also flexible in implementing their traditional values and belief. For this reason, there have been relatively few clashes between parents and children in Dennis’s family, and Dennis is reasonably positive about Korean-ness passing down from his parents. He talks about his parents as follows:

J: Then how traditional you think your parents are then?
Dennis: They are pretty traditional, Korean traditional, when it comes to family stuff, but they are a lot more open minded I guess. Before, when I was younger my dad wouldn’t let me put gel on my hair. Because he thought I’d be like – it’s wrong. And then I asked him – not even a year ago – how come you didn’t let me put gel on my hair. He didn’t know how to be a dad ’cause it was just the beginning. He wasn’t used to this culture. They lived in here for 15 years, so they kind of know now.

J: Uhm / I noticed you’ve got your ear pierced. What did they say?
Dennis: I told my dad I wanted to get my ear pierced, and he was like (XX). And got all [cross]. So I didn’t talk to my dad for a long time when I was younger. And my mom convinced my dad and he just let me do it so I just got it // I think a lot of Koreans, I think are – especially males – they’re really stubborn. You know what I mean? I know all my dad’s friends, they’re all so stubborn.

J: What do you mean by stubborn?
Dennis: If they are mad about one thing, especially with their kids, they’re always right. Korean parents, they’re always right. You can’t really argue with them; they’re always right. That’s their belief.

On immigrating to Canada, Dennis’s family had to adjust their understanding of what it means to be family, taking the Canadian family as a vantage point. As Dennis’s both parents are working at a convenient store, they had to adopt a new set of roles (e.g. working woman) and activities (e.g. attending a Korean church) to accommodate their life in Canada. As such, not only has Dennis’s mother’s role changed as a working woman, but Dennis also had to take on a role as interpreter or substitute household head for working parents. In order to make this new family system thrive, Dennis’s parents knew that they had to adjust their parental style or expectations. Although Dennis’ father remains traditional in many ways, he also learned how to be flexible under certain circumstances as Dennis states in the interview that his father gave in at the end, and acknowledged his son’s rather ‘Canadian’ way of ‘looking cool’.
Sohee’s parents also left their homeland around the same time as Dennis’s parents. Throughout their immigrant days both in Paraguay and Canada, they made frequent visits to Korea and maintained personal and social ties with Koreans, and also accessed Korean popular cultural products on a regular basis. All of these, whether it is a conscious or unconscious process, made a contribution to their understandings of what it means to be contemporary Korean immigrant family overseas, and also enabled them to engage in more flexible parental roles. In the interview, Sohee talks about her parental expectation as follows:

**J:** 한국부모님들 ‘사’자 직업 좋아하시지요? 사회학한다 그랬을때 벌 말씀 안하셨어요? [Many Korean parents prefer certain occupations such as lawyer or doctor. What was their response when you decided to study sociology?]

**Sohee:** 특별히 이렇게 되라고 제게 되라고 이런 말씀은 안 하시는데요. 그래도 mainstream에 가서 일하는 걸 원하시는 거 같아요. 항상. [They do not tell me what kind of occupations I should have, but it looks like that they want me to work in a mainstream].

**J:** Mainstream에서 일하는게 구체적으로 뭐지... [What do you mean by working in a mainstream?]

**Sohee:** ...왜 대학 졸업하고 부모님하고 같이 편의점을 운영하다든지 하는 사람 요즘 많잖아요. 그런걸로 나가지 않고 정당히 월급받으면서 캐나다에서 운영하는 회사라든지 이런데서 일하는 거 말이에요. [There are lots of young Koreans who work at a convenient store even after graduating from the university. As long as I don’t follow that path, and if I work in a Canadian company, they will be happy].

In a way, this excerpt implies that although Sohee is not subject to parental expectations, her parents still want her to succeed in a mainstream society. Sohee’s parents who run a Korean restaurant in Toronto are aware that doing business as an immigrant is not an easy job, requiring many working hours and heavy labor. As such, the imaginary construct of success that Sohee’s parents envision for their daughter is for Sohee to get a white-collar job. To meet her parental expectation of ‘success’, Sohee was actually studying for a test required to become a diplomat.

Jinwoo’s family is a so called “goose family”. The term emerged in the early 1990s when families in Korea began to send their grade school children to the United States and Canada for education and is derived from the nature of migrating birds that fly long distances and have a
special dedication to their youngsters (*The Asian Pacific Post*, November 3, 2004). The wives and mothers in the goose families fly periodically between Korea where their husbands live because of their jobs and the United States or Canada where their children are attending school.\(^\text{14}\)

Although Jinwoo is a landed immigrant, his father never gave up his career as a dentist in Korea, and because of that, Jinwoo had to migrate between Korea and Canada. His mom stayed with him and his older sister while they were attending elementary and high school in Canada, but now that both children go to the universities, Jinwoo’s mother is back in Korea with his father.

Jinwoo describes his parental expectations as follows:

\begin{tabular}{l}
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>J:</th>
<th>우리 한국전통사회에서는 부모님이 연세 많으실 때 보통 장남이 모시잖아요 \textit{[In traditional Korean society, the oldest male child usually lives with the aged parents].}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jinwoo:</td>
<td>아 저희 부모님은 그런거 별로 상관 안 하세요 \textit{[My parents do not care about that].}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J:</td>
<td>그럼, 부모님한테서 의사나 변호사가 되라는 어떤 압력이 있나요? \textit{[Are there any parental expectations to be a doctor or a lawyer?].}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jinwoo:</td>
<td>네, 있죠. 저희 아버지가 dentis 니까 그런 expectation 도 좀 있고, 그것 때문에 여기 온것 같고…. 근데 제가 아직 확실히 좋아하는 거를 몰라 갖고 지금 search 하는 중이에요 \textit{[Yes, there are. Since my dad is a dentist, they expect me to be the dentist. Probably this is why I came here to study... But I am not sure what I like and still searching it].}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J:</td>
<td>근데 지금은 부모님하고 얘기 할때는 의사소통에 단절같은 건 없나요? \textit{[Isn’t there any communication problem with your parents?].}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jinwoo:</td>
<td>예. 있어요 \textit{[Yes, I do].} 제가 next year 에는 일년 take off 하고 다른 나라 Australia 같은데 가서 일하면서 일년동안 제가 될 좋아하냐 찾아본다고 하니까 부모님이 굉장히 놀라서 가지 않고 많이 화내셨어요. 여기는 university 하다가 time off 한 다음에 하고 싶은 거 하고 돈도 벌고 다시 와 갔고</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
\end{tabular}

\(^{14}\) Currently, about 6,000 goose moms are reportedly making their second home in the United States, the majority of them in Southern California. Variations on ‘goose’ include ‘penguins’ (fathers who cannot fly, for financial reasons) and ‘eagles’ (fathers who can fly freely). Thousands more goose families are believed to be in Canada. In Canada, close to 40 per cent of the foreign student population, about 3,739 out of 9,800 foreign students (levels of education unspecified) is Korean (*The Asian Pacific Post*, 2004). According to the 2004 report by Citizenship Immigration in Canada, the South Korean students studying as an international student in Canadian post-secondary institutions amount to one sixth of international students in 2004, totaling 25, 204 out of 153, 638 international students.
Based on the excerpt above, Jinwoo’s parents appear to be flexible in terms of employing traditional Korean values such as the oldest son living with his aged parents. However, as it comes down to their children’s academic or professional success, their expectations are fairly rigid. High expectations of their children’s academic success are, in fact, shared qualities amongst “goose families” since the fundamental motive for their migration to North America is rooted in their aspiration for their children’s better education. As is the case in Jinwoo, children of “goose families” are well aware of their parental expectations for academic success, and in fact, they take it seriously because they are also fully aware that their parents’ economic and physical sacrifice for the sake of their education. In the case of Jinwoo, although he understands his parents’ sacrifices and expectations, sometimes he feels that his parents’ high expectations for academic success are a burden, especially when he is compared to his academically stronger older sister. In the interview, he talked about the clashes between Jinwoo and his parents, caused by his shifting ways of thinking or acting, which he perceives a norm in Canada, but a misfit in Korea. The physical separation that this “goose family” has between parents and children can compound the cultural clashes arising between them, thereby having a negative impact on their children’s hyphenated identities.

To sum up, my 1.5 and second generation Korean Canadian participants go through heterogeneous experience in their Korean family, and construct different understandings about what it means to be Korean family in Canada. Because the Korean society has transformed itself
dramatically due to the rapid changes in economy, politics, and traditions over the last couple of decades, a form of Korean family has evolved through different stages. As my discourse analysis suggests, child of immigrants who moved to Canada in the 70s goes through different understandings about belonging to a Korean family in Canada than the child of immigrants who moved in the 90s. Accordingly, a construct of Korean-ness being negotiated between children of immigrants and their parents in this immigrant family also vary depending on the period in which each family immigrated to Canada.

In the next section, I will investigate ways in which my Korean Canadian participants negotiate their identities by attending a Korean church and by interacting with church members. A Korean church in North America is a community based organization where the first generation Korean immigrants’ primary socialization takes place, and thus, 1.5 or second generation Koreans are exposed to first generations’ values or belief, not to mention Korean customs or traditions.

5.1.2. Korean Church

Korean churches form an environment where some 1.5 or second generation Korean Canadians nurture their Korean-ness and, consciously or unconsciously, equip themselves with certain aspects of Korean ideologies that Korean first generation immigrants facilitate. According to Min (1998), Korean churches are often central to the Korean immigrant community in the United States, and have been found to strengthen Korean ideologies in daily practices. The patriarchal Korean custom of women preparing food and serving it to men is commonplace in Korean church social gatherings. Often, the positions at the highest level in Korean church organization are more likely to be occupied by men than women. The 1.5 or second generation Korean youths attending the church observe these patriarchal gender roles and simulate them
into their daily lives. Sohee and Dennis who attended a Korean church since they had immigrated to a new country are not an exception. Sohee expresses her understandings about what it means to become a Korean girl at home as well as at the church. She states in the interview as follows:

Sohee:저는요. 남미에 살았으면서도 남미사회는 여자들이 traditional 하게 집에서 있는 사람들이 더 많거든요. 결혼도 일찍하고 아이도 더 많이 낳고 그런 분위기예요. 물론 일하는 친구들도 많지만, 근데 저같은 경우는 부모님이 한국분이시고 일세시니까요. 한국적인 여자애를 알게 모르게 말씀하시는 거 같아요. [In South America, there are lots of traditional women who stay home. A lot of women marry and have children when they are young. Of course I have some friends who work, but in my case, my parents are first generation Koreans and I think that they expect me to be 'Koreanized' girl' whether consciously or unconsciously].

J: 한국적인 여자애라면? [What does that mean by the 'Koreanized girl']?

Sohee: 한국적인 gender role 로 expectation 하셨던 거 같아요. 그래서 저도 알게 모르게 한국적인, 약간 보수적인 여성의 role 을 더 생각하는 거 같아요. 그래서 그런 curfew 같은 거도 항상 있었거든요. 그 다음에 뭐 여자니까 이런 거도 항상 알아 놓아야 돼 그런 거였겠죠. 일요일에 교회에서 event 가 있을 때 한국 아줌마들하고 저희 어머니가 부엌에서 음식을 하셨거든요. 그래서 저도 상 차리는 거 도와 드리고// 알게 모르게 여자가 하는 일들에 자연스러워 졌던 것 같아요. [It seems that they expected me to take Korean women’s roles. Therefore, I think of a little bit of conservative Korean women’s roles whether consciously or unconsciously. We always had a curfew. And they reminded me that I am a woman and thus I should know how to do this and that. Whenever we had a Sunday event at the church, all these 아줌마 (middle aged woman in Korean) and my mom worked in the kitchen making foods. I used to help them set the table, etc. Whether consciously or unconsciously, I am so used to the idea that I am Korean woman].

Here, Sohee explains her parents’ expectations of her as a Korean girl, including the need to keep the curfew and to help with the household work. By observing the traditional gender roles performed by her mother at home, and also by other Korean women at the church, Sohee learned little by little how to perform as a nice Korean girl. Such a role performance eventually came to her as something natural and innate to a Korean culture and tradition.
Sohee also had quite a positive view about the whole experience of attending the Korean church. She points out that the Korean church that she had attended in Paraguay played a major role in her maintenance of Korean language.

J: 한국말은 어떻게 계속 쓰게 됐어요? [How do you think that you maintained your Korean language?]
Soohe: 저희가 다니던 교회가 학생들이 교회 활동을 되게 많이 했는데요. 대부분이 온지 얼마 안 되는 친구들이 되게 많았어요. 해마다 새로운 친구들 (laughing) 그래서 같이 어울리다 보니까 따로 Spanish를 잘 하는 친구들이 없고 다 한국말을 잘 하니까 저도 같이 잘 하게 된 거 같아요. [The church that I attended came up with a lot of Korean food festivals or activities for youths. At that time, there were lots of Korean kids who just moved to Paraguay. I hung out with new Korean friends every year, and they were not good at speaking Spanish, and they spoke Korean with me. This is why I could maintain my Korean].

This interview excerpt shows that it is through the Korean church that Sohee was able to keep up with Korean customs and foods in her immigrant life. It is also through the church that she was also able to construct her Korean identity by socializing other Korean 1.5ers who have similar experiences as Sohee as a child of first generation Korean immigrant parents. By socializing with other 1.5 generation Korean children, Sohee could keep using and thus maintain the Korean language. Interestingly, Korean church also served as a place where Sohee was able to pick up the correct use of honorifics which Korean language requires the speaker to use with those older or of higher status. Sohee states in the interview:

Soohe: 모르겠어요. 제 친구중에는요 존칭어를 점점 못 쓰는 친구들도 있거든요. 한국친구들인데. 한국말을 잘해야. 잘하는데. 그러니까 어른들과의 접촉이 안어서 어떻게 쓰아되는지 모르는 친구들이 있어요. 그래서 존경어가 제일 힘들다고 하거든요. [I have friends who come to lose ability to use honorifics. They are Koreans and speak Korean very well, but they don’t know how to use honorifics because of lack of contacts with grown-ups. They say honorifics are the most difficult thing in Korean].

