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ABSTRACT

This thesis contributes to the field of language teacher cognition (LTC) research by investigating LTC and development in South Korea (Korea, hereafter), where English is taught by non-native English speaking teachers (NNEST) as a mandatory foreign language in the national curriculum. English education in Korea is often described as a fever: Curricular reforms in the 1990s raised the stakes for learning English and challenged the status quo of teacher-centered instruction, but reforms were met with resistance from teachers, and Korea’s shadow English education industry has become a multi-billion dollar sector and a socioeconomic malady. Understanding LTC is important for understanding what language teachers do; however, LTC has received little attention from researchers in Korea and this thesis addresses the need for in-depth qualitative research with prolonged engagement and persistent observations.

The aim of this exploratory thesis is to problematize key issues related to LTC and English language teacher development in Korea. The scope covers initial commitments to English language teaching (ELT), stated cognitions, observed practices, and the influences of experience on the cognitions and practices of Korean public school English teachers. The theoretical framework is defined as grounded narrative inquiry, an approach that combines narrative research and grounded theory methods. Critical incident (CI) theory and case study methods also influenced the design.

The thesis comprises two studies. Study 1 was a background study using narrative frames to prompt four stories from 27 Korean English teacher participants regarding their (1) reasons for teaching English, (2) prior language learning experience, (3) pre-service education, and (4) first year teaching English. Narrative content was coded and categorized to uncover patterns and themes in participant stories. Findings from Study 1 influenced the design of Study 2, which consisted of four in-depth case studies, two with experienced primary school teachers and two with novice primary school teachers. Data collection occurred over 18 months and included reflective writing, CI logs, semi-structured interviews, and observations. This thesis contributes to the field in the following ways:

1. Using workplace commitment theory to discuss the issue of ELT turnover in Korean primary schools;
2. defining a professional knowledge base (PKB) that provided a context-sensitive, locally-appropriate framework for discussing ELT expertise;
3. discussing the stated influences of experience on LTC, including the anti-apprenticeship of observation;
4. mixed-methods analysis showing that experienced teachers were more aligned with curricular aims than were novice teachers, for example, regarding the communicativeness of lessons, teaching English through English, collaborative learning, and meaning-focused instruction; and
5. a CI model for interpreting LTC change with in-service teachers, grounded in the practice of teaching.

The thesis findings question the status quo of second language teacher education (SLTE) in Korea by drawing attention to participant knowledge gaps regarding ELT methodology and second language acquisition (SLA). This research implies that a more situated view of learning to teach is necessary in Korea in order to increase the efficacy of SLTE. Recommendations for future studies include further research on ELT turnover in Korea, applying the PKB to materials development and to discussing locally effective practices, and looking for practical applications of the CI model for developing SLTE programs.

Key words: language teacher cognition, narrative inquiry, professional knowledge base, non-native English speaking teachers, English in South Korea
DEDICATION

To Mirang Jun
for reminding me why this is important

AND

To Wynn and Lou Moodie
for your commitments to education
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am forever grateful to my primary supervisor Dr. Anne Feryok for her mentorship throughout the research process, beginning when I approached her with an ambitious idea years ago. She has consistently gone above and beyond my expectations for supervision, and I owe much to her guidance on this thesis and in my career beyond. I am thankful to my secondary supervisor Prof. Jae Jung Song for agreeing to supervise a topic outside the purview of his regular work in linguistics and for his clarity, critical eye, and prompt feedback. Thanks are also due to the University of Otago for generously funding this thesis.

To my parents, Wynn and Lou Moodie, I would like to express my gratitude to you for supporting the life-long education of your children and your commitments to the field of education. Also, thanks for proofreading and offering comments, sometimes on very short notice.

Professors Boyoung Kwon, Gitaek Ryoo, and Scott Miles deserve recognition for their support of my previous work in the English & TESOL Department at Daegu Haany University. I am grateful to Dr. Hyunjeong Nam for peer debriefing my interpretation of research published in Korean. Thanks are also due to Mira Jun for help finding literature from Korea, to Prof. Andrew Finch for his help recruiting participants, and to Sookhui Kim for her generosity.

To all my friends and colleagues in our department, it was a pleasure to work with people of such diverse talents and backgrounds. In particular, I am thankful to Jo Oranje and Max Olsen for proofreading chapters and peer-debriefing the analysis, and to Jieun Lee for help translating and transcribing Korean text.

Lastly, my greatest appreciation is reserved for my best friend and companion Mirang Jun, who was the inspiration for this thesis. Your support and encouragement were invaluable.
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABSTRACT</td>
<td>ii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEDICATION</td>
<td>iv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS</td>
<td>v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIST OF TABLES</td>
<td>xii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIST OF FIGURES</td>
<td>xiii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIST OF APPENDICES</td>
<td>xiv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS</td>
<td>xv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A NOTE ON KOREAN LANGUAGE AND AUTHORSHIP</td>
<td>xvi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION  ................................................................. 1
  1.1 Background of the Problem ......................................................... 1
  1.2 Purpose of the Study, Research Questions, and Significance ............. 4
  1.3 Research Approach and Rationale ............................................... 5
  1.4 Overview of Methodology ......................................................... 6
  1.5 Definition of Key Terms .......................................................... 7
  1.6 Organization of the Thesis ....................................................... 8
     1.6.1 Literature Review (Chapters 2-4) ....................................... 8
     1.6.2 Methodology (Chapter 5) .................................................. 9
     1.6.3 Findings (Chapters 6-8) .................................................... 9
     1.6.4 Discussion (Chapter 9) ..................................................... 9
     1.6.5 Conclusion (Chapter 10) ................................................... 10
  1.7 Integration of Published Research ............................................. 10

## CHAPTER 2: BACKGROUND ON ELT IN KOREA: HISTORICAL PRECEDENTS, CONTEMPORARY ISSUES, AND THE PUBLIC SCHOOL CONTEXT ........................ 13
  2.1 From Missions to Free Market: A Brief History of Education Policy and ELT in Korea ............................................................... 13
     2.1.1 Early Roots: Missions (1883-1910) ...................................... 15
     2.1.2 Japanese Colonization (1910-1945) ..................................... 15
     2.1.3 The End of World War II: Korea Divides, US Intervenes in the South (1945-1950) ................................................................. 16
     2.1.4 The Korean War (1950-1953) and Aftermath (1954-1960) ............ 17
     2.1.5 Post-War Politics and Education Policy (1954-1960) ................. 17
     2.1.6 The Korean Miracle: Economics and education under dictatorship (1960s to 1980s) ................................................................. 18
     2.1.7 Looking Outward: English Education Policy of the 1980s and 1990s 19
     2.1.8 Curricular Reform in a Globalized World (1997-present) ............ 20
     2.1.9 The Free Market English Frenzy ............................................ 20
  2.2 Korea’s English Fever and Current Issues ..................................... 21
     2.2.1 Necessitation: The Perception of Needing English ..................... 21
     2.2.2 Examination Hell .............................................................. 22
     2.2.3 English: Equality or Enmity? ................................................. 22
CHAPTER 4: GROUNDED NARRATIVE INQUIRY AS THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK: THE EDGES OF A PARADIGM ..................................................77

4.1 The Narrative Turn in Social Science ..............................................79
  4.1.1 Four Turns in Qualitative Paradigms for Narrative Inquiry .......80

4.2 Situating Narrative Inquiry: The Edges of a Paradigm .................83
4.3 Ontology and Grounded Narrative Inquiry .....................................83
  4.3.1 Dewey’s Pragmatic Theory of Experience .................................83
  4.3.2 Narrative Selfhood as Adaptation ...........................................86
  4.3.3 Epistemology and Narrative Inquiry: Narrative and Paradigmatic
        Cognition ..................................................................................88

4.4 Methodology and Narrative Inquiry ..............................................89
  4.4.1 What is a Narrative? Key Characteristics of Narrative Data ........89
  4.4.2 Stories Big and Small ..............................................................91
  4.4.3 Two Approaches to Analysis: GNI Versus PAM NI ...................92
  4.4.4 Narrative Knowledging: NI from Beginning to End ..................93