J: 보통 그렇죠 [I can understand].
Soohe: 근데 저는 한인교회를 다니서 그래서 어른들이 있어서 그런지 존칭어가 익숙하거든요. 근데 이제 나이차이가 많지 않을때 존칭어 쓰고 이런 식수를 하고 막 그랬던 거 같어요. [But I am so natural with the use of honorifics. I don’t know why. Maybe I attended a Korean church where I had many contacts with grown-ups. But my
problem was that I was often overusing honorifics, let’s say, to somebody who is not much older than me].

Honorifics is a unique feature in Korean language and usually considered to be excruciatingly difficult for any Korean language learners, not only because of their complex forms, but also because the speaker should take the age, status and social distance relationships with his/her interlocutor into account in order to utilize them correctly. For this reason, even a number of 1.5 or second generation Koreans have a hard time employing the correct use of honorifics. Moreover, incorrect use of honorifics entails awkwardness in the utterance without any grammatical or semantic errors. Therefore, many of the Korean parents do not make a big deal out of their children’s incorrect use of honorifics; they just appreciate the fact that their children are able to speak Korean. However, Sohee was different. By attending the Korean church, she had much interaction with Koreans of her parents’ age, which, in turn, generated ample opportunities for her to practice honorifics and thus, maintain their use.

Dennis’s experience with a Korean church was very similar to Sohee’s. His grandfather is a missionary, and since childhood going to church has been a salient part of his daily life. He talks about his church experience as follows:

J: Can you tell me more about your church experience?
Dennis: Yeah. When I was younger, I always looked up to 형 s [older brother] when I first moved to London, that was grade 4, all the 형 s were older than me. All the 형 s and 누나 s [older sister], we all used to hung around in church. They supported younger guys and now one of my 형 s, the one that Sohee likes, he’s the one that grew up with me. We always played ball together.

By socializing with other youths in the church, Dennis naturally learned to use the kinship terms, hyung for older males and nuna for older females in the same generation as him. Kinship terms
are one of the most salient features of Korean language, which signifies that Korean language is hierarchically stratified based on one’s age. By learning to locate himself in age related linear hierarchy system, Dennis became a legitimized member in the Korean church youth group, and at the same time, gained a sense of his Korean identity.

By contrast, Jinwoo’s experience with a Korean church was different from the other two 1.5 generation participants. Jinwoo talks about his church experiences as follows:

Jinwoo: 집안이 불교였는데 처음엔 교회에 몇 번 갔었어요. 근데 원래 불교 신자여서 그런지 부모님도 안 맞아 하시고 저도 별로여서 그 다음부터는 안 갔어요 [My family was originally Buddhists but we went to church a couple of times at first. But because our belief is Buddhism or what? My parents did not enjoy going to church, and neither did I so we stopped going to church].

J: 뭐가 제일 안맞았는데? [Why do you think you didn’t enjoy going to church?].

Jinwoo: 교회 사람들 중에 옛날에 이민 온 사람들이 많았는데 부모님도 그렇게 그런 사람들하고는 사고방식이나 모든게 조금씩 안 맞더라구요 [Lots of people at the church came to Canada a long time ago, and we thought that we did not have any shared ground with them, like ways of thinking, etc. were a bit different from ours].

J: 그럼 한국 사람들은 아예 안 만났어요? [Then, you didn’t meet any Koreans at all?].

Jinwoo: 그래도 어머님이 맨 처음 왔을때 몇명 한국 사람들 소개 받았어요. A few selective people들 같이 놀고 / 몇몇 친하신 분이랑 / [When my mom came here first, she got introduced to several Koreans, so we hung out with those people. A few close friends].

As described in the interview, when Jinwoo’s family first moved to Canada, they made an effort to attend a Korean church although Jinwoo’s family originally believed in Buddhism back in Korea. However, soon, their enthusiasm about attending a church began to wane as they began to notice implacable differences between those who immigrated to Canada a couple of decades ago and themselves. Those ‘old timers’ are the ones who organize church practices and events, and participate in all kinds of church activities as legitimate members. More often than not, these people are the preservers of Korean customs, values and ideologies that they brought to the new
country decades ago. These old immigrants had not benefited from the Korean economic growth in the late 80’s and 90’s, and when they came to this new country, they had to find their way with very little financial support.

By contrast, recent goose families like Jinwoo’s moved to Canada for completely different reasons, one of the primary reasons being their children’s education. Most of the goose families are financially well off enough to support their children’s education in Canada, experienced democratization in Korean society and politics, and tasted the effects of globalization as it permeated Korean life through media and technology. When the old immigrants and the goose families with very different social and cultural pasts and experiences meet, the clash between them is almost inevitable. Despite the goose families’ attempts to obtain full membership at the church and to access to a wide range of ongoing activities and information, resources and opportunities for participation, they were not favorably situated by members of the Korean church, thereby continuously positioning the goose families as peripheral members within a community of practice (Lave and Wenger, 1991). According to Lave and Wenger, in order for the newcomers to acquire a full membership within a community of practice, newcomers as well as old-timers should absorb and be absorbed in the culture of practice, assembling constantly evolving viewpoints from which to understand the practice. However, in the case of Jinwoo’s family, their full membership at the church was both denied by the members of the church and simultaneously given up by Jinwoo’s family due to the lack of shared social and cultural grounds between Jinwoo’s family and other church members.

Likewise, Korean church is also a site of struggle for Daniel, my second generation participant. Daniel describes his church experience as follows:

J: Why did you stop going to church?
Daniel: I thought it was a waste of time.
J: Are you going to church now?
Daniel: No. For a bit, they are like come and eat so I went and ate. Then I felt bad. I only show up when they have foods. Just don’t bother going anymore.
J: You don’t think that the church was useful somehow in your life? For example to help you maintain your Korean heritage or help you facilitate interactions with Koreans.
Daniel: No, in terms of cultural aspect, no not really. Because I didn’t speak if I did speak it was with people in English. I didn’t make any friends there any way. I didn’t speak to a lot of people. My best time was when I brought my friends with me. That was my best memory of church. In terms of Korean culture, they alienated me because I felt worse things like people look at me weird.
J: Church people?
Daniel: Yeah. Because I grew my hair long and wore baggy pants (XXX) they look at me and look away. They talk about allergies and stuff so //

As Daniel describes in the interview, the reason for his poor attendance to the church is that he failed to establish meaningful relationships with any of the church members. As Lave and Wenger (1991) argue, in order to accept or be accepted as a legitimate members into a group, a certain level of efforts to absorb and be absorbed in the culture of practice, in Daniel’s case, Korean church, are to be required from both newcomers and old timers. However, Daniel did not successfully reach a converging point where his views and other church members’ come together to understand the church practice and to share in the church activities.

Moreover, in the Korean church in North America where Korean values and ideologies are facilitated and promoted (Lew, 2006; Min, 1998), it is not very surprising to see that Daniel who grows his hair long and wears hip-hop baggy style jeans is quickly positioned as an outcast.

In order to understand Daniel’s marginal position pertaining to his fashion sense, I need to examine more closely what kind of symbolic meanings this hip-hop style can possibly generate.

In Lee’s study (2005) on Hmong immigrant youths, she found that the majority of Americanized second generation youth adopt the hip-hop style associated with urban youth of color. She explained the adoption of hip-hop style as second generation Hmong youths’ way of Americanizing themselves. While Americanized youths viewed African Americans as
economically and politically unsuccessful relative to Whites, they understood that hip-hop culture, which they associated with African Americans, had an oppositional social and consumer power.

In a similar fashion, Ibrahim (1999) also demonstrated the hip-hop culture adopted by French speaking African immigrant youths in his study of racial and gender identity construction in acquiring a second language. Using data collected through classroom observation and interviews over a six month period, he showed how French-speaking African immigrant high school boys in Canada “become black” through identifying themselves with Black American pop culture, such as rap and hip-hop, and by learning ‘Black English’ as a second language. Ibrahim argues that in becoming Black, the African youths were interpellated by Black popular cultural forms, that is, rap and hip-hop, as sites of identification, an act of investment, an expression of desire, and a deliberate counterhegemonic undertaking.

The argument shared by both Lee’s and Ibrahim’s studies is that hip-hop clothes, music, and language are, at least in part, about resistance to White mainstream culture. This does not suggest that the oppositional politics of hip-hop culture does not appeal to some White youths. In a discussion of White middle-class youths’ attraction to hip-hop, Kelley (1997) argues that “Hip Hop, particularly gangsta rap, also attracts listeners for whom the ‘ghetto’ is a place of adventure to suburban boredom” (p. 39). It is this opposition to authority that attracted some youths of immigrant families to hip-hop culture, which is a camouflage, and a collage of different linguistic and cultural capitals expressing human, social and historical conditions (Ibrahim, 1999). From this perspective, Daniel adopts hip-hop style represented as baggy pants and oversized T-shirts and a long hair as a way of opposing authorities in his ethnic as well as mainstream White communities, and of enacting and performing his hyphenated identities.
In conclusion, my 1.5 or second generation Korean Canadian participants go through different experience depending on their individual perceptions about the Korean church and church members. Some Korean Canadian youths conceived of Korean church as a site where they are able to construct positive Korean-ness in themselves, and learn linguistic features specific to Korean language such as honorifics or age-based kinship terms. For other Korean Canadian youths, Korean church is a place where their identities are contested and marginalized. My study suggests that the participants’ heterogeneous experience in the Korean church is closely connected to their experiences in their Korean family, and their understandings about Korean ideology.

In the next section, I will examine the identity construction of my participants in their formal schooling in Canada. Central to this discussion is how they are positioned in a dominant society and how their racial and ethnic minority status affects their hyphenated identities. In so doing, I will also look at ways in which my participants enact their agency to empower themselves, and turn their marginal positions to their own benefit.

5.1.3. Canadian Schools

Jinwoo went to elementary school in Youngju, Kyung-Sang province as well as in Seoul, Korea. He moved to Canada in grade 5, and went to elementary and high schools in Toronto where he could befriend with other Koreans or Asians. Sohee moved to Paraguay in grade 1, and went to Italian founded elementary and high school. According to Sohee, first-class schools in Paraguay were often under foreign foundations – American, German, and in her case Italian. As such, the school that she attended did not offer an English class, but Italian instead. Prior to coming to Canada, she went to a private language institute run by Koreans for about one year to learn English. She reports that her main socialization with Korean friends in Paraguay took place
in the Korean church. She moved to Langley, BC, in grade 10, and went to high school where there were quite a few Korean students like her.

Dennis moved to Canada at the age of four, and went to an elementary school in Scarborough. He moved to London, Ontario, in grade 4, where he finished the elementary and high school. Throughout his formal education, Dennis mostly socialized with White students. Daniel went to kindergarten in Glenco, Ontario, for one year, and then moved to Seoul for two years because of his father’s job transfer. There, he went to Seoul International school where all the subjects were taught in English for two years. His family moved back to London, Ontario, when Daniel was in grade 1. He went to elementary and high schools in London where he mostly socialized with White Canadian students. In this section, I will first begin my discussion of the 1.5 generation participants’ experiences in Canadian schools, and then, move to the discussion of my second generation participant.

Whereas Korean family and church provide 1.5 generation Korean Canadians with ample opportunities to generate their own understandings about Korean-ness, they construct their 1.5 generation identity by meeting other 1.5ers, sharing their experiences growing up in an immigrant family, and identifying with having been an “FOB” (“fresh off the boat”) when they first moved to Canada by not understanding English or the local culture. Although Dennis cannot recall what it was like during his first school year in Canada due to his age, Sohee and Jinwoo remember what it was like to be “FOB” at school. Jinwoo writes in his written journal as follows:

When I was younger, I was insecure about my surroundings as well as my English. I remember during lunch hours eating by myself in the school cafeteria and running to my sister’s classroom at every break --- One day, I wore this T-shirt saying something in Konglish, I don’t remember what it said exactly, but I remember I was mortified when the kids in my class pointed at the words and giggled at each other (Written journal on January 23)
In this journal, Jinwoo expresses the feelings of insecurity and embarrassment that he felt because of his lack of English and his “FOBBY” dress when he first started studying at the Canadian elementary school. In Korea, a fairly homogenized nation with very few racial varieties, Jinwoo has always been in an unmarked category as a Korean with black hair, eating Kimchi for breakfast, and speaking Korean wherever he goes. When moving to Canada, his ethnicity as a Korean suddenly became a marked category, thereby entailing another dimension of his identity. Moreover, he had to embrace his status as an ESL speaker. This transition period was crucial in constructing my 1.5ers’ hyphenated identity, and offered a lens through which to perceive what it takes to become a 1.5 generation Korean Canadian.

The ethnic club where 1.5 generation students meet with other 1.5 generation students and socialize with them also became a site where my 1.5 generation Korean students shape and reshape their hyphenated identities. The Korean Students’ Association (KSA), one of the ethnic club organizations at UWO, of which Jinwoo and Sohee are members, is a good example of this. Sohee explains her experiences in KSA as follows:

J: KSA 선 경험이 어땠어요? [How was your experience in KSA?]
Sohee: 거기가 웃긴게 매년 회장을 뽑잖아요. 그런데 만약에 회장이 이세가 당선이 되면 의석이나 이런 사람이 다 이세가 되는 분위기고요. 또 일점오세가 되면 의석들도 일점오세가 되는 분위기예요. 제가 의석이었을때 일점오세가 회장이었거든요. 되게 친한 친구였어요 또. 그래서 같이 어울리다 보니까 준비하는 거도 다 같이 하고 친하게 지내고 재미있었어요. 한국에서 대학생활 하면서 느끼는 그런 유대감 같은 것을 좀 느껴 왔다고 그렇거나. MT도 같이하고 행사도 준비하고 그랬던거 같아요. 재미있었던 것야요. [There was a funny thing going on. If second generation is elected as a president, all the executive positions are occupied by second generations. If 1.5er becomes a president, all the executive positions go to 1.5ers. When I was an executive, the president was a 1.5er. He/she was a very close friend. I had a lot of fun by working with him/her. It’s like a type of bond that you get to feel during your Korean university lives. I went to MT (membership training) and did all these preparations for events. I had lots of fun].
In this interview, while talking about her positive experience at the KSA in terms of sharing experiences and perspectives with other 1.5 generation Korean university students in Canada, Sohee also expresses a sense of gaps and rifts between 1.5 and second generation Koreans within the club. As mentioned earlier, disparities and disaccords between foreign born 1.5ers and an adopted country born second generations have been depicted by much of the academic literature in terms of their experiences, a level of bilingualism, perspectives, or values (Danico, 2004; Kibria, 2002; Lee, 2005). The general interpretation is that 1.5ers who emulate to be good kids by achieving academic success in the mainstream are perceived as less than cool kids by second generations due to their foreign mindset, values and behaviors. For this reason, many second generations dissociate from 1.5ers in their attempts to negate their own presumed foreignness as well as for fear that the 1.5ers’ foreignness might reinforce, in the eyes of others, their own (Kibria, 2002).

Further investigation of socialization patterns of my 1.5ers and second generation participants supports this reasoning. My 1.5 generation participants, Sohee and Jinwoo exclusively hung out with Asian students including Koreans who recently arrived in Canada.

Jinwoo describes his socialization pattern as follows:

**J:** 학교 다닐 때 누구하고 친하게 지냈어요? 한국사람? [When you were in school, who were your friends? Korean?].

**Jinwoo:** 맨 처음에는 한국에들 하고 굉장히 친하다가 그 다음 second 학교로 전학갔을때 중국애들이랑 좀 많이 사귀고... 이상하게 캐나다인이랑은 많이 안 사귀었어요 [I was very close to several Koreans at first, and when I moved to another school, I hung out with Chinese... Strangely, I didn’t hang out with Canadians].

**J:** 그건 왜인거 같아요? [Why do you think this is the case?].

**Jinwoo:** 개네들은 같이 놀면 hockey 같은 운동으로 많이 사귀잖아요. 근데 저는 ice skate 하기도 할출 모르고 개네들은 끼리끼리 놀고 중국애가 비슷한 나이때 오면은 영어도 잘 못하잖아요 영어 가르쳐 주면서 서로 막 친해지고 [They...
make friends by playing sports like hockey, but I don’t even know how to skate. They always hung out with themselves. But I could make a lot of Chinese friends because when they first arrived, they couldn’t speak English. We became very good friends while I am teaching them English].

As Jinwoo explains in the interview, he exclusively befriended Koreans or Chinese who were in a similar position as he was as a recent immigrant, and an ESL speaker. To Jinwoo, Canadian kids’ socialization mainly builds on participating in sports such as hockey. Having come from the Korean education system that does not value sports in its school curriculum, he chooses not to participate in a Canadian athletic circle, but to remain on the periphery by largely befriending 1.5 Koreans or Chinese who have a similar immigrant experience, and also have physical similarities. In contrast to Kibria’s (2002) observation that Chinese and Korean second generation participants tried to disassociate themselves from other Asian groups due to the foreignness placed on all Asian Americans regardless of their birth status in America, Jinwoo’s intentional socializations with other Asians in school show that he is neither trying to be integrated into the mainstream Canadian circle, nor does he attempt to continuously compare his position to that of Canadians; he simply accepts who he is as a kid who was born in Korea, but grew up in Canada receiving Canadian schooling. Jinwoo is fully aware that he cannot completely erase his Asian racial identity, not to mention his Korean ethnic identity. Rather, to Jinwoo, being accepted as Canadian is understood to be part of a process of upward socioeconomic mobility as witnessed in other studies on immigrant children (Kibria, 2002; Lee, 2005; Lew, 2006). The similar kind of acceptance about their identity as a Korean Canadian was also observed in the interview with Sohee. She states as follows:

J: 세가지 speech communities 에서 성장했는데 자신의 Identity 에 대해 어떻게 생각하세요? [You grew up in three different speech communities and what you do you think about your identities?].
Sohee: 저는 그렇게 별로 없었어요. Identity crisis 같은거 // 그냥, 남미에 살때도 뿌리는 한국인인데 교포니까 그냥 외국에서 사는 한국인. 근데 좀더 Westernized 된 그런
This interview shows Sohee’s straightforwardly acceptance of her Korean ethnicity, of her not being Canadian, and of her hyphenated Korean Canadian identity. She tends to accept her race, ethnicity or hyphenated identity without evaluating them from the perspective of the dominant group. Both Jinwoo and Sohee accept their ethnicity, race, and hyphenated identities as a matter of fact, and neither of them tries to shift their innate Korean frames of reference to those of Canadian’s. In other words, they remain Korean in many respects, and are aware that being, thinking or acting more like Canadians does not help them to integrate into mainstream society. Rather, they recognize that integration into mainstream society can be achieved by social mobility or socioeconomic status that they achieve through education.

By contrast, my second generation participant, Daniel, or 1.5er, Dennis show a different socialization pattern. Daniel socialized mostly with White friends. Dennis who moved to Canada at the age of four socializes with both recent immigrants and Whites. What they experienced while socializing with their White friends is a sense of racialized exclusion from established conceptions of Canadian. Both Daniel and Dennis experienced a sense of alienation by being not one of them. Dennis expresses a sense of racialized exclusion as follows:

Dennis: ---’cause I was a pretty bad kid when I was younger. I used to always get suspended from school and stuff. I’ve always gotten racist comments and stuff,
you know what I mean? You’re going to get racist comments if you’re not White. And then I used to get into fights all the time in school. My dad, he never got mad at me for fighting for a specific reason like that. If I got into fight for a dumb reason then he’d be mad. But for something like that, he would never yell at me for that / In my school, there was like // the White people hung out with White people, and immigrants hung out with the immigrants. There was all like // especially in cafeteria, we walk in and White people are on this side and minorities are on this side.

J: How did you like to belong to minority group?
Dennis: I didn’t really care, to be honest. I didn’t care if I mix with another crowd or not. ‘Cause no matter what, I am not going to be Canadian. I am always going to have black hair. I am always going to look like a Korean. I am not going to turn into Caucasian style.

As Kibria (2002) pointed out, second generation Koreans’ Childhood marked the beginning of awareness of the difficulties of being Canadian, given an Asian racial identity. The interview shows that Dennis is not an exception. As evidenced in his reserving the term “Canadian” to refer to White people, Dennis has rather deterministic racialized views about what it takes to be Canadians; being racially White and having yellow hair. Although he speaks English as a first language, and understands its mainstream culture, he does not consider himself as a Canadian simply because he is not White and does not have yellow hair. To Dennis, whiteness invisibly defines what “Canadian” is. Likewise, Daniel expresses a sense of racial exclusion that he experienced as follows:

J: Earlier, you mentioned that you don’t belong to either of the cultures (Korean and Canadian).
Daniel: Yeah. Not fully cause of the way that they joke like that. They joke about it. That means they are hinting at it. If they hint at it, that’s how they see it a little bit. That means I can’t be in it. In New York, we were walking out, me and an Indian guy, Black guy and White guy. The waitress goes when we’re leaving what you’ve got UN or something? You know. Things like that. I don’t see it because I don’t see myself. And I don’t see it in other people, I don’t think, because I see more mixed than all other people. But when you hear that, oh, I am not.

J: So when you think of yourself, do you think you are Korean or Canadian?
Daniel: Depends on where I am. Some of my friends they think it’s a joke. Oh, he is like a Chinese guy in the group or an Asian guy in the group but I don’t really feel like being pointed it out. They are like joking about it and accentuating it. When I am with Koreans, I don’t feel great at all.
Like Dennis, Daniel has been influenced by the culture of whiteness, internalizing that Whites can be only “authentic” members in the mainstream society. When Daniel and Dennis spoke about “Canadians” and “Canadian culture”, they typically described what they saw valued on TV as well as at the schools they have attended. As Daniel was born and raised in Canada, and has been educated in a Canadian school system, emulating the White middle class norms and values has been a natural practice for him. Most of the time, his positioning himself as a White middle class Canadian is not problematic, and seems to be accepted by Canadians as well. However, by hearing the racial jokes unconsciously and randomly made by people, he realizes that he cannot be one of the legitimate members in the mainstream White society due to his race. In other words, he realized that in the eyes of others he is not Canadian but a foreigner, identified as “Asians” or “Chinese”, in Tuan’s (1998) term, “forever foreigners”. Such awareness made Daniel conscious of the significance of race, specifically of the privileges of “whiteness”, in Canadian society, as well as of the gaps between himself and many of his White school peers.

Kibria (2002) explains that it is within the family that members of the second generation encountered messages of race – lessons and ideas about how to deal with the experiences of racialized exclusion. Among these messages was the counsel to retain a sense of consciousness and pride in being Korean when faced with racism. In the interview above, Dennis stated that he often got into fights with his school peers who made racist comments to him, and that his fighting was covertly acknowledged by his Korean father. Based on Kibria’s interpretation, Dennis’s father’s acknowledgement of his fight is understood as his teaching a sense of consciousness and pride in retaining Korean ethnicity. As a matter of fact, the interview excerpt below demonstrates that Dennis has already absorbed his father’s advice to deal with racism,
thereby constructing his self based on his Korean ethnicity and pride, and positioning Canadians as “others”. Let us look at the following excerpt:

J: Some Korean Canadians have a hard time building a membership in both Korean and Canadian cultures due to the gaps in values or thoughts between these two cultures.

Dennis: There are different types of Canadians. There’s always going to be bad and good kids. If you pick moral kids, they’re a lot like Koreans. They have respect for their parents. It’s not like they are a lot different, they still have morals. So it’s not that hard to chill with them.

This excerpt shows Dennis’s strategy to deal with his sense of racial exclusion building on his pride as a Korean; he picks out his White friends who have much resemblance with Koreans. By positioning Koreans as good and moral, and Canadians as ambivalent, Dennis is identifying himself with Korean, while disassociating himself from Canadians. By engaging with this strategy, Dennis embraces his sense of racial exclusion that he has experienced in a Canadian society.

Likewise, Daniel also retains a sense of consciousness of being Korean which he utilizes as a shield from his sense of racial exclusion that he is experiencing. Although he still faces ongoing challenges to his authenticity as a “true Korean”, he still takes a pride in certain Korean values imparted from his parents. However, his sense of racial exclusion is compounded when Daniel’s work ethics valued in Korean culture is misunderstood by his Canadian co-workers. Let us look at the following interview excerpt:

J: You are not one of them because you are Asian, but you have no control over the fact that you are Asian either.

Daniel: Even habits something like that. Seem like I actually do more work. When I look at it, like my new job, I mail it in the beginning of the day and end of the day. So at the end of the day, everyone stops at five to four. I am in there and they turn a light off to get me to stop working. I am like why? You guys stand there you don’t do anything for five minutes. Why don’t you just let me work? I am just sorting a mail it’s not like I am doing something hard. But they are like stop. Who
are you trying to impress? Do you want to get a raise or something? Obviously I can’t get a raise because it is a summer job. I am like No, I just don’t like to stand around and doing nothing for five minutes.

J: So you think that you do not belong to either culture.
Daniel: Yeah, but I know both cultures pretty well. I would say I know Western culture better than Korean culture. I don’t really know Korean culture that well. I know a lot of things I see are according to Western views.

Daniel inherited a hard work ethic valued by Koreans. However, when employing the work ethic in his Canadian workplace, it is misunderstood and devalued by his Canadian co-workers as observed in the interview. Such an incident makes him question his membership in a Canadian speech community, thereby worsening his sense of racial exclusion. In the interview, Daniel also equates the concept of “Western” to Canadian when he states that he sees a lot of things according to Western views, thereby assuming that Whites are equal to “Canadian”. The ideology behind this is that to be considered a Canadian, ‘good’ immigrants must aspire to achieve middle class status and assimilate to the dominant White culture (Lee, 2005). In fact, during the 1960s the stereotype of Asian Americans as hard-working and successful “model minorities” emerged and Asian Americans were thereby likened to Whites. As model minorities, Asian Americans achieved the status of “honorary Whites” (Tuan, 1998). However, as “honorary Whites”, Asian Americans do not have the actual privileges associated with “real” whiteness as they are denied the opportunity to identify solely as Whites. In other words, embracing whiteness does not mean that the resources to assimilate to the White culture are in fact available to non-Whites (Lee, 2005). Although the Canadian multiculturalism act (1985, c. 24 [4th Supp.]), states that the Government of Canada recognizes the diversity of Canadians as regards race, national or ethnic origin, color and religion as a fundamental characteristic of Canadian society, the White ideology may be still at work in immigrants’ every day lives as found in Daniel’s example.
On the other hand, academic achievements emerged as a strategy to compensate for the disadvantages of minority racial status (Kibria, 2002; Lee, 2005; Lew, 2006). This is most likely the reason why parents of my 1.5 and second generation participants emphasized their children’s academic success so much as I showed in an earlier section. While Jinwoo and Sohee accepted academic achievements as a way to succeed in the mainstream society, and therefore, strived to meet their parents’ expectations, Daniel had a series of clashes with his parents due to their emphasis on academic success. In the case of Dennis whose parents realized early on that their son is not particularly excelling academically, he was encouraged to play basketball. He says in the interview:

Dennis: I didn’t put in any extra effort to blend in, you know what I mean?
J: But you want to be cool. You have desire to be cool.
Dennis: But I would not try to impress White people.
J: But who are the cool kids? Are they Canadian?
Dennis: It’s not // depends on where you see it from. If you are a White person, then White people are cool. If you are a minority, then minority people are cool. But another category was athletes. All the athletes kind of chilled together.