4.5 Mapping a Paradigm .................................................................95
CHAPTER 5: METHODOLOGY .................................................................................................................................100
5.1 Overview of Grounded Theory Methods in the Thesis ......................................................................................100
5.2 Critical Incident Approach for Investigating LTC ..............................................................................................101
5.3 Emic and Etic Perspectives ...............................................................................................................................102
5.4 Researcher Positionality .........................................................................................................................................104
5.5 Study 1: Grounded Narrative Inquiry into English Learning and Teaching Experience ....................................104
5.5.1 Participants and Recruitment ..........................................................................................................................105
5.5.2 Data Collection Instruments: Narrative Frames .............................................................................................106
5.5.3 Developing and Piloting Narrative Frames ....................................................................................................107
5.5.4 Narrative Frame Topics .....................................................................................................................................107
5.5.5 Data Collection ................................................................................................................................................108
5.5.6 Data Analysis ..................................................................................................................................................109
5.6 Study 2: Case Studies of Experienced and Novice Teachers ...............................................................................109
5.6.1 Research Sites and Participants .....................................................................................................................110
5.6.2 Role of Researcher ..........................................................................................................................................111
5.6.3 Data Collection ................................................................................................................................................112
5.6.4 Case Study Analysis ........................................................................................................................................118
5.6.5 Interpreting and Synthesizing Findings for Discussion ...................................................................................121
5.7 Language as Data ................................................................................................................................................122
5.8 Validation: Strategies for Establishing Trustworthiness ......................................................................................123
5.8.1 Credibility ......................................................................................................................................................124
5.8.2 Transferability ................................................................................................................................................124
5.8.3 Dependability ................................................................................................................................................124
5.8.4 Confirmability .................................................................................................................................................125
5.9 Ethical considerations ..........................................................................................................................................125

CHAPTER 6: NARRATIVE FRAME FINDINGS (STUDY 1) ..........................................................................................126
6.1 Narrative Frame 1: Reasons for Becoming a Teacher .........................................................................................126
6.1.1 The Most Influential People ..........................................................................................................................128
6.1.2 Reasons for Teaching English .......................................................................................................................130
6.1.3 Thoughts about Teaching English Before and After Starting ....................................................................131
6.1.4 Future Hopes for ELT .....................................................................................................................................133
6.1.5 Summary of Findings in NF1 ........................................................................................................................133
6.2 Narrative Frame 2: Prior Language Learning ......................................................................................................134
6.2.1 Descriptions of English Classes and Methods ...............................................................................................135
6.2.2 Best Memories of English Class ....................................................................................................................137
6.2.3 Worst Memories of English Class ..................................................................................................................138
6.2.4 Stated Influences of Educational Experiences on Teaching English ................................................................139
6.2.5 Changes in English Education .......................................................................................................................140
6.2.6 Reasons for Successful L2 Learning .............................................................................................................141
6.2.7 Summary of Findings in NF2 ........................................................................................................................142
6.3 Narrative Frame 3: Pre-service Teacher Education ...........................................................................................143
6.3.1 Memories of Professors and Courses ............................................................................................................144
6.3.2 Most and Least Helpful Experiences for Teaching English........145
6.3.3 Missed Opportunities.......................................................147
6.3.4 Summary of NF3 ..........................................................148
6.4 Narrative Frame 4: The First Year Teaching English ...............149
   6.4.1 Initial Feelings about Teaching English.........................149
   6.4.2 The Biggest Challenges .............................................153
   6.4.3 Best Memories of the First Year ....................................154
   6.4.4 Overall Impression of the First Year ...............................155
   6.4.5 Summary of Findings in NF4 .........................................156

CHAPTER 7: CASE STUDIES WITH EXPERIENCED TEACHERS (STUDY 2, PART I)..........................................................157
7.1 Mia (Experienced Primary Teacher, Novice English Teacher) .......157
   7.1.1 Critical Incidents in Language Learning ............................157
   7.1.2 Critical Incidents and Influences in Becoming a Teacher .........158
   7.1.3 How Mia Became a Full-time English Teacher .....................159
   7.1.4 Mia’s Teaching Setting .................................................160
   7.1.5 Themes in Mia’s Conceptions of ELT .................................161
   7.1.6 Stated Influences from the Four Phases of Teacher Experience on
        Mia’s Cognitions and Practices ........................................163
   7.1.7 Summary of Observations ............................................166
   7.1.8 Critical Incidents in the Process of Development and Change in
        Cognitions and Practice ..................................................171
   7.1.9 Commitment to Teaching English: “Right Now I Want to be a
        Homeroom Teacher” .......................................................177
   7.1.10 Case Summary: Mia ....................................................177
7.2 Sami (Experienced Primary Teacher, Experienced English Teacher) ..180
   7.2.1 Critical Incidents in Language Learning ............................180
   7.2.2 Critical Incidents in Becoming a Teacher ...........................182
   7.2.3 How Sami Became an English Teacher ...............................182
   7.2.4 Sami’s Teaching Setting ...............................................183
   7.2.5 Themes in Sami’s Conceptions of Teaching English ..........184
   7.2.6 Stated Influences from the Four Phases of Teacher Experience on
        Sami’s Cognitions and Practices .......................................186
   7.2.7 Summary of Observations ............................................188
   7.2.8 Critical Incidents in the Process of Development and Change in
        Cognitions and Practice ..................................................194
   7.2.9 Commitment to English Teaching .....................................197
   7.2.10 Case Summary: Sami ....................................................198

CHAPTER 8: CASE STUDIES OF TWO NOVICE KOREAN ENGLISH
   TEACHERS (STUDY 2, PART II) ............................................200
8.1 Eunjeong (Second Year Teacher, First Year English Teacher) ........200
   8.1.1 Critical Incidents in Language Learning ............................200
   8.1.2 Critical Incidents in Becoming a Teacher ...........................201
   8.1.3 How Eunjeong Became an English Teacher ..........................201
   8.1.4 Eunjeong’s Teaching Setting .........................................202
   8.1.5 Themes in Stated Cognitions about ELT .............................202
   8.1.6 Stated Influences from the Four Phases of Teacher Experience on
        Eunjeong’s Cognitions and Practices .................................204
### CHAPTER 9: DISCUSSION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>9.1</th>
<th>RQ1: Why do People Become English Language Teachers in Korea?</th>
<th>235</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.1.1</td>
<td>Reasons for Becoming Teachers in Study 1</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.1.2</td>
<td>Reasons for Teaching English in Study 1</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.1.3</td>
<td>Commitments to Teaching and ELT in Study 2</td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>RQ2: What are the Stated Cognitions of Korean English Teachers about ELT?</td>
<td>243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.2.1</td>
<td>Themes in Conceptions of Teaching English</td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.2.2</td>
<td>The Professional Knowledge Base: A Grounded Model</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.2.3</td>
<td>An Integrated Developmental Model of the Professional Knowledge Base</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>RQ3: What are the Stated Influences on the Cognitions and Practices of Korean English Teachers?</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.3.1</td>
<td>Phase 1: The Anti-apprenticeship of Observation</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.3.2</td>
<td>Phase 2: From “A Waste of Time” to “Very Helpful”</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.3.3</td>
<td>Phase 3: Homeroom Teaching as the Source of Practical Knowledge</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.3.4</td>
<td>Phase 4: Variable Outcomes: “The Turning Point” to “a Wasting of Time and Money”</td>
<td>264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>RQ4: What are the Observed Practices of Korean English Teachers?</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.4.1</td>
<td>Language Use in Class: Reconceptualizing TETE</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.4.2</td>
<td>Planning: Supplementary Materials and indischool.com</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.4.3</td>
<td>The Communicativeness of Pedagogic Activities for Experienced and Novice Teachers</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.4.4</td>
<td>Habituation and the Tolerance of Negative Behavior</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>RQ5: What Experiences Led to Change in Cognitions and Practices during the Study?</td>
<td>278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.5.1</td>
<td>Discussion of Changes in Beliefs about ELT in Study 1</td>
<td>278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.5.2</td>
<td>The Gap in Research on Language Teacher Cognitive Change</td>
<td>279</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9.5.3 A Critical Incidents Model for Interpreting Language Teacher Cognitive Development