Dennis recognizes that being a good athlete can offer him an opportunity to be “cool” in a Canadian mainstream society, transcending racial exclusion and racial discrimination. In other words, he realizes that being a good athlete can provide him with a means to engage his agency in an active and safe manner, and to be able to participate in the mainstream society as a valued member. As such, my 1.5 and second generation participants strive to find a way to succeed in or immerse themselves into the mainstream society, whether it is academic or non-academic. This choice is fundamentally important as it offers very useful insights into my Korean participants’ investments into their heritage language at a university.

To sum up, through the formal schooling in Canada, my 1.5 and second generation Korean participants construct their hyphenated identities differently. Whereas 1.5ers socialize
mainly with Asians and accept their status as Korean-Canadians, second generations including Dennis who moved to Canada at the age of four had a stronger desire to be assimilated to the mainstream society. One of the fundamental difficulties in the course of assimilating was, however, the racial exclusion, which makes my second generation participants strongly aware of their race and ethnicity as inevitable components to construct their identities. Nevertheless, my finding also suggests that my participants are equipped with a strategy to enact their agency, to empower themselves, and to turn their marginal positions to their own benefits.

What follows in the next section is an examination of what prompts my 1.5 and second generation Korean participants to invest themselves into maintaining their heritage language. The findings will build on my participants’ experiences in their family, church, and socialization practices in the Canadian schools, thereby verifying that my participants’ investments in a heritage language are not stemming from an impulsive decision, but deeply connected with their histories, desires, upbringings and socialization practices.

5.2. What does it Mean for the Korean Students to Maintain Their Heritage Language in Canada?

In this section, I will explore what it means for my 1.5 and second generation Korean participants to maintain their heritage language at a university in Canada. However heterogeneous the investments of my Korean participants may be, common junctures are also found from the following two perspectives; my participants’ transnational ties with an ethnic speech community, and linguistic and cultural capitals associated with their ethnic identity. I will first discuss how my Korean participants’ desires to maintain their heritage language were gradually strengthened over time through their transnational travel or plans to make a trip to Korea. Then, I will examine how the transnational travel or ties encourages them to maintain
their heritage language, and how the maintenance of the heritage language is associated with a kind of linguistic and cultural capital that my participants perceive would benefit them in the long run.

5.2.1. Sohee

Sohee made frequent transnational trips to Korea throughout her immigrant years whether alone or with her parents, usually to see her relatives in Korea. The last trip to Korea where Sohee had taken a year and a half ago lasted for four years during which Sohee taught English at a private English institute and submitted music that she had composed during her university years to the music industry. As we have seen earlier, Sohee hardly felt a sense of racial exclusion in Canada like Dennis or Daniel. She accepted her Korean ethnicity as a matter of fact, and was hardly contested due to her minority status, her race or ethnicity. I would argue that behind her stable and positive Korean self was her regular social and cultural influx from an ethnic speech community whether it is through popular cultural products such as Korean dramas or popular songs or through transnational trips. Such constant social and cultural contacts with Korea provided an opportunity for Sohee to create ballads or R & B songs as hobby, however amateur. After she completed her third year as a university student in Canada, Sohee decided to go to Korea to pursue her dream and to become a professional song writer. However, the Korea that she experienced in her adult life was quite different from the Korea that she has imagined as a warm motherland. She volunteered to work for a couple of music companies with a hope that one day her songs will be passed onto some famous singers, but this dream was far from coming true. Sohee describes her experience in the Korean music industry as follows:

J: 그래서 지금 어떤 가수가 부르는 노래가 있나요? [Is there any of your songs that popular singers sing?].
Sohee: 아니오. (laughing). 한국이요. 작곡가 만나면 시스템이 되게 이상하게요. 곡이 좋다
그래서 같이 일하자 그러면은요. 그냥 몇 년간은 밑에서 일반 하는거예요. 제가 곡을
쓰면서 그 사람 일을 다하고 약간 좀 그런 스타일이예요. 그래서 잘 //그리고 또
한국에서 용돈을 벌려고 학원에서 영어를 가르쳤거든요. 그래서 막(a gesture that
she was really busy)) [No, Korea has a very strange system. They said that “I like your
songs and let’s work together”, so we started to work together. But what really happened
was that they just let me work for them for several years. I ended up doing the work for
them. So I started to teach English in hakwon (private English institute) to make money].

J: 곡 내면서 급여를 받고 일했어요? [Did you get paid from working for the music
company?].

Sohee: 아니오, 월급 안 받았어요. 근데 배운다는 자세로 일한다고 생각하면서 하나가
괜찮았는데 그 사람들이 제가 지은 곡들을 보면서 웃을 때는 참 난감하다고요.
특히 spelling 이 틀린 단어들이라든가 그런것들을 보면서 웃을때는 [No, I didn’t get
paid, but it’s OK. I could take everything as learning experience, but I was pretty
mortified when they laughed at my music, especially about the words that I misspelled].

Being unfamiliar with the Korean music industry, Sohee had to face the fact that she cannot
succeed in a working environment where she is projected as a hopeless apprentice, and denied an
opportunity for a full participation. Through the act of creating songs in Korean, she thought that
she was building cultural capital valued in a Korean market and yet the market did not perceive
Sohee’s songs as her capital. Rather surprisingly, the cultural capital that happened to be valued
in the Korean market was her English skills. As such, she ended up teaching English in Korea for
three years.

Moreover, Sohee’s identity was also contested by her less than perfect Korean. As a
person who always possessed a certain level of confidence in her Korean, Korean people’s
amusement with her misspelled words left quite an unforgettable scar in her memory, and
thereafter a permanent crack in her legitimate membership of the Korean community. However,
this incident only marked the beginning of her inquiry of the Korean membership, and her
Korean-ness. The following interview excerpt demonstrates ways in which Koreans in Korea
perceived Sohee and her Korean-ness. She talks as follows:
J: 한국에서 interaction 할때 세정이 한국어를 듣고 뭐 다르다 그랬던 경험이 있어요? [What kind of comments did you get from other Koreans about your Korean?].

Sohee: 발음이 좀 이상하다고 그런 분도 계시고요. 너무 필요없는 경이, 존칭을 쓴대요. 그런것도 있었어요. 학원에서 선생님들이 저는 교포인데 다른분들은 외국에서 이삼년 사시다 오신분들 맛 그랬거든요. 언니들이 저한테 맛 이태원에서 살다 온애라고 [Some people think that my pronunciation is strange, and some say that I overuse honorifics. 언니 (other English teachers) in hakwon where I worked jokingly teased me saying that I used to live in Itaewon (famous shopping district where there is an American army base)].

J: 왜? [Why?].

Sohee: 한국음식 너무 잘 알고 한국말 너무 잘하고 그런데 한평생 외국에서 살았으니까 이해가 안 간다는 거에요. 너 이태원에서 살다 왔지? 농담으로 맛 그리고.[I know Korean culture and speak Korean language perfectly, but I actually lived most of my life in foreign countries].

In this interview, Sohee talks about how she was perceived by Koreans in Korea; seemingly she fits into a category legitimized as Koreans in the ethnic speech community, and yet her trivial linguistic habits such as an overuse of honorifics or an English pronunciation of Korean words identify her as a perpetuate foreigner, thereby denying her Korean membership as “true Korean”.

By taking Sohee as having grown up in Itaewon where one can experience Western culture represented through Western bars or Western restaurants or numerous foreigners due to the presence of an American army base, Koreans who already established a status quo conceive of Sohee as a black sheep in the group.

Right after coming back from Korea, Sohee resumed her fourth year at a Canadian university and chose to take a Korean class. Considering her experiences in Korea, it now makes sense that Sohee’s will to maintain her heritage language was a way of reaffirming her membership in the ethnic Korean community, and of reassuring her ethnic identity. Without her transnational experience would she still have taken a Korean class? This is not to say that her will has nothing to do with a linguistic capital that she will gain by learning the basics of honorifics or rules for spellings. Rather, what I would like to emphasize is that Sohee’s
investment into her heritage language is inextricably connected with her intention to restore the
ethic identity capital, which Kibria (2002) defines as “the opportunities, broadly speaking, that
accrue to them from others’ perception (whether justified or not) of them as a member of an
ethnic community and hence able to tap into the social capital – the connections, solidarity, and
other resources of that community” (p. 98-9).

5.2.2. Jinwoo

Having been a “goose family”, Jinwoo regularly travels to Korea to visit his parents; his
mother returned to Korea on Jinwoo’s entering the university. He plans to go back to Korea after
his university education in Canada is completed. Jinwoo talks about the reason why he took a
Korean class as follows:

Jinwoo: 이상하게 생각할때는 한국말로 생각하는데 쓸땐 영어가 더 편해요.
[Strangely I think in Korean, but I feel more comfortable writing in English].
J: 그게 한국말로 많이 쓰질 않아서 그런가? [Do you think it is because you
have not practiced enough in Korean].
Jinwoo: 네 그런거 같아요. [It seems so].
J: 그러면 이 한국어 class 는 왜 들었어요? [Then why did you take a Korean
class?].
Jinwoo: (smiling) 솔직히 말해서 맨 처음에는 좀 easy course 같은 한국 class 가 어درك
호기심이 들기도 했는데 점점 들어보면서 제 grammar skill 이 전짜 나쁘고
거의 child 수준이니가 improve 해야겠다는 생각이 들어서 // (blurring)
[Frankly speaking, at first, I thought of the course as easy and took it out of
curiosity. When the course passes by, I felt that I have bad grammar at a level like
a child so I thought that I needed to improve].

As his word “easy course” indicates by itself in this excerpt, Jinwoo’s primary investment into
his heritage language is to build on his established resources and knowledge of Korean language.
Achieving a good mark in Korean language course will help him to achieve overall academic
success at a Canadian university. Moreover, for Jinwoo who plans to go back and get a job in
Korea, good marks in Korean class will prove to potential employers in Korea that he maintained
Korean language proficiency at a level that will allow him to perform in the workplace. However,
as the course continued, Jinwoo increasingly felt that his Korean proficiency was not as good as when he first came to Canada. Maybe it would be more correct to say that his Korean has not improved since he had come to Canada while his English has continuously expanded. To prove this point, he stated that his weak areas in Korean were grammar and writing, of which skill areas Jinwoo still needs to improve if he is to be successful in the job market in Korea.

On the other hand, Jinwoo’s attitude in the Korean class points to a sense of ethnic pride as a Korean. Let us look at the following excerpt:

Jinwoo: 아무래도 2세대한테 안 물어보고 1.5세대한테 다 물어보니까 [They (Chinese students) do not ask questions to second generation Koreans but 1.5ers].
Jinwoo: 네, 중국학생들이 이세대한테 전혀 안 물어보잖아요. [Yes, can’t you tell that Chinese students never ask questions to second generations].
J: 아 그래? [Oh, really?].
Jinwoo: 근데 중국애들은 좀 ashamed 이렇게 아니고 자꾸 learning 태도로 approach 하니까 가르쳐 주는 사람도 재밌죠 [But, the Chinese students are not ashamed of asking questions but approach me with a learning attitude, so it’s fun to teach them].

As a resource holder concerning Korean language and culture, Jinwoo enjoys answering the Chinese peers’ questions in the Korean language class. Conversely, from the perspective of Chinese students, Jinwoo seems not as Canadianized as other second generation Koreans, but is a more personable and approachable than his second generation counterparts. By offering Chinese students Korean linguistic, cultural or social resources Jinwoo gains ethnic identity capital (Kibria, 2002) that can accrue from perceived connections to Korea. Due to the steady popularity of Korean popular cultural products such as dramas or popular songs in China as well as Korea’s recent economic growth, the implications of possessing ethnic identity capital are definitely positive for Jinwoo. From this perspective, investment in the heritage language for Jinwoo can be understood as pursuing, cultivating and using ethnic identity capital.
5.2.3. Dennis

Since his family immigrated in the early 90’s, Dennis visited Korea just once when he was a high school student. He talks about his first trip to Korea as follows:

J: So what was it like to visit Korea?
Dennis: I didn’t really know what to expect when I went to Korea first time, ‘cause when I came to Canada, I was still young, so I don’t really remember. But when I went there, it was kind of what I was expecting. I always saw pictures in dramas before too, right? It was kind of what I was picturing. I like Korea; I can’t wait to go back.

J: 한국이 왜 좋아요? [Why do you like Korea?]
Dennis: I just like being around Korean people. I just / it feels more comfortable, kind of X I can hang out with White people too, I can hang out with any race, I don’t really care, but going to my home country and seeing all Koreans, it’s pretty cool. ‘Cause when you walk down here, go to the mall, you see a bunch of different races / but when you go to Korea, it’s mostly Koreans so / And going to (XX) just eating actual Korean food / My mom’s a good cook, it’s good, but going to your country and then eating it, it’s different. And experiencing the culture there and going out, partying and stuff.

This interview excerpt demonstrates that Dennis had a certain developed conception and images of his homeland even prior to his first trip to Korea. He explained that the Korea that he saw through his trip was quite similar to the images that he drew in his head by watching Korean dramas or other popular cultural products such as a reality show. Because of advanced technology and developed online communities, Korean popular cultural products are more easily and readily available to immigrant youths nowadays (e.g. on the computer), and help them to keep them in steady touch with culture and language in their homeland. Globalization that makes the world a smaller place, connecting societies to each other in ways that promote mutual understandings, changes the relationships and nature between immigrant’s life in an adopted country and that of an ethnic speech community. For Dennis, his trip to Korea had shown him how economically and culturally significant his homeland society was becoming or had become
already. He came away from the trip to Korea with a keen sense of the economic and cultural
dynamism of Korean society and of his own pride in these achievements.