CHAPTER 10: CONCLUSION

10.1 Research Aims

10.2 Summary of Major Contributions

10.2.1 ELT Commitment and Turnover in Korea

10.2.2 Developing a Locally-appropriate Professional Knowledge Base

10.2.3 An Integrated Developmental Model of Pedagogical Content Knowledge

10.2.4 The Influence of Prior Experience on LTC and Practices

10.2.5 Key Differences Between Experienced and Novice Teachers Regarding Curricular Pedagogical Knowledge

10.2.6 A Critical Incident Model for Understanding the Process of Development and Change in Cognitions and Practices

10.3 Implications and Recommendations

10.3.1 Policy Implications

10.3.2 Pedagogical Implications

10.3.3 Theoretical Implications

10.4 Limitations

10.4.1 Methodological Limitations

10.4.2 Conceptual Limitations

10.5 Future Research Directions

10.5.1 Pedagogical Research

10.5.2 Theoretical Research

10.6 Researcher Reflections

REFERENCES

APPENDICES
LIST OF TABLES

Table 1-1 Published Articles Based on Thesis Research and Corresponding Thesis Sections.........................................................11
Table 2-1 OECD Rankings of Purchasing Power Parity (PPP) for Korean Teacher Salaries in 2003.................................................................28
Table 2-2 Paths to Teaching English in Korean Public Schools .................................................................30
Table 2-3 Allocation of Contact Periods by Subject Area at Primary School Level (MEST, 2009a, p. 4; Song, 2012, p. 30) .................................................35
Table 2-4 Number of English Words to be Learned in Schools (MEST, 2008; Song, 2012) .................................................................36
Table 3-1 Methodology Issues in Research on CLT and TETE in Korea.................................................................74
Table 4-1 Summary of Influences for Becoming Teachers (Case Study 1).........................................................................................85
Table 4-2 General Characteristics of Themes for a NI Ontology Based on Deweyan Theory of Experience................................................91
Table 4-3 Intersections of Epistemology, Theory, and Methods in Narrative Inquiry.................................................................98
Table 5-1 Comparison of Emic and Etic Research Constructs .........................................................................................103
Table 5-2 Themes and Temporal Dimensions in Narrative Frame 1: On Becoming a Teacher.............................................................106
Table 5-3 Narrative Frame Titles and Themes ..............................................................................................................107
Table 5-4 Participants’ Age, Teaching Experience, and Grade Assignment for 2013-2014........................................................................110
Table 5-5 Key Data Sets for Case Studies ............................................................................................................112
Table 5-6 Categories and Topics of Critical Incident Logs .........................................................................................114
Table 5-7 Concepts in Rationalist versus Naturalistic Inquiry .....................................................................................123
Table 6-1 Prompts for Narrative Frame 1: Why I Became a Teacher .............................................................................126
Table 6-2 Prompts in Narrative Frame 2: My English Learning Experience in School...........................................................................134
Table 6-3 Prompts in Narrative Frame 3: My Memories of University .............................................................................143
Table 6-4 Prompts for Narrative Frame 4: My First Year Teaching English ...........................................................................149
Table 7-1. Mia’s Observation Report Summary ........................................................................................................166
Table 7-2 Common Functions and Examples of Classroom English Use Observed in Mia’s Classes .........................................................................171
Table 7-3 Sami’s Observation Report Summary ........................................................................................................189
Table 8-1 Eunjeong’s Observation Report Summary .....................................................................................................207
Table 8-2 Yuna’s Observation Report Summary ........................................................................................................222
Table 9-1 Summary of Influences for Becoming Teachers (Case Study Participants) ...........................................................................240
Table 9-2 Commitment Mindsets to HRT and ELT in Study 2 .........................................................................................241
Table 9-3 Summary of the Anti-Apprenticeship of Observation Expressed in Study 1, NF2 ...........................................................................261
Table 9-4 A List of Behavioral Incidents Occurring During Study 2 .............................................................................276
Table 9-5 Summary of Reasons to Teach English, Prior and Current Thoughts, and Future Hopes from NF4 ..............................................................................................................................................278
LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 2-1. Map of South Korea. ................................................................. 13
Figure 5-1. Flowchart of grounded theory methods for the thesis. (Adapted from Tweed & Charmaz, 2011, p. 133). ..................................................... 101
Figure 9-1. The professional knowledge base (PKB) for Korean primary school English teachers. ........................................................................ 249
Figure 9-2. A conceptual divide for language teacher cognition. ................. 256
Figure 9-3. An integrated model of the professional knowledge base. .......... 259
Figure 9-4. Sources of materials in observed classes as percentage of class time in Study 2. ........................................................................ 269
Figure 9-5. Activity types in observed classes as percentage of class time. .... 271
Figure 9-6. Percentage of class time spent on different groupings in observed classes. ........................................................................ 272
Figure 9-7. Activities including student-student interaction as percentage of class time in observed classes. ............................................... 273
Figure 9-8. Form-focused versus meaning-focused activities as percentage of class time. ........................................................................ 274
Figure 9-9. A critical incidents model for understanding language teacher cognitive change with in-service teachers. ................................ 284
Figure 10-1. An integrated developmental model of PCK for NNESTS. ......... 299
Figure 10-2. Proposed model for designing intervention programs to initiate language teacher cognitive change with in-service teachers. ....... 300
LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix A: ELT Methods Recommended for Primary English (NCIC, n.d.)
Appendix B: Glossary of Terms in Narrative Research
Appendix C: Ads and Information Sheets for Study 1
Appendix D: Text from Online Questionnaire for Participants in Study 1
Appendix E: The Narrative Frames
Appendix F: Example Story
Appendix G: Example Categories and Codes Used in Study 1 and 2
Appendix H: Screenshots of Code Systems in Study 1
Appendix I: Example Excerpts from Study 1
Appendix J: Information Sheets and Consent Forms for Study 2
Appendix K: Topics for Open and Semi-structured Interviews
Appendix L: Transcription Conventions
Appendix M: Data Reference Conventions
Appendix N: Observation Report Template
Appendix O: Critical Incident Log Template
Appendix P: Categories and Coding Abbreviations for CIL and Observation Reports
Appendix Q: Critical Incident Log Data
Appendix R: Observation Report Data
Appendix S: Cross-case Observation Data
Appendix T: Excerpts from Class Transcripts for Each Participant
Appendix U: Example Code System from Study 2
Appendix V: Screenshot of Data Analysis in MAXQDA 11
Appendix W: Example Interpretation Outline Tool
Appendix X: Critical Incident Checklist for Changes in Cognitions and Practices
Appendix Y: Data Management
Appendix Z: Electronics and Software Used in Thesis
# LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AL</td>
<td>Applied linguistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Communicative activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CI</td>
<td>Critical incident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL</td>
<td>Critical incident log</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLT</td>
<td>Communicative language teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSAT</td>
<td>College Scholastic Ability Test (in South Korea)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELT</td>
<td>English language teaching/teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPIK</td>
<td>English Program in Korea (Native-speaker co-teaching program)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GNI</td>
<td>Grounded narrative inquiry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GT</td>
<td>Grounded theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRT</td>
<td>Homeroom teaching/teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSET</td>
<td>Intensive in-service English teacher training program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEDI</td>
<td>Korean Educational Development Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KET</td>
<td>Korean English teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KICE</td>
<td>Korean Institute for Curriculum and Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1</td>
<td>First language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2</td>
<td>Second language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LE</td>
<td>Language exercise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTC</td>
<td>Language teacher cognition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTCC</td>
<td>Language teacher cognitive change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEST</td>
<td>Ministry of Education, Science &amp; Technology (restructured MOE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOE</td>
<td>Ministry of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCIC</td>
<td>National Curriculum Information Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEST</td>
<td>Native English speaking teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NF</td>
<td>Narrative frame</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NI</td>
<td>Narrative inquiry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNEST</td>
<td>Non-native English speaking teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUE</td>
<td>National University of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OECD</td>
<td>Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCK</td>
<td>Pedagogical content knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEK</td>
<td>Personal experiential knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PKB</td>
<td>Professional knowledge base</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPP</td>
<td>Present-practice-produce (ELT method)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQ</td>
<td>Research question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLA</td>
<td>Second language acquisition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLTE</td>
<td>Second (or foreign) language teacher education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNC</td>
<td>Seventh National Curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>Task-based activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBLT</td>
<td>Task-based language teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEE</td>
<td>Teach English in English program (in-service SLTE course)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TESOL</td>
<td>Teaching English to speakers of other languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLETE</td>
<td>Teach English through English (policy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TL</td>
<td>Target language (i.e., English)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A NOTE ON KOREAN LANGUAGE AND AUTHORSHIP

In this thesis I use the Revised Romanization of Korean (RRK) system for transliterating Korean language in the text. An exception is made for names of people, places, and things with an established orthography differing from RRK. For example, Syngman Rhee (이승만), the first president of South Korea, remains as is commonly found in print, rather than Yi Seung-man, as it would be under RRK. Citations of Korean authors appear how their names were published. If a Romanized transliteration was not given in an article or database, I used RRK. As per APA guidelines, initials of given names were used to differentiate authors with the same surname. Hyphenated names are kept as in print. In one instance, hyphenation differentiates two authors: Eun Gyong Kim, who wrote about the history of ELT in Korea, is cited as (E. G., Kim, [year]), whereas Ee-Gyeong Kim, who wrote about ELT policy in Korea, is cited as (E.-G., Kim, [year]).
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

This thesis consists of two qualitative research studies that explore English language teaching (ELT) in South Korean primary schools, and contribute to understanding language teacher cognition (LTC) in a public school context where English is taught as a foreign language by non-native English speaking teachers (NNEST). In the 1990s, curricular reforms in South Korea (Korea, hereafter) changed the objectives for English education and revised a structural syllabus to one centered around aims for communicative competence; however, many studies have shown that reforms in favor of communicative, student-centered language education have been resisted by teachers. Public English education is perceived as being ineffective and families look to the private sector to support students’ language learning. However, Korea faces a significant issue regarding the “social malady” (Song, 2011, p. 45) of private education and it seems critical that the efficacy of public English education be improved. The overarching impetus for this research is to offer a contribution on these matters by problematizing key issues concerning LTC and teacher development in Korea. The implications of this research suggest how shortcomings might be addressed in second language teacher education (SLTE) regarding teacher knowledge about ELT methodology and second language acquisition (SLA).

This chapter summarizes the background and purpose of the study and then states the research questions. It introduces the research approach and outlines the methodology. The final sections define key terms, describe the thesis structure, and clarify how published research based on the thesis was integrated into the text.

1.1 Background of the Problem

LTC research is an expanding area in applied linguistics (AL), but there remains much to be discovered. In his synthesis of research, Borg (2003, 2006) stressed the need for further studies, particularly in foreign language contexts where English is a mandatory subject under centralized curricula. Although some recent work has addressed this gap (Borg, 2012), more is needed (Kubanyiova, 2014), and in Korea’s case, the need for further research appears urgent (see Moodie & Nam, forthcoming).

The demand for English in Korea has been described as a frenzy (J. S.-Y. Park,
2009; Song, 2011), as a fever (Y.-M. Kim, 2002; J.-K. Park, 2009), and as fetishism (J. S.-Y. Park, 2009). Over the past few decades, the increasing status of English has contributed to educational and socioeconomic issues (see Chapter 2). Reforms over the last two decades increased the importance of English within the education system where it became one of the three most important subjects in the national curriculum. English test scores are an important criterion in high-stakes university entrance exams that are associated with student wellbeing issues, such as high rates of adolescent depression (M. Lee & Larson, 2000). Moreover, the frequent use of English to screen job applicants (Booth, 2012; S. Y. Choi, 2002) has further necessitated the learning of English despite Korea being a relatively monolingual nation where English is barely used for communicative functions (J. S.-Y. Park, 2009). Public education has not been able to fulfill its own aims and families look elsewhere: Private education accounts for a quarter of household expenditure (S. Kim & Lee, 2010), with English tuition taking the largest share, estimated to account for 2% of GDP (H.-C. Jeon & Choi, 2006).

Against this backdrop, public school English teachers have had to adapt to changing curricular aims (see Kwon, 2000). The reforms ostensibly addressed the ineffectiveness of traditional teacher-centered, L1-mediated instruction as Korea has transitioned from a transmission model of education to a more student-centered model. Curricular revisions promoted communicative competence as a goal of English education and recommended communicative and task-based language teaching with English as the medium of instruction (K. Ahn, 2009; E.-J. Kim, 2008). However, much local research has shown curricular implementation remains incomplete, with teachers challenged by large classes, inappropriate materials, and exam washback (e.g., J. Jeon, 1997, 2009; Yook, 2010). Further, a lack of teacher L2 proficiency and a lack of knowledge about ELT methodology appear to be issues despite reforms to pre-service teacher education and wide-scale ELT training programs for in-service teachers (see Moodie & Nam, forthcoming).

Although research has found many issues with ELT reforms in Korea, the research itself is problematic. To date, local research on English education tends to rely on self-reported data (Moodie & Nam, forthcoming); research approaches are often (post)positivist when interpretive paradigms would be more appropriate. For example, a body of research has approached ELT methods as treatments, seemingly underappreciating the context-laden nature of language education in public school classrooms. Furthermore, researcher positionality is often vague, requiring a reader to
infer it, and this makes it difficult to judge the trustworthiness of findings. There is a paucity of qualitative studies meeting the research standards of the wider field (see Edge & Richards, 1998). Moreover, few studies discuss LTC and rarer still are studies investigating ELT practices longitudinally with multiple participants, which presents a gap in local research addressed by this thesis (see Chapter 3).

LTC research is important for making sense of what language teachers do (Borg, 2003, 2006). Much is known about teacher cognition, less about LTC, although there are some emerging themes. Eight themes are discussed below that help position the present thesis.

First, prior research indicates that LTC is influenced by what I will call the *four phases of experience,* comprising of (1) prior language learning and education, (2) pre-service teacher education, (3) in-service teaching experience, and (4) in-service teacher training (see Borg, 2003, 2006). In this thesis, the influences of these phases on in-service Korean English teachers are considered, which extends the knowledge of LTC with NNESTs in a foreign language context.

Second, research from western and ESL contexts has emphasized that in order to understand LTC and development, attention must be paid to the personal experiences and local contexts of teachers (D. Freeman, 2002; Johnson, 2006; Kubanyiova, 2012, 2014; Kumaravadivelu, 2006; Wright, 2010). These themes are not as evident in research from Korea (Chapter 3; Moodie & Nam, forthcoming) and the present thesis addresses this gap through research involving prolonged engagement in the context (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

Third, researchers have described the principles (Bailey, 1996; Breen, Hird, Milton, Oliver, & Thwaite, 2001; D. Woods, 1996) and maxims (J. Richards, 1996; Tsang, 2004) of language teachers in a small number of settings. Despite some efforts (e.g., Tsang, 2004), there are still gaps in our understanding of this kind of teacher knowledge in EFL contexts where English is a taught by NNESTs guided by national curricula (Borg, 2006; Kubanyiova, 2014; but see Borg, 2012).

Fourth, studies have described the differences between novice and experienced teachers (Farrell, 2008c, 2011; J. Richards, 1998b) and have defined ELT expertise (Farrell, 2015a; Tsui, 2003). These topics are unexplored in Korea (Chapter 3), so it is important to get a better understanding of the differences between experienced and novice teachers there in light of curricular reforms and changes in ELT education that have occurred over a generation (see Kwon, 2000).
Fifth, there is more to be understood about the relationship between cognitions and practices, in particular, the processes of LTC development and the experiences leading to change (Borg, 2006; Kubanyiova, 2012). Therefore, the present thesis considers the incidents leading to changing practices that occur during the data collection period, and offers a contribution towards interpreting LTC change.