Moreover, Dennis’s transnational trip to Korea offered him a perfect opportunity to
compensate for a sense of racial exclusion that he experienced in Canada. In the interview above,
Dennis expressed what good feelings he had when surrounded by the people of same race and
tasting authentic Korean foods. He felt that he fit in. Here, I would also argue that the cultural
modernity that Dennis experienced in Korea was an appealing point. Ang (2004) claims that
Asian idealized cultural modernity is associated with material affluence, consumerism, and
individualism, which is a precise reason why Korean dramas, soap operas or commodities have
been very popular in parts of Asian countries. To those who have hyphenated identities and live
across bilingual or multilingual societies such as Dennis, Korean culture conceived of as a
hybridization of both modern and traditional may serve as an attractive point. As such, Dennis
plans to go back to Korea and play basketball for a professional Korean basketball team after
graduating from the university in Canada. This is one of the primary reasons why he invests
himself into learning Korean language.

Another reason for Dennis’s investments in his heritage language lies in the maintenance
of Korean ethnic identity capital. He describes his future plan to marry a Korean woman and to
teach Korean language to his kids as follows:

J: Are you going to marry Korean?
Dennis: Before I didn’t think I was going to marry a Korean girl, I thought I was going to
marry a Canadian girl. But I am going to marry a Korean girl. ‘Cause my [grandfather] was telling me a story that / saying that I have to marry
a Korean girl and I was like “why?” And then he goes like – if you marry a
Canadian girl, and you have a kid and then that kid marry another Canadian, then
our Korean root is gone. And it kind of made sense so.
J: Would it be part of reasons why you are learning Korean now?
Dennis: Yeah, if I go out with a Korean girl, I can speak Korean to her. Even though I am
not that good at it, but I can still understand and converse.
J: Then, are you going to teach Korean to your kids?
Dennis: Yeah.
J: Why?
Dennis: It’s just a root thing. You are Korean so you should learn your own language.

In this interview, Dennis spoke of wanting to marry a Korean woman and to teach Korean and convey a sense of Korean identity to his children. In the context of the globalizing world economy, familiarity of Korean culture and language could be a valuable dimension of identity, effectively signaling to others a genuine Korean membership and belonging in the Korean collectivity. Dennis’s thoughts on childrearing are certainly informed by an understanding of the strategic value of Korean ethnicity. This understanding is clearly related not only to globalization but to other economic, social and cultural conditions that offered positive and affirmative views on Korea, and Korean ethnic groups within Canadian society. Believing that cultivating a Korean identity was strategically valuable as ethnic identity capital, Dennis wished to give his children the necessary tools, especially language, with which to enhance and to fully exploit it.

5.2.4. Daniel

Daniel visited Korea twice since he was born in Canada. He made the first trip when he was about six years old. He stayed for two years because his father had a job transfer to Seoul. At that time, Daniel went to an international school where all the subjects were taught in English. The second trip was made when he was in grade 10 to visit his relatives. His memory on the second trip was not a favorable one due to his perceived language barrier; Koreans in Korea spoke so fast. He felt that the Korean that he had learned through interacting with his parents was not useful because it differed from the “authentic” Korean spoken and heard in the contemporary Korean society. He talks about his experience as follows:

J: How did you like that trip?
Daniel: I didn’t really enjoy it. I felt I lost. I didn’t understand.
J: Didn’t you speak some Korean?
Daniel: No. everyone spoke Korean so fast. I am only used to my parents saying. But you know how it feels listening to someone else speak. You are used to one certain way. If they say it normally, you can’t understand. My cousin can understand me but can’t understand other English speakers. Even my mom can’t hear me because I mumble a lot when I speak Korean. But she can pick it up. But I couldn’t understand anything. I just felt lost.
J: Did you feel that Korea changed a lot?...
Daniel: …Yeah. I didn’t recognize it. Well / when I lived there we didn’t have anything. Here in Olympic plaza, It was all new. We were the end of the circle at the end. There was a field. The road and the field. The bus goes up on the field it goes around the school I didn’t recognize anything. We went back to see and no idea.

Unlike Dennis who had regular contacts with Korean popular cultural products and also had various interactions with Koreans mainly through a Korean church, Daniel’s only source for Korean culture or language was his parents. Consequently, having been exposed to “authentic” Korean culture and language through his transnational trip to Korea, Daniel quickly felt lost. It was not only the language or culture that made him feel lost, but the changing scenery in Korea that truly overwhelmed Daniel. Not surprisingly, this transnational trip to Korea did not motivate him to make another trip to Korea.

So why does Daniel, who is seemingly uninterested in maintaining transnational ties with his homeland society, invest himself into learning Korean? What symbolic resources or cultural capital does learning Korean possibly provide to Daniel? My data suggest that Daniel’s investment is strongly tied with his passion for Kungfu, for which he developed a passion after dropping out of university. Kungfu was the bridge that helped Daniel reconnect with his parents and refurbish his Korean-ness, Korean identity and Korean ties. He explains his first encounter with Kungfu as follows:

J: Can you describe your first encounter with Kungfu?
Daniel: So I always see a football season in November. It ends in November, I didn’t make it basketball team so I wasn’t doing anything. I was too old to play hockey. So my friend and I went in and saw 소림사’s [Shaolin] monks making a tour. They are not really Shaolin monks but they are kung fu guys, putting on cool outfits. And we went to see them at (XXX) they’ve all seen a video the first one that they did in Las Vegas. So we
watched that. He watched that. So my friend goes to the school (in New York) that I go to now. So he recommended it and I went in. and then I just kept going.

Surprisingly, Kungfu that Daniel had discovered by accident provided a primary motivation for him to resume his college life at one of affiliated colleges at the University of Western Ontario. Daniel decided to major in East Asian Studies as a way to cultivate his passion for Kungfu, and to visit China as an exchange student. By going back to the university, Daniel was also able to meet his parents’ expectations and to compromise with their insistence on the university education. His parents were very happy with their son’s resuming his college life, and at the same time, they were disappointed when heard their son’s plan to go to China. Daniel describes his parents’ reaction as follows:

J: What was your motivation to take this Korean course?
Daniel: To learn languages, to improve language skills. Like I said, I want to take this for a language to go to China for exchange so //
J: What are your parents’ reactions to your going to China?
Daniel: I know like my dad like I said before, he wants me to do something after for sure. He said do whatever I want but I know he is just saying. He doesn’t understand what he is saying. You can do whatever you want. After you are done, I don’t think he really understands / Now that I am dating with Laura, they are really upset about that so // They will tell me to go to Korea. They say instead of applying for China, my dad says if you go to Korea, you can take Taekwondo (Korean martial arts), study Korean, but really he wants me to go to Korea and find a Korean girlfriend. I am saying I am going to China. I am going to Korea for two weeks maybe.

This interview excerpt demonstrates Daniel’s parents’ indirect pressure to their son to get married to a fellow ethnic. When Daniel told his parents that he would go to China as an exchange student, they were trying to persuade their son to go Korea instead out of hope that Daniel get into relationship with a Korean woman rather than the White girlfriend that he was going out with. To Daniel’s parents, his son’s marriage to a non-Korean would imply “lose blood” and a weaker claim to a Korean identity on the part of Daniel as well as on the part of his children. As was observed in Dennis’s grandfather’s comment in the interview excerpt earlier “if
you marry a Canadian girl, and you have a kid and then that kid marry another Canadian, then our Korean root is gone”. Korean immigrant parents’ notions of blood strongly bear on ideologies of Korean nationalism, ethnic and racial identity marker. In other words, “blood” is directly related to visible physical characteristics that can signal one’s racial and ethnic identity, and thus, the ones who intermarry are not “true” to their blood, family and nation. The most crucial effects of intermarriage on blood and identity would be looks and identity of children. For this reason, it has been reported that male children of Korean family receive more emphasis on marrying a fellow ethnic than female counterparts. Nevertheless, Daniel was already determined to go to China and pursue his passion for Kungfu.

This excerpt shows that Daniel makes use of the credit that he earns from the Korean class to chase his dream. In order to participate in an exchange program, he needed a certain number of language course credits, and this is why he enrolled in the Korean language course. Then, what relations does this second generation Korean Canadian’s passion for Kungfu have with his investments in Korean language? Would his passion for Kungfu be completely unrelated to his Korean identity and ties with Korean ethnic communities? Daniel stated that he learned Taekwondo when he was young. He had to stop doing Taekwondo because there was no place to learn and practice it near his house when his family moved to London. Instead, he discovered a place where he can learn Kungfu. To Daniel who had previous trainings in Korean martial arts, Kungfu was not a difficult sport, but easy to practice, and cool to deliver. In this regard, Daniel’s passion of Kungfu builds on his training in Taekwondo. Daniel found something that he could be enthusiastic about while utilizing and making the best use of the Korean resources that he has already possessed. From this view, the path to cultivate his passion for Kungfu can be
understood as a way of being and becoming Asian Canadian in the White dominant Canadian society.

Kibria (2002) argues that becoming Asian American in the context of U.S.A. may offer a way of filling the identity gaps left by their own weakening ties to the ethnic communities and cultures, and of being ethnic that meshes quite effortlessly with the social and cultural expectations of dominant society. To Daniel who organizes his social and cultural life around his Korean-ness in only sparse ways, becoming Asian Canadian may make sense as a way to assimilate into the dominant society. By practicing Kungfu, he learns to cultivate his Asian-ness as a primordial marker. By pursuing his passion for Kungfu, Daniel is hoping to gain economic and social capitals potentially valued in a Canadian society, and also to construct his hyphenated identities whereby neither his Korean-ness nor Canadian-ness is threatened or dying out, but fostered, nurtured and coexist peacefully.

5.3. Chapter Conclusion

In this chapter, I examined ways in which my 1.5 and second generation Korean Canadian participants construct their hyphenated identities in the three discourse sites – Korean home, Korean church and Canadian schools - and what it means for them to maintain and further develop Korean language in their bi/multicultural world. My findings suggest that the investments of my participants into their heritage language are strongly tied to their histories, identities, perceptions, and positions in the dominant society. My study has shown that my 1.5 and second generation Korean Canadian participants construct different understandings about what it means to be Korean Canadians, depending on the period in which their family immigrated to Canada, and the Korean-ness that they have to negotiate with their Korean parents and other ethnic community members. These heterogeneous understandings about their
hyphenated identities, in turn, influence each participant’s heritage language learning and their investments differently. Equally important to consider is the extent to which my participants believe that their identity is associated with a native speech community through transnational ties, and the ethnic identity capital gained through learning Korean language.
Chapter VI: Pedagogical Implications

In this chapter, I will discuss the pedagogical implications based on the findings of my study. The pedagogical discussions centre on how to successfully facilitate a multilingual and multicultural language classroom where students bring their identities, past histories, desires or conflicts. As seen in my study, more frequent transnational movements nowadays challenge the monolingual norms of language learners in the foreign language classroom (e.g. Chinese international students studying in Canadian university in my study). As such, focus of my pedagogical discussion in the first section is on what and how to teach, and how to empower learners in today’s multilingual and multicultural foreign language classroom. In the second section, I change my pedagogical discussions to the context of Korean heritage education. I first discuss what has been lacking in the pedagogical dimension in the field of Korean heritage language education, and suggest an alternative approach to Korean heritage language teaching and learning practices.

6.0. Pedagogical Discussion: Multilingual and Multicultural Practices

In this section, I will discuss pedagogical implications that result from the findings on the centre discourses, which included the curriculum and the teacher’s linguistic and teaching practices in my study. The language classroom under investigation for this study was the place where language learners of diverse racial, ethnic and gender backgrounds brought their identities, cultures, languages, desires and goals together. In such a multicultural and multilingual place, my study has shown that a certain group of learners benefited less from the language of instruction and the utilization of Korean related resources employed by the centre discourses. Such a situation raises questions for other educators working in a language classroom where students of diverse cultural and linguistic backgrounds are present. Do teachers need to bring
multilingual teaching practices into their language classrooms? How would the instruction of language equally benefit everyone in a language classroom?

Since the primary mission of language teachers is to create an environment that generates rich input in the target language, perhaps the question that we need to raise is not whether language teachers should engage multilingual teaching practices, but how language teachers equally impart the legitimacy to speak in a linguistically and culturally diverse classroom to the students. In line with Goldstein’s (2003) pedagogical solution that teachers need to talk about the linguistic advantages and disadvantages in a direct, forthright manner in the beginning of the school year, I would argue that teachers need to have the students discuss the language practices in the classroom directly. This would allow teachers and students to establish some expectations about when, how, and why Korean will be used as a language of instruction in class, when, how and why languages other than Korean will be used in the classroom, and when, how, and why certain linguistic resources can advantage some students and disadvantage the others. By offering a space where the students can discuss and think about the possible linguistic tensions that can accompany a multicultural and multilingual language classroom, the teacher can provide an opportunity for team or community building, and also provide a space for the issue of exclusion to emerge and to talk about the issue of working across linguistic difference with the students.

Another emerging issue along with the linguistic practices in the language classroom is how to utilize the resources that each student brings to the classroom. We have seen in my study that my Chinese international students were likely excluded from a variety of discussions pertaining to Korean culture, language and society because I as an instructor constantly seek to
use resources of either Korean students or the students who have been to Korea. If we consider that learning a foreign language implies a degree of intercultural learning in a sense that teacher and students bring diverse linguistic and cultural backgrounds into the classroom (see Kramsch, 1993), the process of learning a foreign language undoubtedly involves becoming more aware of one’s own culture in the process of learning about another. Guilherme (2002) explains this perspective of foreign language learning:

…learning/teaching a foreign language/culture implies taking an ideological view of the world beyond our cultural borders which reflects the way we perceive ourselves within our own culture and its position towards the Other… In sum, meeting the Other and her/his view of ourselves generates a process of (self)reflection, since one cannot see or hear the familiar until it is made strange (p. 155).

From this perspective, learning a foreign language is a process of building one’s intercultural skills, and a foreign language classroom where multilingual and multicultural practices are present, is viewed as a bridge for the learning of intercultural skills, as well as for raising cultural awareness. Therefore, in a Korean language classroom, for example, linguistic, cultural and social discussions pertaining to Korea should build on students’ linguistic, cultural and social understandings of their own linguistic and cultural practices in their L1. As such, in a discussion regarding a specific cultural aspect of Korea, a teacher can ask students to think about their own cultural practices in their respective countries and share them with the class before or after the discussion of Korea unfolds.