Sixth, LTC research faces a few epistemic challenges. One is the terminological issue: Borg (2006, p. 49) criticized the many dozens of terms used in studies as creating superficial diversity, but others have argued diversity of terms is inevitable, justifiable, and necessary for delimiting different constructs (see Kubanyiova & Feryok, 2015). A working definition of LTC for this thesis can be found in Section 1.5, below, and terminology is discussed further in Chapter 3.

Seventh, there is the issue of “what counts as evidence” (Borg, 2006, p. 278). Methodologically, LTC data have generally been sourced through verbal commentaries, reflective writing, self-reporting, and/or inferences from observations but “these reflect different assumptions about the nature of teacher cognition itself” (Borg, 2006, p. 279). In consideration of this issue, the research design includes all data types described by Borg, and the analysis makes use of extensive data triangulation. The methodology addresses a gap in local research where self-report instruments are most common (see Chapter 3).

Lastly, an overlooked aspect of LTC research is the question of why people enter the field of language teaching in the first place (see Moodie & Feryok, 2015). As education research has found, teaching commitments are linked to teacher retention (P. L. Choi & Tang, 2009) and efficacy (Day & Gu, 2007, 2009), but there is limited research on commitments to language teaching. Therefore, this thesis also investigates participant life histories in order to make sense of the experiences that led people to teach English in Korea, paying particular attention to the status and working conditions that are described in policy reports as being significant factors drawing people to the field of education in Korea (E.-G. Kim, 2009, 2011).

1.2 Purpose of the Study, Research Questions, and Significance

The purpose of this thesis is to understand LTC, ELT practices, and language teacher development of Korean public school English teachers. The research design was emergent, arising through the process of grounded theory (GT) methods
undertaken during the study (Charmaz, 2014; Corbin & Strauss, 2008). Therefore, the research aims were iteratively refined as constant comparative analysis occurred (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). The following questions guided the research process:

1. Why do people become public school English teachers in Korea?
2. What are the stated cognitions of Korean English teachers about ELT?
3. What are the stated influences on the cognitions and practices of Korean English teachers?
4. What are the observed practices of Korean English teachers?
5. What experiences led to change in cognitions and practices during the study?

The significance of the present thesis lies in its potential to identify and explore ELT practices and LTC in Korea that may influence the implementation of language policy and teacher education there. Further, it contributes to understanding how LTC develops with in-service language teachers.

### 1.3 Research Approach and Rationale

This thesis is described as a grounded narrative inquiry (GNI) into LTC in that it combines grounded theory (GT) methods (Charmaz, 2014; Corbin & Strauss, 2008) with a narrative approach (see Polkinghorne, 1995; cf. Clandinin & Connelly, 1990). Necessarily, LTC research is interpretive. It is an assumption in this thesis that language teaching practices develop through personal experiences in the workplace that are influenced by prior education and general life experiences and that these experiences are particular to an individual and a context (Dewey, 1933, 1938). However, any discussion of experience requires data and a methodology that accounts for how we make sense of experience. As Clandinin and Connelly (2000) argued, I assume that the most promising means of doing so is through participant narratives (see also Elbaz, 1983; Johnson, 2006; Johnson & Golombek, 2002).

Narrative thought (Bruner, 1986) is fundamental to our make-up as a species (Dennett, 1992, 1993; O. Flanagan, 1992). The narrative structure is an organizing construct that brings order and meaning to experience (Bruner, 1986, 1991; Ochs & Capps, 2001; Polkinghorne, 1995). Narrative thought can be understood as a mode of cognition itself (Bruner, 1986), one that is geared to “understanding human action” (Polkinghorne, 1995, p. 11).
However, a challenge for narrative-oriented research is that narrative inquiry (NI) remains “a field in the making” (Chase, 2011, p. 429) and is seen differently by different researchers (see also Barkhuizen, 2014). Methodologies differ according to the phenomena being studied (Hollingsworth & Dybdahl, 2007; Mishler, 1995; Polkinghorne, 1995), and in education, one branch of research has defined NI as a particular method that configures data into teacher narratives (Connelly & Clandinin, 1990, 2000; Johnson & Golombek, 2002). To clarify, this thesis does not adopt this storytelling approach to NI. Rather, it aligns with what Polkinghorne described as analysis of narrative, that is, methods based on procedures for GT (Charmaz, 2014; Strauss & Corbin, 1990). Due to the fact that NI is less established in AL than are traditional approaches (see Barkhuizen, 2011, 2014a; Bell, 2011; Benson, 2014), Chapter 4 is dedicated to further discussing GNI as the theoretical framework (see also Appendix B for a glossary of narrative terms). Although the nascent status of NI within AL research requires such elaboration, as Barkhuizen (2014a) described, the rationale for a narrative approach lies in its potential for exploratory research without conventional constraints extant in more established methodologies, thus making it attractive as a theoretical framework.

1.3.1.1 Overview of Methodology

Situated as a GNI, this research takes Charmaz’s (2014) constructivist approach to GT, and also consults the work of Glaser and Strauss (1967) and Strauss and Corbin (1990), on which GT is founded. Critical incident (CI) research (Brookfield, 1995; Farrell, 2008a; J. Flanagan, 1954; Webster & Mertova, 2007) also influenced the research design, as did qualitative analysis procedures described by Miles and Huberman (1994).

The present thesis consists of two complementary studies. Study 1 uses narrative frames (NF) as data collection instruments (Barkhuizen, 2014b; Barkhuizen & Wette, 2008). Ten NFs were piloted and the final set was reduced to four. Twenty-seven public school Korean English teachers (KET) participated by writing stories about (1) their reasons for teaching English, (2) the influence of prior learning on cognitions and practices, (3) their experiences in pre-service education, and (4) their first year teaching English. All participants were in the Daegu/North Gyeongsang area (which addressed a gap in local research) and they were purposively recruited (Miles & Huberman, 1994). Stories were collected online and during a professional development
course. Data analysis followed constant comparative methods (Glaser & Strauss, 1967), and qualitative analysis procedures (Miles & Huberman).

Study 2 comprises four in-depth case studies (Stake, 2013; Yin, 2014) including data from reflective writing, life history interviews, semi-structured recall interviews, observations, critical incident logs, field notes, and other documents collected over 18 months. Participants were recruited through selective and snowball sampling (Miles & Huberman, 1994). To address a gap in local research, this study included only primary school KETs. Triangulating multiple data sources enabled rich descriptions of (1) critical incidents in participants’ prior language learning and the process of becoming English teachers, (2) their conceptions of ELT, (3) their observed practices, and (4) the influence of experience on cognitions and practice.

Data analysis software MAXQDA 11 was used for analysis. The findings from both studies are discussed in a separate chapter (see Section 1.7 below). The quality criteria for the thesis are based on the concept of trustworthiness in qualitative research (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; see also Edge & Richards, 1998).

1.4 Definition of Key Terms

*Language teacher cognition* (LTC) is used as a blanket term for the thoughts, beliefs, and knowledge of language teachers about teaching language (Borg, 2006). This thesis does not attempt to distinguish between these constructs (cf. D. Woods, 1996). LTC also refers to the cognitive process insofar as it can be interpreted from data. *Cognitions* is a related term, which is primarily used in two senses. First, it is a plural form for thoughts, beliefs, knowledge, etc. where the everyday notion of one of these does not seem suitable; second, it refers to the outcome of cognitive processes as they relate to language teaching (i.e., *products*).

*Language teaching* means second or foreign language (L2) teaching. *English language teaching* (ELT) is used for discussions that may be particular to English L2 education. ELT also refers to the practice of teaching English.

*Applied linguistics* (AL) refers to the academic discipline. There are three main sub-disciplines often referred to: second language acquisition (SLA), language teaching methodology, and *second language teacher education* (SLTE) research. SLTE refers to the discipline of L2 teacher training; thus, there is overlap between AL and education. *TESOL* refers to the discipline of ELT and ELT research, also defined under the parent
discipline of AL in this thesis.

*Practice (or teaching practice)* can be understood as the collective set of practices in a teacher’s repertoire. It may also refer to the ongoing activity of teaching English as a professional. These are non-countable senses. A *practice* (countable) refers to a specific pedagogic routine or activity performed by a teacher.

*Pedagogic activities* refer to the discrete units of exercises that make up a lesson. There are three main activity types addressed in the thesis: language exercises (LE), communicative activities (CA), and task-based activities (TBA) (see Section 5.5.3.4 for clarification).

*Experience* has four main senses in the thesis. First, it refers to Dewey’s (1933, 1938) conception of experience that aligns with an everyday notion of the continuum of phenomena that can become available for conscious reflection (see Section 4.3.1). Second, it may refer to a period of time during which someone was engaged in a course of action, for example, learning a language. Third, it may refer to a specific event that someone was a part of, such as a training seminar. Fourth, it may refer to an accumulation of knowledge or skills gained from doing something, which in this case most often means the practice of teaching English. (A glossary of narrative terms appears in Appendix B.)

### 1.5 Organization of the Thesis

This thesis has ten chapters but it follows the established format of introduction, literature review, methodology, findings, discussion, and conclusion. The structure of the thesis is explained below.

#### 1.5.1 Literature Review (Chapters 2-4)

Chapter 2 expands on the background for the study and explains the research context. It discusses the historical precedents and contemporary issues for English education in Korea, explains the process of becoming a public school English teacher, and describes the place of English in the national curriculum.

Chapter 3 reviews LTC research, and organizes literature around the *four phases of experience* (see above). Sub-sections address local research on these topics, focusing on themes in the national curriculum. Chapter 3 finishes with a critique of methods used in local research, which provides further rationale for the present studies.
Chapter 4 explains GNI as the theoretical framework and further justifies GNI as an approach for researching LTC. It discusses the narrative turn in social science and describes the research paradigm (i.e., constructivism) by outlining an ontology and epistemology for the studies and positioning the research according to the various methodological strands of NI.

1.5.2 Methodology (Chapter 5)

Chapter 5 describes the methodology of both studies. It begins with an overview of the GT methods and CI analysis used in the thesis. Subsequently, emic/etic distinctions and researcher positionality are discussed. The chapter then describes the participants, data collection instruments and procedures, and data analysis for each study. Lastly, it explains the analytic procedures for interpreting findings, the use of language (L1/L2) as data, the trustworthiness criteria, and ethical considerations.

1.5.3 Findings (Chapters 6-8)

Chapter 6 presents findings from Study 1, beginning with reasons for teaching English in Korean public schools (NF1). The chapter then continues by describing the influences of prior learning (NF2) and pre-service teacher education (NF3) on ELT practices. Lastly, it presents findings from stories about participants’ first year teaching English (NF4).

Study 2 is split across two chapters. Chapter 7 consists of two case studies with experienced teachers, and Chapter 8 consists of two case studies with novice teachers. The cases follow the same format, which is oriented around the research questions (see Chapter 5 for details). The cases begin with participant background information, CIs in learning English and becoming English teachers, and the research setting. The next sections present findings on participants’ conceptions of ELT, the stated influences of prior experience on participants’ cognitions and practices, a summary of observations, and an interpretation of CIs that led to changing cognitions and practices during the research period. Each case study closes with a discussion of participants’ commitment to ELT and a case summary.

1.5.4 Discussion (Chapter 9)

Chapter 9 discusses the research findings of both studies, and answers the
research questions sequentially. First, workplace commitment theory is applied to interpreting why people become teachers in Korea, their reasons for teaching English, and the issue of ELT turnover in Korean primary schools. Second, findings from participants’ conceptions of ELT in Study 2 are discussed, culminating in a professional knowledge base (PKB) model that becomes a framework for interpretations offered through the remainder of the chapter. Third, the stated influences on LTC are discussed, beginning with the anti-apprenticeship of observation (cf. Lortie, 1975), then the influence of pre-service education, homeroom teaching, and in-service SLTE. Fourth, cross-case analysis of observation data is presented under themes in the national English curriculum. This section discusses the differences between experienced and novice teachers with regard to language use in class, materials selection, and the communicativeness of activities. It also includes an etic interpretation of what seemed to be habituation to the tolerance of negative student behavior. Fifth, a CI model for interpreting LTC change is proposed and applied to interpret relevant case study findings.

1.5.5 Conclusion (Chapter 10)

Chapter 10 concludes the studies. It first reviews the research scope and summarizes the contributions. Implications and recommendations are then addressed, beginning with ones for policy and pedagogy, before addressing the theoretical implications of the models from Chapter 9. Highlights of the chapter include discussion of the critical issue of ELT turnover in primary schools, ideas for extending the knowledge base of KETs through reflective practice, and discussion of how the CI model for interpreting LTC change might be adapted. The chapter also discusses limitations and recommends directions for future research. Lastly, I offer reflections on the research process.

1.6 Integration of Published Research

Following university guidelines, the purpose of this section is to describe how published works based on the present thesis were integrated into the text, and to clarify author contributions in coauthored work. There are two forthcoming articles based on work in this thesis. Table 1.1 lists the titles and indicates corresponding thesis sections that were adapted in the articles.
Table 1-1 Published Articles Based on Thesis Research and Corresponding Thesis Sections.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Article</th>
<th>Thesis sections</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Both of the articles listed in Table 1.1 are considered new contributions (American Psychological Association, 2010). However, the write-up for the studies listed in Table 1.1 above coincided with drafting this thesis; therefore, there was some reflexivity involved in the drafting of these articles and the thesis that requires clarification of portions of the articles that also appear in the thesis. First, regarding the forthcoming study in *The Modern Language Journal* (Moodie & Feryok, 2015), I undertook all data collection and analysis of findings in this article and the present thesis. The findings from the case studies in this thesis (Chapters 7 & 8) were adapted for the article; however, data were reinterpreted in the article. Although a reader will find overlapping text between excerpts in the article and excerpts in Chapters 7 and 8, this goes uncited because the article (Moodie & Feryok) constitutes a new contribution (American Psychological Association, 2010; see p. 16): The article introduces a conceptual framework focused on interpreting commitments to ELT, and focuses narrowly on specific extracts from the more general and much larger data set used in the thesis. Feryok initially conceived of the framework and we developed it together with reference to case study data for the aims of the article. I adapted the framework for the thesis discussion but with a different focus to the article and a wider data set (see Section 9.1). However, for the clarity of future readers, paragraphs and ideas that are similar to those appearing in Moodie and Feryok (2015) are indicated in Section 9.1 with citations.

Second, the review for *Language Teaching* (Moodie & Nam, forthcoming) is based on the sections in Chapter 3 that focus on ELT research from Korea. The sections
indicated in Table 1.1 appear in the article with slight revisions. Nam peer-debriefed my analysis of the articles that were written in Korean. To clarify, I collated and analyzed all literature in the second article that is discussed in Chapter 3.
CHAPTER 2: BACKGROUND ON ELT IN KOREA: HISTORICAL PRECEDENTS, CONTEMPORARY ISSUES, AND THE PUBLIC SCHOOL CONTEXT

*The strong zeal for education among Koreans cannot be matched anywhere else in the world.*

Educational Policy Review (OECD, 1998, p. 27)

This chapter reviews the history of ELT in Korea, identifies current issues for ELT, and describes the public school context, including education policy and the national English curriculum. Describing the role of English in Korea’s recent history is necessary for understanding current education policy and the *English fever* (J.-K. Park, 2009) within the modern, industrialized nation.