However, in the course of offering opportunities to understand students’ own L1 cultural practices, it is important for teacher not to essentialize cultural elements between students’ L1 culture and the target culture. Kramsch (1993, 1998a) argues that in teaching a foreign language, it is restraining to teach the target culture behind the language or to employ the students’ L1
According to her, cultural meanings are dialogically created through language in discourse, and thus, the production of meaning should be located across cultures in a ‘third perspective’. To this end, Kramsch challenges the monolingual native speaker norm as the target of foreign language education by arguing that traditional pedagogies based on the native speaker model defines language learners in terms of what they are not, or at least what they have not achieved or learned yet.

In the pedagogy that enables students to fully explore dialogic meaning-making in the classroom, and to dismantle the notion of native speaker norms, teacher’s practices of students’ resource sharing do not likely result in social injustice or unfairness. This is because in this pedagogy, the goal in a foreign language classroom is no longer to become closer toward the native speaker’s norms, but to help the students become efficient intercultural speakers who are able to strategically negotiate the border of each culture. In retrospect, my resource sharing strategies in my Korean language classroom may have been built around the myth of native speaker standards while neglecting to create a ‘third perspective’. By seeking resources from those who are of Korean family background or from those who have been to Korea, I as a teacher was perhaps trying to establish the Korean cultural space and contents generally acknowledged by the native speech communities and met by their standards.

In a pedagogy that encourages students to cross cultural and discursive borders, the role of the teacher is to adequately capitalize on the multilingual and multicultural practices that each student brings to the language classroom, and to identify explicitly the social and cultural voices present in class. The students’ language and culture are safeguarded when teachers respect them
and consider that they have key roles in a system of options for identity negotiation. This negotiation can take place best in intercultural contexts that a foreign language classroom can offer, since these contexts often highlight differences within which students can confirm their preferred identity through negotiating mutual meanings and coming to understand others’ identities (Jin and Gortazzi, 1998). It is, therefore, a language teacher’s job to foster and to facilitate the optimal intercultural contexts where students’ identities are negotiated at a full motion, and their linguistic and cultural capitals in L1 are not penalized, but valued and respected by teacher and negotiated by students for dialogic meaning making.

6.1. Pedagogical Discussion: Curriculum/Instruction

In this study, I have shown how the centre discourses manifested through curriculum, textbook and other teaching resources can have an impact on shaping the students’ learning experience, and negotiating their identities in a Korean language classroom. If we take the view that knowledge is intrinsically social and constructed through interaction between speech community members, which community’s knowledge paradigm becomes the operating explanation of things is settled by an exercise of power (Canagarajah, 1998). In the context of language learning, the knowledge of the dominant group can be imposed through the curriculum, which is why language teachers need to approach their curriculum with critical eyes. The question is how language educators can create the curriculum that is less imposing in terms of cultural and social representations and at the same time, that is more inclusive and accommodates needs and desires of language learners of diverse racial, ethnic, gender or linguistic backgrounds.
Following Pennycook (2000), I would like to approach this issue with inclusivity. An inclusivity points to the importance of making sure that people of different backgrounds are represented in our textbooks and our classroom possibilities. My study has shown that the textbook that we used in the Korean language classroom legitimized White English Speaking learners, thereby excluding learners of different L1, and different ethnic backgrounds. In addition, many KFL (Korean as a Foreign Language) textbooks still portray gender stereotypes: Korean husbands have professional outside jobs whereas Korean wives are full time stay at home mothers. Such gender stereotyping is not only limited to the family, but extended to the workplace: Korean men occupy supervising boss positions whereas Korean women work as a secretaries or assistants doing support work. An argument for greater inclusivity acknowledges that both inside and outside the classroom we live in a world that is moving away from such gender stereotyping, and moving toward gender diversity. Adding to this, Pennycook (2000) highlights the importance of taking such factors as alternative lifestyles or diverse family types (e.g. gay or lesbian parents) into consideration.

In the same fashion, an inclusive focus also points to the significance of acknowledging different learner groups of diverse linguistic, racial and ethnic backgrounds. As such, textbooks of Korean language, for example, can portray racially, ethnically or linguistically diverse group of Korean language learners, thereby imparting a legitimate learnership to the learners of color or of primary language other than English. Moreover, in line with inclusivity, Korean textbook makers may consider moving beyond the standardized version of Korean language as an example for the learners to follow, and also might recognize diversity, for example by promoting awareness of the lifestyles of those living in rural areas of Korea. In this way, the current status of Korean language education overseas can move one step closer to a more inclusive education.
However, I also recognize that creating a textbook that meets all standards of an inclusive education is not an easy task. After all, we must realize that textbook is itself motivated by social practice and thus, destined to depict certain social and cultural representations, thereby making it impossible to be free of ideology. Canagarajah (1998) responds to this by arguing that any existing textbook can be a good tool for negotiating cultures. He explains that the activities of communicative pedagogies that often equate to a non-reflexivity and insensitivity to the ideological implications, can be used to make students develop meta-cultural awareness through the critical interrogations of the communicative rules prescribed. In so doing, the teacher needs to problematize the cultural messages of the textbook so that students will attain a critical understanding of the competing communicative practices. Therefore, the gender stereotyping seen in the Korean textbook in this study can be raised as a topic for discussion in the classroom, thereby offering an opportunity for the students to fully explore the issue critically. As Canagarajah (1998) reminds us, the teacher’s job is not to find a correct answer, but to enable students to move in and out of cultures as the critical evaluation of the textbook develops sociolinguistic competence.

As far as the content of the curriculum is concerned, Auerbach’s (2000) participatory pedagogy offers useful and valuable insights for my study. Participatory pedagogy that Auerbach advocates differs from learner centered education that she believes to focus on individual learners and their mental processes without a consideration of the social context where L2 is taking place. Unlike learner centered education, according to Auerbach, participatory pedagogy not only takes the social context of L2 acquisition into consideration, but also prepares learners to challenge inequities in the broader society. In participatory pedagogy, therefore, curriculum content builds on collaborative investigation of critical issues affecting learners, and learners
challenge the conditions that have left them marginalized and powerless by sharing and comparing experiences, reflecting critically on them, and developing collective strategies for change.

Participatory pedagogy advocated by Auerbach is, in fact, in line with Canagarajah’s (1998) pedagogical stance that involves reflexivity on the discourses, which, he argues, could develop a critical awareness of the processes and practices involved in educational activity. Canagarajah argues that to critically reflect on the hidden values, agendas, and interests embodied in the learning activity is potentially empowering for students since knowledge and the methods employed in educational settings are value-ridden. In a broader scale, both Auerbach’s and Canagarajah’s pedagogical stances can be said to build on Critical Pedagogy (CP), which aims at blending a ‘language of critique’ with a ‘language of possibility’ in education, according to Giroux (1992). The combination of a language of critique with a language of possibility turns education into a form of cultural politics, which involves a deconstructive view of reality and a challenge to fixed interpretative frames. In other words, CP recognizes the importance of education that involves the addition of information, from the interpretation and critique of knowledge and society, to the transformation of reality, in a process of knowledge appropriation and application (Guilherme, 2002). This mode of education is useful particularly as language education is concerned in that it develops the competence necessary to cope with the hybrid cultural context of our multicultural and transnational communities.

The best known pedagogical response to the postcolonial, multicultural and transnational context we live in nowadays would be Giroux’s (1992) ‘border pedagogy’. Border pedagogy challenges a Eurocentric perspective which had imposed epistemological, ethical, political
models on the whole world, and favors the inclusion of the cultures that were once marginal or inferior into the curriculum content. Moreover, border pedagogy aims at legitimizing students’ identities and expanding the range of possible options by promoting their critical experience of different cultural codes, and enabling them to make full use of their capabilities (Guilherme, 2002). It tries to present alternatives to the students’ frames of mind and widening their horizons critically since “such borderlands should be seen as sites for both critical analysis and as a potential source of experimentation, creativity, and possibility” (Giroux, 1992: 34). Giroux’s border pedagogical framework is very enlightening since it suggests positive changes in both curriculum content as well as an approach to teaching and learning in a way that enables students to fully participate in an educational activity. Therefore, not only are the subjects that were previously neglected incorporated into the curriculum, but also the subjects that emerge as a response to post-colonial and transnational world that we live in today. Popular culture would be a good candidate for integration into the language teaching curriculum. My study has shown that many of my students in a Korean language classroom invested themselves into Korean popular cultural products such as dramas, movies and fashion as a way of making their agency work in a full motion. It is one of the primary missions of the teacher to identify the different sites in which students invest their identities and desires and to develop curriculum materials that engage our students’ raced, classed, gendered, sexualized, and abled identities (Ibrahim, 1999).

While incorporating popular culture into the language learning curriculum is not new as far as teaching Korean language is concerned, the educational activities that utilize the Korean popular cultural products should also incorporate ways in which students could evaluate all cultural representations critically. Giroux (1988) is clear on this issue by stating as follows:
The knowledge of the ‘other’ is engaged not simply to celebrate its presence, but also because it must be interrogated critically with respect to the ideologies it contains, the means of representations it utilizes, and the underlying social practices it confirms (cit. in Guilherme, 2002, p. 45).

From this view, studying Korean popular cultural products not only involves acknowledging the social, cultural, historical or political facts, but also unraveling the complexity of hidden meanings or underlying values, and how these integrate into the micro- and macro-contexts. The role of teachers is to help students engage knowledge as border-crossers, and translate it into their own contexts.

What has been lacking in the previous literature that had strived to provide hidden meanings or underlying values of Korean cultural products is that it failed to let the students participate in the dialogic meaning making practices. For example, let us suppose that a teacher decides to introduce a Korean drama that portrays a beautiful, energetic, single, career oriented female protagonist in an urban area. She starts her day by walking her dog. After her executive work in the company is over, she goes shopping and runs on a treadmill. On the weekend, she is fencing, playing pool, and dancing. After observing this Korean woman’s lifestyle, a teacher would begin asking questions to students such as “What do you think about this woman’s life?”, “Do you think that this woman reflects a modern Korean society where more and more women have professional careers for their own fulfillment?”, “What is the percentage of women in the workforce in your respective countries?” I am not suggesting that these questions are not of any importance to encourage students to critically think and evaluate values and realities reflected upon by the protagonist of the drama. Rather, what I am trying to argue is that these kinds of questions may lead the students to explain ideologies and meanings from one dimensional point of view. This Korean woman may have rich parents who enabled her to lead a comfortable life
by imparting much of their economic capital. From this view, she may reflect part of a Korean society stratified by the economic rich and poor with a social status quo steadily and continuously maintained. On another dimension, this female protagonist may echo a Korean society where there is a large gap in terms of life style, economy, and capital between urban and rural population. On the other hand, she can mirror the burdens of many career oriented Korean having to deal with pressure within the family (e.g. marriage) as well as in the workplace (e.g. promotion). What is important here is that teachers should not make a mistake by providing students with politically correct interpretations or evaluations of the woman portrayed through a Korean drama. Instead, what teachers need to do is to make these possible interpretations or explanations available to the students, and help them bring about their own understandings and interpretations. As Kramsch (1993, 1998a) reminds us, students’ understandings about the target culture are located in a ‘third perspective’ through the mediation with their L1 culture. It is, therefore, important for the teacher to help the students become critically aware of the meanings and interests of the ‘other’ in Giroux’s (1992) term, and to identify and clarify their own struggles, points of view, predispositions, which are likely to help them make more enlightened choices.

6.2. Pedagogical Discussion: Silence

In my study, we have seen that Chinese international students were often positioned to be silent in class. As discussed in the previous chapters, this silence signaled the Chinese international participants’ insecurity stemming from their perceived lack of English proficiency. Pedagogy that works toward helping students to negotiate silences may be to foster an environment where each student’s voices can be respected and heard regardless of their L1 status.
or race, ethnicity or gender. Teacher’s sharing their own ESL identities with the students can be very positive and helpful in making the students like Ming in my study feel more at ease to speak out in class. By telling their own stories and experience as an ESL speaker, teachers can build a common ground with the students, and also offer a space where the students can deconstruct the myths and stereotypes they hold about accents and different varieties of English (Goldstein, 2003).