*Figure 2-1. Map of South Korea.*
The epigraph above (OECD, 1998) echoed findings of an earlier UNESCO review on the state of education in Korea in 1954 (Seth, 2002). As Seth explained, “Koreans have inherited a worldview that is hierarchical and rank-conscious so that education is a means of firmly establishing one’s position in society” (p. 251). Historically, this extends to the civil service examination system established centuries ago (Seth, 2006); however, recent decades have seen English become embedded in the nations’ education fever (J.-K. Park, 2009). English is now one of the most important subjects in a fiercely competitive public education system (Song, 2011). This is so even though English is almost never used among Koreans in public domains for communicative functions (J. S.-Y. Park, 2009). Yet beginning in primary school, all students must study English. To some degree, their future academic and employment prospects depend on learning English because it is a large portion of the national College Scholastic Ability Test (CSAT) and is used for screening job applicants in many sectors (Booth, 2012; S. Y. Choi, 2002). Educational policy has contributed to the English fever (J.-K. Park, 2009; see also Song, 2011); however, public education has not been able to address demand and the private English education sector became a multi-billion dollar industry (H.-C. Jeon & Choi, 2006). This underscores the necessity for research in the area.

This chapter is divided into three sections. The first section traces the history of English education in Korea from its mission roots to the robust free market that it is today. These historical precedents provide a context for current issues with English education, discussed in the second section. The third section outlines SLTE policy, the education system, and the national English curriculum.

2.1 From Missions to Free Market:
A Brief History of Education Policy and ELT in Korea

This section discusses the history of ELT in South Korea, focusing on language policy since the late 19th century. Familiarity with this history is helpful for
understanding how English became so important in Korean society and in the national curriculum.

2.1.1 Early Roots: Missions (1883-1910)

Following a Korean-American treaty signed in 1882, King Gojong (1863-1907) approved an academy to train English translators (Kim-Rivera, 2001). Previously, there had been little English language contact in Korea. There were visits from western traders, and skirmishes with American merchant vessels, which created some pretext for the agreement; however, these were isolated incidents (Cummings, 2005). A significant compromise in the treaty allowed American missionaries to establish schools (Kim-Rivera, 2001).

Initially, mission schools had trouble recruiting students (Seth, 2002); however, they grew into influential institutions, with many graduates holding powerful military and political positions. They challenged Confucian stratification of society by opening up education to women and the lower classes (Kim-Rivera, 2001; Robinson, 2007). Further, the missions promoted modernization and western ideals, for example, democratization and national independence (Collins, 2005; Robinson, 2007).

2.1.2 Japanese Colonization (1910-1945)

Pre-1900, Korea had been a suzerain of China’s Qing Dynasty when Korea’s Joseon Dynasty (1392-1897) fell victim to expanding Japanese hegemony in East Asia. Korea was annexed in 1910, thus beginning a brutal occupation. Japanese administrators transformed education, establishing “a comprehensive, modern national system of education characterized by a high degree of centralization, and professionalism among teachers and other educational personnel” (Seth, 2002, p. 19). However, the means were oppressive: The end-goal of language and educational policies were total assimilation of Korea with imperial Japan (Rhee, 1992). Japanese was the dominant language for instruction and by 1938 the Korean language was banned in schools and in public space.

Education was encouraged, but entry was competitive (Seth, 2002). Koreans were restricted to non-academic tracks and tertiary applicants faced severe competition on entrance exams. Seth described how these realities contributed to the post-colonial “mass pursuit of education” (p. 20).
Understandably, this was not a significant period for ELT. Private tutoring was tolerated initially but by World War II (1939-1945) English was suppressed (Kim-Rivera, 2002). It was, after all, the language of the enemy.

The occupation left a grim but influential legacy. Japan’s educational policies would be adapted by future Korean administrators; for example, using centralized curricula to promote the aims of the state, standardized examinations, and universal standards for teaching qualifications (Seth, 2002). Many schools operating today were established during this period, including one in Study 2.

2.1.3 The End of World War II: Korea Divides, US Intervenes in the South (1945-1950)

The Japanese occupation ended abruptly in 1945 when Emperor Hirohito surrendered unconditionally, bringing World War II (WWII) to a close. Japan’s exit created a power vacuum in the region and Korea was caught in a power struggle between the two superpowers left after the war. Somewhat arbitrarily North and South Korea were divided on the 38th parallel, with U.S.S.R. occupying the North and the U.S. controlling the South.

With input from local intelligentsia, the U.S. Army Military Government in Korea (USAMGIK) governed South Korea from 1945 to 1948. In regards to education, they prioritized adult literacy, implemented a policy of compulsory, universal schooling, and called for the development of Korean language mediated curricula (Seth, 2002).

These policies were effective: Adult literacy rose from 22% to 58% by 1948 and the number of tertiary institutes more than doubled (E. G. Kim, 2011). However, as Seth (2002) clarified, much credit was due to “sincere and patriotic individuals” (p. 47) inheriting a latent zeal for education.

Administrators adapted the centralized education system left by the Japanese, but their stated aims were humanistic, promoting “universal and equal opportunity in education” (Seth, 2002, p. 96). As Seth described, the administration “gave confirmation and intellectual support to the mass movement toward schooling” (p. 96).

For English, this period is notable because it became the most important and dominant foreign language (Song, 2011). For the first time significant numbers of native English speakers resided in Korea, namely, U.S. Armed Forces personnel.
Moreover, because U.S. educated Koreans were routinely promoted by the administration, “the status of the English language was elevated and solidified as the language of the ruling class” (E. G. Kim, 2008, para. 3). In 1948, the U.S. ceded direct control as the Republic of Korea (R.O.K., i.e., South Korea) was established; however, they maintained their military presence on the peninsula.

2.1.4 The Korean War (1950-1953) and Aftermath (1954-1960)

After WWII, regional instability continued and in 1950 a brutal civil war began. This “calamitous internecine conflict,” saw the level of “devastation enlarged by the intervention of the major powers” (Seth, 2002, p. 104). A U.S. led United Nations coalition supported the R.O.K., with China and the U.S.S.R. supporting the North. The fighting ended with an armistice in 1953, but the war never officially ended and a demilitarized zone still separates the two countries roughly along the 38th parallel (see Figure 2.1 above).

The war was ruinous to infrastructure, damaging or leveling about 80% of schools and universities (Seth, 2002). However, it can also “be seen as a part of the process of social turbulence and change that spurred the public demand for educational advancement” (Seth, p. 107).

The US provided direct aid, transfer payments, and loans to the struggling economy. According to H. H. Moon (2009),

Massive material aid from the U.S., upon which the war-torn society of South Korea relied, seems to have strengthened its image of great wealth, technological and scientific advancement, and socio-cultural achievement. Its language, English, was perceived to be the carrier of what the U.S. meant symbolically to Koreans. (p. 72)

This is an important point considering the present day state of English education where competency is pursued more for status than for communication (J. S.-Y Park, 2009).

2.1.5 Post-War Politics and Education Policy (1954-1960)

In 1954, the First National Curriculum was introduced by the Ministry of Education (MOE). While a floundering economy was propped up by U.S. aid, the education sector continued to flourish (Seth, 2002). Literacy rates increased to 70% by 1960. There was intense demand for higher education; by then there were an estimated
70,000 university students in Seoul alone (Robinson, 2007). English was an optional subject but it was taught at most secondary schools (H. H. Moon, 2009). Aims for English education reflected lofty humanistic intention:

[English education] was depicted as multi-faceted, namely to promote responsibility, morale, justice, and cooperation at the international level; to uphold national pride and to enhance the spirit of independence and self-esteem at the national level; and to cultivate capability, knowledge, and attitude as citizens at the individual level. (H. H. Moon, p. 73)

However, efficacy of instruction was limited by a paucity of competent English speaking teachers, reliance on grammar-translation methods, and resistance to change.

Post-war life was stark. Syngman Rhee (1948-1960) consolidated power by “ruthlessly extending wartime emergency measures” (Robinson, 2007, p. 122). He won a contentious third term but “reports of massive election fraud galvanized public protests led by university and high school students” (Robinson, p. 125). Demonstrations presaged a military coup in 1961.

2.1.6 The Korean Miracle: Economics and education under dictatorship (1960s to 1980s)

Major General Park Chung Hee (1961-1979) took control of the government in 1961. Though contentious and anti-democratic, his rule carried a “clear vision and plan for the economic development of the country” (Robinson, 2007, p. 129). In economic terms, history would show that his vision became a remarkable success.