Providing the students with an opportunity to prepare for a group discussion or a task prior to the classroom hours can also serve as a good strategy to work with the students who are positioned to be silent. For example, teachers can encourage students to bring something they have previously prepared for their next class or to show the work to teachers or sympathetic classmates before the class meets for approval or suggestions for improvement (Goldstein, 2003). I also believe that written communications between teacher and the student can be as a powerful tool as spoken communications as to empower silent students in language classroom. In this study, bi-weekly journals that I had collected as part of course assignments provided me with a lens through which I could unravel and understand my Chinese international students’ desires, conflicts, and dilemmas that I could not have otherwise fully scrutinized. Therefore, it is important for teachers to constantly seek a way to communicate with those who are positioned to be silent through a variety of written communication methods including email correspondences. In this regard, distance language courses can offer many benefits as far as language education is concerned, by which, I argue, a certain level of equality can maintain amongst students as well as between teacher and the students, and where those who are silent for a variety of reasons can be empowered.
6.3. Pedagogical Discussion: Pairing/Grouping

One of the emerging issues regarding the student’s pair or group work was that linguistically and ethnically mixed pairing or grouping that I intentionally and strategically used in my Korean language classroom was not working as effectively as I thought it might. I was hoping that through linguistically and culturally diverse pairing and grouping, pairs or members within the group would assist one another, exchange resources pertaining to Korea(n), and share common interest areas (e.g. Korean dramas, songs, etc). However, my Chinese participants did not find my way of pairing or grouping particularly helpful because their Korean partners’ Korean was simply better than theirs, and thus, the Koreans in the pair/group likely took charge of whatever task I assigned to each group. Although some sympathetic Korean students like Jinwoo or Sohee were willing to help non-Korean students by explaining grammatical points or the meanings of difficult vocabulary, some Chinese students felt that they were being treated as complete novices in Korean language and culture. This kind of relationship is not necessarily conducive to an enabling and healthy learning environment because it generates power imbalances amongst the group members. Moreover, this kind of pair or group work becomes problematic in that it does not readily allow those who are less proficient in the target language to learn from the task. The role play project was a prime example of this in my study. Ming told me in an interview that the role project that I assigned was not particularly useful because one Korean student in her group ended up writing an entire script for the group’s role play. Consequently, Ming simply memorized her lines to do her part for the role play, sometimes without even understanding the meanings of her sentences.
What needs to be addressed here would not be my pairing or grouping strategy, but how I as a teacher should have done something for the students to engage the task in a way that everyone in a group can benefit from one another. What should I have done for those who are less proficient in Korean not to feel that they are overwhelmed by the presence of Korean peers in their pair/group who are superior in terms of Korean language and other Korea related resources, let alone English? One way of dealing with this problem would be to monitor the progress students are making on pair/group projects rather than group products. This particular strategy was suggested by Goldstein (2003) as a way of alleviating tensions amongst the students in a multilingual and multicultural classroom when working on their group work assignments. Adopting this strategy, teachers can ask students to document their individual responsibilities to the group in writing. For example, in the role play project, teachers can ask each group member to write their parts of the storyline in Korean once each group comes up with an outline for their story: in order to monitor the group process, teachers may offer classroom time for each group to get together to create a script for the role play. In this case, ideally, teachers need to make it clear that scripts should be created within the boundary of what the students have learned so far. If the story is full of difficult vocabulary and sentence structures that the students have not learned yet, then those who are less proficient in the target language will have a hard time memorizing their lines and playing their roles during the role play. In addition, those who are less proficient in the target language will also enjoy other groups’ role plays less because they will have difficulties in understanding what happens in the role play. However, what is important here is for the teacher to be flexible about students’ incorporating unlearned vocabulary and sentence structures into their role play. In my own teaching experience, I noticed each student’s abilities to manage unlearned vocabulary and sentence structures vary, and it is important for teachers to impart a
certain level of freedom to students, thereby enabling them to create scripts with their own thoughts and voices. Once each student finishes composing their parts of the script, each group can get together and create a final script by piecing each member’s contributions together.

One way to find out whether or not pair/group work was as effective as the teacher would hope is to ask students directly about their linguistic practices, learning experience, or power dynamics that may be present in pair/group work. For example, once the pair/group work is complete, teachers can evaluate each student’s experience by having them write out the things they liked and disliked about pair/group work and to present the results to the class. This kind of activity can facilitate critical knowledge that is appropriated and made meaningful by teachers and learners alike. Critical awareness, which is an important part of Critical Pedagogy, provides principles that enable teachers to create a different approach that stems from a new perspective into intercultural knowledge, its relation to life, and how it is positioned towards and exchanged by teachers and students of foreign languages and cultures (Hones, 1999).

In order to effectively manage the linguistic, racial or ethnic tensions that can emerge in such mixed pairs/groups, it may be helpful to be flexible in grouping arrangements and alternating the kinds of groups in which we ask students to work (Goldstein, 2003). Alternating grouping arrangements provides teachers with a space to encourage rather than restrict students’ L1. Although students working in their primary language lose an opportunity to practice the target language, they gain the opportunity to speak about academic materials in ways that are enabling and might better prepare them for the kind of interaction, discussion or debate, etc. In fact, considering that my Chinese participants learned Korean better by utilizing their L1 and having interactions with their Chinese peers, my findings support that the use of student’s L1 in a
foreign language classroom does not hamper the acquisition of the target language, but enhances it.

### 6.4. Implications for Heritage Language Education

In this section, I will discuss pedagogical implications for Korean heritage language learners. First, I will explain my views of what heritage language education should consider at a post-secondary level. Then, I will address the issue of curriculum and instruction. In so doing, I will suggest ways in which to empower heritage language learners and to help them to mediate linguistic and cultural knowledge and to participate in dialogic meaning making practices. Along the way, I will also discuss a future direction.

#### 6.4.1. New Approach to Heritage Language Education

As far as Korean heritage language education is concerned, there has been much academic literature published about the relations between identity and heritage language (Cho, 2000; Cho, Cho & Tse, 1997; Lee, 2002). If these studies approach the topic of identity from the prospective approach in a sense that they predicted the level of one’s ethnic or cultural identity based on the amount that they maintained their heritage language, my study employed a retrospective approach in a sense that I probed ways in which one’s identity influences their investments in the heritage language. In fact, my study has shown that the investigation of my Korean Canadian participants’ hyphenated identities made a significant basis on which to understand their investments into maintaining Korean language, thereby proving that the question of identities is not apart from learners’ language learning practices, but deeply intertwined with them. Here, I would like to raise a question: why have such important issues as learners’ hyphenated identities, their past histories, perceptions, or positions in the dominant
society not been adequately addressed in the field of heritage language education? Although one
may argue that these are the subjects that should be explored in other disciplines such as
sociology or Asian studies, I would still argue that the subject of heritage language maintenance
cannot be properly researched or considered apart from heritage language learners’ hyphenated
identities, let alone where pedagogical implications of heritage language education are concerned.

In fact, so much of what we read about in heritage language education, or hear in teacher
education classes, tends to conceive of classes as closed boxes. I would like to propose an
alternative view that recognizes the heritage language classroom as a complex social and cultural
space where heritage language learners bring their past histories, identities, desires and goals
(Canagarajah, 1993, 1999; Morgan, 1998; Norton, 1995; Pennycook, 2000). From this view, not
only should we recognize linguistic practices such as methods, competencies, strategies,
grammar, tasks or drills when educating heritage language learners, but also the path that the
heritage language learners have taken in the past, their positioning in the ethnic community as
well as in the dominant society, or their ties with the native speech community.

As a way of making heritage language learners familiar with the issues mentioned above,
teachers would ideally be open to talking about their life trajectories or their feelings. If the
students are shy about openly discussing these issues with the teacher, journal writings can be a
great method of communication between teacher and the student as recommended by other
researchers (Auerbach, 2000; Goldstein, 2003). Providing the learners with an opportunity to
explicitly discuss ways in which they have negotiated their hyphenated identities within family
or Korean church if they attended one, or in Canadian elementary or high school that they
attended, and what brought them to relearn their heritage language. My study has shown that
ethnic identity capital, the capital that can be a positive effect in their life, serves an important
source for my Korean participants to invest themselves into maintaining their heritage language. Therefore, it may also be helpful for a teacher to locate the learner’s ethnic identity capital as it also pertains to their investments in their heritage language.

6.4.2. Curriculum/Instruction

As far as Korean language classroom at a post-secondary level is concerned, many studies have thus far suggested solutions through which Korean heritage language learners and foreign language learners can be efficiently integrated in one learning context, and equally benefit from the instruction (see Kim, 2008; Lee and Kim, 2008; Ree, 1998; Yu, 2008). My position for the curriculum in this mixed Korean language classroom is mostly congruent with the curriculum suggested by this previous research: individualized instruction catering to the needs of heritage language learners and foreign language learners, resource sharing (see the previous section of my study for further discussion), different assignments for heritage language learners and foreign language learners. Although I appreciate the value and contributions that these studies have made in regard to method, curriculum or strategies, I would also argue that this linguistically, ethnically and racially mixed learning environment is something that Korean language educators should celebrate instead of posing as a problem. In my opinion, this mixed learning environment becomes a problem when educators consider the needs of the different groups of students and create the curriculum solely based on needs assessment. Although this traditional approach to the curriculum can inform our teaching practices from creating teaching materials to engaging students to the activities or assignments, I would also suggest that educators approach the needs assessment with a critical eye. As Auerbach (2000) contends, needs are often defined in terms of deficiencies, skills or competencies that students lack, but which experts have determined are necessary to meet socially or institutionally defined standards.
This is not to say that these factors are not significant in creating the curriculum, but to say that educators should explore students’ strengths, interests, concerns, and expectations with them rather than putting too much emphasis on testing or measuring skills in relation to specified externally defined outcomes.

Furthermore, anyone teaching mixed group of students should be also aware of the downside of individualizing the curriculum. As I mentioned in the previous chapter, segregating heritage language learners from foreign language learners for more individualized instruction may not work most efficiently in a linguistically, racially and ethnically mixed Korean language classroom. In one school year, I employed a more individualized method by having heritage language learners do the content based reading practices, and by having foreign language learners engage in a listening exercise in the other classroom. To my surprise, my students did not find this method very efficient. Although they may have benefited from this individualized instruction in terms of improving their language skills, they also wanted to participate in a collaborative learning (Guttierez & Larson, 1994) whereby the students can take part in a negotiation process of various linguistic and cultural meanings and codes, and of connecting their lives and perspectives to language instruction. To support this, Toohey (1998) argues that individualizing practices can actually contribute to the construction of stratification and the perpetuation of inequalities within classroom communities, thereby causing the whole learning experience to work against community building. For this reason, before engaging in individualized curriculum, teachers need to be sensitive to what is important to the students and link them to language instruction.

Heritage language educators should also help heritage language learners to mediate their acquired linguistic, cultural and social understandings of their heritage language, and to
(re)negotiate their experiences with their family, ethnic community organization, and their minority positions in the dominant society. Some of the studies of heritage language learners depict the students’ struggle to rectify their knowledge of heritage language, with which they were socialized in informal contexts and to learn the standard forms of speaking and writing introduced by native speech communities (Jo, 2001; Wiley, 2008). The divergence between academic instructions from the practices of home/community may require negotiation or mediation on the part of learners if the curriculum is to be successful. It is therefore important for teacher to acknowledge the linguistic varieties and cultural understandings of the native speech community as they are, and present a standard linguistic variety or other dimensions of cultural or social representations to the learners. What is important here is that teachers do not focus on presenting a right or correct answer but on suggesting many alternatives as an example. By helping the students to create a ‘third perspective’ (Kramsch, 1993, 1998a), the ultimate decision can be made by each student.

Here, I will scrutinize Kramsch’s (1993) cross-cultural framework more in detail in order to uncover implications for our heritage teaching and learning practices. In order to build that ‘third place’ which, in Kramsch’s terms, corresponds to cross-cultural understandings, she recommends four steps:

1. Reconstruct the context of production and reception of the text within the foreign culture (C2)
2. Construct with the foreign learners their own context of reception, i.e. find an equivalent phenomenon in C1 and construct that C1 phenomenon with its own network of meanings (C1)
3. Examine the way in which C1 and C2 contexts in part determine C1 and C2, i.e. the way each culture views the other.
4. Lay the ground for a dialogue that could lead to change. (p. 210)
Kramsch (1998b) later reverses the order between step 1 and 2, clarifying that the two occur simultaneously. In the application of Kramsch’s framework to heritage language learning, C1 points to heritage language learners’ acquired understandings of their heritage language and culture (i.e. knowledge that they gained through interaction in their family, community organization), and likewise, C2 refers to their acquired understandings of heritage language and culture through a formal education. In some cases, there is likely no discrepancy between the former and the latter. In others, there are gaps as we have seen from the case of Daniel in my study. To Daniel who has a traditional Korean family, and who has mostly acquired Korean from the interaction with his parents who moved to Canada in early 70s, a modernized version of Korean (i.e. lots of English loanwords) or modern Korean lifestyle that he had contact through a Korean language course may have come as a shock. Therefore, to Daniel, learning Korean can be depicted as a process of negotiating the meanings and codes that he has learned through his family or other fellow Koreans, and the meanings and codes that he came in contact with through a Korean language course.

Although students like Daniel are getting fewer and fewer due to a well developed technology and readily available transnational trips to Korea, Kramsch’s framework may shed a useful light into heritage language learning in terms of conceiving of learning as a dialogic meaning making process. As such, with students who benefit from technology and transnational trips such as Jinwoo in my study, the teacher can bring his or her views of the fast changing Korean language and culture into discussion. Jinwoo who had the first contact with Korean language in Korea a couple of decades later than the teacher can contribute to the discussion by expressing his ways of utilizing Korean language, or of growing up in a relatively economically
affluent Korean society. Such a contribution made by Jinwoo can be a strong basis on which to build a dialogic meaning making with the points of view of the teacher.

As the world has steadily become globalized, the nature of immigration and technology has changed. Heritage language learners increasingly find it easy to maintain ties with their homeland and to retain their heritage language and culture. Children of immigrant families can now benefit from a variety of popular cultural products created in their homeland society and readily delivered to them in their adopted country through internet or TV. In keeping up with this changing social trend, today’s Korean heritage language curriculum should incorporate such topics as transnational trips and popular culture, as discussed earlier. These topic areas not only help the students to understand the language and culture of their native speech community, but also help them to be sensitive to cultural fluidity.

6.5. Chapter Conclusion

In this chapter, I have discussed various pedagogical issues surrounding teaching Korean as a foreign or heritage language, and suggested pedagogical implications based on the findings of my study. I have argued that everything that learners bring, from their past histories, identities, to desires or conflicts, have a significant impact on what happens in the classroom, and that everything that teachers do, from how they teach, what they teach, and how they respond to students, to the materials they use, the way we evaluate students, greatly influences students’ learning experiences. In a pedagogy that continually strives to empower students, curriculum should be a continual process of uncovering what is significant to students and connecting these issues to language instruction. As a facilitator and mediator, it is a teacher’s mission to help students to develop critical reflexivity and to participate in dialogic meaning making processes.
Chapter VII: Conclusions

In this critical ethnography, my primary goal was to show language learners’ day to day classroom lives, their identity negotiations, their learning experiences, or their conflicts or desires, and to probe their relations to the investments in Korean language. As the Korean language classroom under investigation comprises two groups of learners, those learning Korean as a foreign language and those maintaining Korean as a heritage language, my research unfolded at two levels. In the context of the foreign language classroom, I have explored ways in which centre discourses in the language classroom include and exclude students, and how the Chinese participants placed on the periphery cope with their marginalization. In the context of heritage language learning, I have examined ways in which Korean heritage language learners negotiate and shape their hyphenated identities, and investigated how their hyphenated identities are connected with their investments in their heritage language. My study has shown that language learners’ race, ethnicity and gender are salient parts of their identities, and thus, impact their learning experiences to varying degrees and levels.

My research findings support Norton’s (1995) conception of the language learners as having a complex social identity and as active agents who may resist the marginalized subject position. The Chinese international students who do not possess as much capital or as many resources as their peers in either Korean and English, find ways of performing their identities apart from the centre group of students and from the centre discourses. If silence and the use of their L1 were strategies that they utilized inside the classroom, they engage in a safe house style negotiation (Canagarajah, 2004) outside the classroom where they can enact their identities by investing themselves into Korean popular culture. On the other hand, students of European backgrounds in the Korean language classroom who are placed in a minority position primarily
due to their racial and ethnic status showed a tendency to ally with the centre group of second
generation Korean students, and linked their investments into Korean language to their
transnational trips to Korea and their Korean social networks.

In the context of heritage language learning, I have shown ways in which heritage
language learners construct their hyphenated identities in their home, Korean church, and
Canadian schools in order to prove that heritage language learning is not unrelated to their
hyphenated identities, past histories, and positioning within and outside their Korean world. My
research, therefore, suggests that heritage language learners’ hyphenated identities are deeply
tied into the maintenance of their heritage language, comprising a base on which they
(re)organize their world around them. It was also found that ethnic identity capital (Kibria, 2002),
which the heritage language learners embrace and envision in relation to their perceptions of
their native speech community as well as its status, was inextricably intertwined with the
heritage language learners’ investments in their heritage language. In what follows, I will discuss
contributions and limitations of my study, and then examine future directions.

7.0. Contributions of the Study

As I have discussed throughout this study, much research concerning language learning
has been undertaken from a cognitive perspective, viewing learning as individual acquisition,
conceiving of language learning as acquiring a body of knowledge and information. Within the
last fifteen years, more and more research has used critical/poststructural perspectives in
conducting ethnographic research on the social, cultural and political dimensions of language
learning (Blackledge, 2000, 2001; Giampapa, 2004; Goldstein, 1997, 2003; Ibrahim, 1999;
Morgan, 1997; Norton Peirce, 1995, 1997a; Pavlenko, 2001). My study contributes to this small
body of research by showing that power relations and social context cannot be divorced from
considerations of language learning, and by proving that the language classroom is not only a place that knowledge and meanings are exchanged, but also a site of struggle where various ethnicities, races and genders are at play and intersecting one another, and where certain forms of social and cultural representations or ideologies are produced and legitimized.

Another value of my study lies in the fact that this is one of the very few ethnographic studies conducted in the language classroom at a post-secondary level. While much of the ethnographic research taking a critical and poststructural approach has followed the language trajectories of several focal participants, my study has provided a thick description of the university classroom dynamics in the context of foreign language learning. Also, considering how scarce ethnographic research has been in the field of teaching Korean as a foreign language, my study has undoubtedly shed a useful light into the field.

My research findings also illuminate our understandings of various pedagogical issues, which range from what and how to teach, what materials to use, how teachers respond to students, to equally empowering students from diverse racial, ethnic and L1 backgrounds, and helping teachers to be sensitive to the relations between ideologies and power in the language classroom. Since I was aware that the work in the line of critical pedagogy can be overly theoretical or academic (see Morgan, 1998), I strived to be as specific as I could in the pedagogical discussions, and also to provide concrete examples of how theories can be exercised and practiced in the classroom wherever possible.

Conceptualizing the heritage language classroom from critical and poststructural perspectives also offers an alternative point of view in the field of heritage language education, where identities should be considered as a salient part of heritage language learning. My study has shown that each heritage language learner negotiates their hyphenated identities differently
around their home, Korean church, and Canadian schools, and that they go through heterogeneous socialization patterns and perceptions, goals and desires or challenges accordingly. This is an important finding because it calls on heritage language teachers to be more sensitive to the relations between their learners’ hyphenated identities and their heritage language learning. Moreover, my pedagogical implication points to the fact that heritage language learning involves a great deal of mediation between the linguistic and cultural meanings and understandings that heritage language learners have acquired previously, and the points of view and meanings they learn through a formal learning of a Korean language. My study, therefore, makes it clear that it is important for teachers to help heritage language learners participate in a dialogic meaning making practices (Kramsch, 1993, 1998a).

7.1. Limitations of the Study

As Pennycook (2000) reminds us, the language classroom should be seen as a “microcosm of the larger social and cultural world” (p. 102). This, in turn, implies that everything outside the classroom, from language policies to cultural contexts of schooling, may have an impact on what happens in the classroom. Although my study has examined ways in which power relations are constructed between centre and periphery as well as within the students groups, my investigation of centre discourses are primarily restricted to the curriculum, the textbook and the instructor. Future studies probing the language classroom as their investigation site may want to incorporate broader contexts such as the post-secondary institution where the language classroom is situated or the institution’s language policy into centre discourses in order to entail policy related implications.

Another limitation arises from the fact that I as a researcher investigated my own language classroom. As I discussed in the methodology chapter, my role as a teacher provided
me with many advantages as an insider who knows the weaknesses and strengths of each student very well. However, at the same time, because I was not a detached observer, one may argue that I may have been too familiar with the learning context and culture under investigation, thereby possibly missing some important events for the data analysis or interpretations, and potentially failing to engage in a more objective examination. However, it is important to remember that any ethnography represents researcher’s interpretations of classroom events and privileges their voices as a researcher. Van Maanen (1995) reminds us that the problem of perspectival seeing always remains in any piece of research.

7.2. Future Directions: Language Education and Globalization

In this conclusion, I have discussed various pedagogical issues based on the findings of my study, and provided contributions and limitations of the study. Having already suggested future directions pertaining to the practical issues such as curriculum, teaching strategies and methods, as well as to the theoretical issues such as the conception of language classroom or a policy related approach, I would now like to examine future directions from the globalization perspective.

Across three different groups of the students under investigation in this study, commonalities in their investments into Korean language revolve around Korean popular cultures, transnational trips to Korea and social networking with Koreans. Outwardly, the commonalities behind their investments into learning Korean language are not related to one another. However, on closer observation we realize that these things are conjoined under the phenomenon of globalization that distributes all sorts of symbolic and material goods by exchanging popular cultures or by creating a new dimension of building social networks (i.e. online community). From this view, future studies should consider what impacts globalization
can possibly bring in approaching a political dimension of language education. For example, the new literacy demanded by new technologies may bring unforeseen power dynamics to the context of language learning. As languages are being treated more and more as economic commodities (Heller, 2002), learners’ investments in learning the language, their choices about which language to learn, and how institutions allocate resources for language education will also shift and change.

Globalization also puts the issue of identities into question. As globalization weakens the traditional representations of nations (Block and Cameron, 2002; Kumaravadivelu, 2008), discourses of nationhood and national identity that have relied heavily on the idea of distinctive ethnic ‘Korean-ness’ becomes problematic. In fact, Harris, Leung and Rampton (2002) show that the continuing interaction between diasporic communities and native speech communities makes possible plural or hybrid identities, challenging the assumption that people must identify with a single national identification.

Lastly, globalization changes the nature of foreign language education. As seen in my study, more frequent movements across national borders produce a more diverse population within a globalizing and transnational community. The presence of Chinese international students in the Canadian Korean language classroom in my study was a good example of this transnational movement, and these transnational human movements challenge the monolingual norms of language learners in the foreign language classroom. As seen from these examples, globalization will undoubtedly play a significant role in language learning and teaching practices more and more in the future. Future studies need to carefully investigate the impacts of globalization on all dimensions of language education, and to explore optimal ways for the field of language education to move forward with global minds and perspectives.
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Appendix A:

Table 1: Participant Profiles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Second Generation Koreans</th>
<th>1.5 generation Koreans</th>
<th>Chinese enrolled as international students</th>
<th>Second generation Chinese</th>
<th>Canadians of European backgrounds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daniel (m) – 22 years old</td>
<td>Sohee (f) – 26 years old</td>
<td>Yan (f) – 23 years old</td>
<td>Melissa (f) – 19 years old</td>
<td>John (m) – 30 years old</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jinwoo (m) – 20 years old</td>
<td>Ming (f) – 22 years old</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ray (m) – 23 years old</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis (m) – 20 years old</td>
<td>Ping (m) – 24 years old</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Shan (m) – 24 years old</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B:

Background Survey

Korean 200 (06-07)

1. Name:

2. Email:

3. Major/Department:

4. Year of your present program:

5. Years that you attended a Korean Saturday School (Hangul Hakkyo), if applicable (specify the number of years attended)

6. Years that you took OAC (Ontario Accredited Credits) Korean in high school, if applicable:

7. If you were not born in Canada, specify when you moved to Canada.

8. Note any previous experiences with learning Korean language (e.g. tutoring, living in Korea…)

9. Circle the language skills you want to improve through this course?
   
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Listening</th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Grammar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>Other Skills (specify)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. Other languages that you can speak, read or write:

11. What motivated you to take this course? What is the main purpose of your learning Korean?
Appendix C:

Instruction for a Written Journal

The written journals are part of the course assignments. In the journal, the students are expected to write any changes in their lives, whether it is campus or family life, related to learning Korean. Recommended subjects for the journals are (1) their observations or feelings in the Korean class (2) changes in their feelings or attitudes toward Korean people, culture, language (3) any changes in their identity pertaining to their experience in learning Korean (4) any changes that they noticed in their Korean language skills (5) any changes that they noticed in their desire or motivation to learn Korean. The students can choose their own style (i.e. essay, diary…) in writing a journal. The journal can be written either in English or in Korean, whichever the student prefers, and the length of the journal is about one page (8 x11 paper). Each journal will be collected bi-weekly on Sept 19, October 3, 17, 31, November 14, 28, 2006, January 23, February 6, 20, March 6, 20, 2007.
Appendix D:

Questions for Semi-structured Interviews

Family Background
   How many members are there in your family?
   Where is your father from?
   What is your father’s occupation?
   Where is your mother from?
   What is your mother’s occupation?

For Korean students:
   To what degree do you think that your parents are Korean? (e.g. do they practice Korean
customs every day?)
   Do your parents encourage you to speak Korean?
   When your parents speak Korean to you, do you answer them back in Korean or in
   English

Geographical Background
   Where were you born? If you were not born in Canada, which Canadian city did you
grow up in?
   Can you describe your hometown?
   Did the city where you grew up have Koreans? If yes, did you socialize with other
   Koreans?
   Did the city where you grew up have other minority groups?
   When you were growing up, which group of children did you mainly socialize with?

Korean Communities
For Korean students:
   When you were growing up, did you attend any kinds of Korean community organization?
   (e.g. churches)
   To what degree, in your opinion, these community organizations are beneficial to Korean
   communities?
   When you were growing up, were the Korean broadcasts or newspapers available?
   If you build a community organization for Korean people, what kind of organization
   would that be?

Education
   Which elementary school did you attend?
   Which high school did you attend?
   What is your major at the University?
   Did you ever join any kind of Korean clubs on the campus?
   Do your parents encourage you to study a certain subject area?

For Korean students:
   Did you attend Korean weekend school?
- How long did you attend the Korean school?
- Who taught your classes? How many students were there?
- What kind of activities did you do?
- Were the classes organized by content?
- What cultural activities concerning Korean culture did you do in class?
- How would you evaluate the Korean school overall?
- What kind of improvement do you think the school needs?

Korean Language
Why do you want to learn Korean?
Do you think that Korean language proficiency is beneficial to you?
How would it be beneficial to you?
What language skills do you think you need to improve most?

Korean Culture
What do you think about Korean culture compared to your native culture?
What do you like about Korean culture?
What do you not like about Korean culture?

Korean People
What do you think about Korean people compared to the people in your country?
What do you like about Koreans?
What do you dislike about Koreans?

Identity
How do feel as a woman or man in the class?
How do feel as a first (second, third, fourth) year student in class?

Korean Identity
For Korean students:
Do you think that you have identity as a Korean?
If yes, where do you think that that Korean identity has been formed?
When do you feel that you are a Korean?
What does it mean to be a Korean in Canada?
Do you think that Korean language proficiency helps one to retain one’s Korean identity?
Describe several important things that one should have to have in order to facilitate that Korean identity?
If you were/are married and have kids, would you teach Korean to your kids?

Identity as Student Learning Korean as a Foreign Language
For non-Korean students:
How is it that learning Korean brings about changes in your identity?
What is it that distinguishes yourself from other people by learning Korean language?
How do you feel as part of a minority (e.g. of European descent) in the class?
How do you feel as part of a majority (of Chinese descent) in the class?
Appendix E: Transcription Conventions (following Giampapa [2004])

/ Short pause (up to 5 seconds)
// Long Pause of more than 5 seconds.

… Continuing talk occurs at the beginning and/or the end of a sentence indicating an interruption by another speaker. For example:

Shan: We don’t watch romantic dramas. Just watch movies, the one you showed us, that was really good…
Jee: [Festival]?
Shan: …Yes. About the funeral. It was really good to know because we have the same thing, the similar thing in China.

- (dash) truncation
--- (3 dashes) smaller parts of conversation (2 or 3 sentences) edited out as irrelevant to the excerpt
----- (5 dashes) larger parts of conversation (more than 2 or 3 sentences) edited out as irrelevant to the excerpt

IDENTITY Capitals used for emphasis
[Italics] author’s addition of English translations
[] grammatical inaccuracy produced by participant (e.g. [When I were in Shenzhen])
(laughing) author’s comments or references
(?) word uncertainty
(X) inaudible word
(XX) inaudible words
(XXX) inaudible three or more words – inaudible sentence

All Korean utterances were translated into English in Italics in brackets, unless indicated otherwise.

Transcription was based strictly on what my participants said or wrote. I did not correct grammar or otherwise modify the data content.