Korea’s so-called economic miracle began in the 1960s, seeing the nation transform from a rural, agrarian society to a modern, urbanized, industrial state. Statistics exhibit unprecedented growth: In 1961 the per capita GDP was $91.50 USD, but by 2010 it was $18,647, an over 200-fold increase; by 2011, the GDP (adjusted for Purchasing Power Parity) was 13th highest in the world at $1.549 trillion (CIA, 2012).

Although the economic growth was remarkable, it cannot be decoupled from the militarized agenda of the state that used centralized curricula for inculcating policy (Seth, 2002). Education remained a priority but resources were directed toward industrialization, prioritizing vocational training over academic study.
Park was assassinated in 1979 and Korea experienced political turbulence in the 1980s. Democratization movements were punctuated by military crackdowns. Eventually, the military ceded control and elections were held in 1987.

### 2.1.7 Looking Outward: English Education Policy of the 1980s and 1990s

During Korea’s economic rise the government sought a more international profile, winning bids for the 1986 Asian Games and 1988 Summer Olympics. These events were intended to showcase the radical development of the economic miracle (Cumings, 2005). Both the government and the general public wanted to put on a good show, and part of that was being able to communicate in English, the global language. Wide-scale ELT programs were established for the public (Cumings, 2005) and the MOE started after-school English programs in primary schools (J.-K. Park, 2009).

The government promoted internationalization through education reforms. In the Fourth National Curriculum (1982-1987), World History, Geography, and Social Studies became compulsory subjects. For high school students, English became the second most important subject, taking up roughly a quarter of the CSAT (H. H. Moon, 2009). In the Fifth National Curriculum (1987-1992), English became a core subject (along with Korean, Math, and Hanja ‘Chinese characters’). The curriculum stressed the importance of native-like pronunciation and promoted CLT methods (H. H. Moon, 2009). In the Sixth National Curriculum (1992-1997), CLT was reemphasized in a call for student-centered classrooms. The English Program in Korea (EPIK) was established, recruiting native-speaking teachers for public education. The reforms were met with resistance from teachers, particularly because standardized exams did not reflect the MOE’s aims (Yook, 2010).

Yook (2010) articulated four factors which has impacted policy since the 1980s: (1) the importance of English in the age of globalization; (2) criticism of traditional English teaching methods in Korea (i.e., teacher-centered, grammar-focused); (3) the field-wide trend towards CLT in the 1980s; and (4) sociopolitical pressure from parents demanding effective public English education. The increased emphasis on English stimulated private education sector demand (J.-K. Park, 2009; see below).
2.1.8 Curricular Reform in a Globalized World (1997-present)

The Asian financial crisis of 1997—derogatorily called the IMF crisis in Korea—was a critical event for English policy (J. S.-Y. Park, 2009; Song, 2011, 2012). Korea entered a severe recession: The Korean Won (KRW) plummeted; 20,000 companies went bankrupt; interest rates hit 30% as growth rates fell; and massive layoffs spiked unemployment (Robinson, 2007, pp. 173-175). To avoid bankruptcy, the International Monetary Fund (IMF) provided loans but mandated strict economic reforms as preconditions.

The crisis had a strong social and psychological impact in Korea (Robinson, 2007). Regarding English, it strengthened what J. S.-Y. Park (2009) described as an ideology of necessitation: Policy makers believed English was “a language one must acquire and secure in order to survive and flourish in the globalizing world” (p. 26). While many businesses faltered, one thriving sector was the private English education industry (J.-K. Park, 2009).

Changes planned prior to the crisis were accelerated, for example, starting English in the third grade of primary school. The Seventh National Curriculum (SNC) (1997-present) called for teachers to use English exclusively and reemphasized CLT and TBLT methods (MOE, 1998). The MOE introduced the “Comprehensive Five-Year Plan for the Activation of English Education” (MOE, 2006). This included recruiting more NESTs for team teaching, intensive English and ELT training for in-service teachers, new employment exams for KETs, and increased contact hours (E.-G. Kim, 2009). The SNC is described further in Section 2.3.

In 2007, the Ministry of Education, Science, and Technology (MEST)—a restructured MOE—revised the curriculum (MEST, 2007), and phased in non-civil servant English instructors in schools (MEST, 2008a), which was a controversial plan among tenured teachers (Kwon, 2000). Further revisions in 2009 increased the importance of English, making it equivalent in value to Korean and mathematics on the CSAT. Grades in these subjects are the most important determinant for students’ academic future (Song, 2012), an issue discussed below.

2.1.9 The Free Market English Frenzy

Over the past half century, the government continued to increase public education spending; for example, in 2005 the budget was 18 times that of 1985 (Nam,
2007). However, the investment was not able to offset the demand for private education (Seth, 2002). Roughly 75% of primary and secondary students attend *hagwon* ‘private institutes’ or receive private tutoring (S. Kim & Lee, 2010). Two factors in particular, the necessity of education for upward social mobility and the competitive structure of public schooling, contributed to a bloated private education sector. Private expenditure on education averages 25% of household income and matches roughly 80% of government spending on education (S. Kim & Lee). No subject takes up more of this investment than English. A multi-billion dollar private English education industry is thriving, accounting for nearly 2% of the annual GDP (H. C. Jeon & Choi, 2006). Private education has “become a social malady” (Song, 2011, p. 45). Because of the extreme demand and costs, socio-economic issues abound that have implications for public school English teachers. These issues are discussed in the following section.

### 2.2 Korea’s English Fever and Current Issues

#### 2.2.1 Necessitation: The Perception of Needing English

H. H. Moon (2009) discussed the political and ideological underpinnings in the push for English under these curricula. In the late nineties, Korea's rapid growth reeled back during the Asian financial crisis of the late 1990s. Education specialists put “forward the view that a country with a linguistic barrier cannot become an advanced one; they argued that competence in English was 'the' solution to tackle the problem” (H. H. Moon, p. 97). Policy makers believed that a lack of English competency was a threat to national survival and that it was needed for “negotiations with foreign countries” (H. H. Moon, p. 97). The MOE's stance, however, was to universalize public English education and elevate its status within the school system. Their plans, combining with the existing education fever (Seth, 2002), would ignite an already booming private English education industry (J.-K. Park, 2009). The free market quickly adjusted to the shifting education policies. J. S.-Y. Park (2009) described this impetus as an ideology of *necessitation*. Public English education became universal creating a situation where people can no longer afford not to learn English. The main socioeconomic issues for English education are discussed below.
2.2.2 Examination Hell

In the introduction to *Education Fever*, Seth (2002) describes a scene reminiscent of a national security emergency: a television address by the president, elevated police presence in the streets, restricted flights, and a request for silence. But this was not due to threats from enemy North Korea; rather, it marked the beginning of the university entrance exam (i.e., CSAT). While by no means the only exams or tests which matter in Korea, they are the biggest, and probably the most responsible for the expression *sihom jiok* ‘examination hell’ (M. Lee & Larson, 2000; see also S. Kim & Lee, 2010; Robinson, 2007). A repercussion of the CSAT has been negative washback creating a wide-reaching socio-economic impact on family life. Further, the aims for English education have been undermined by the widespread use of a pedagogy known as *teaching-to-the-test*.

Since the 1990s, educational policy called for the exclusive use of English and CLT; however, the CSAT is one of the biggest issues for rejecting these directives (J. Jeon, 1997, 2009; Liu, Ahn, Baek, & Han, 2004; Yook, 2010; see Chapter 3). For example, Yook (2010) quoted one teacher saying, “The national exam has total control over classroom teaching and learning” (p. 134). Another participant explained the rationale for rejecting CLT, saying,

> If I don’t teach to the exam, if I don’t teach them test-taking skills and drill them on test items from a test preparation book, students would look at me as if I am wasting their precious time by talking nonsense (p. 133).

These striking words show that students are also aware of the importance of exams and expect teachers to prepare them for it.

Testing washback extends beyond the classroom, however. One of the main reasons a bloated private education industry exists in Korea is the demand for academic achievement on these tests (S. Kim & Lee, 2010).

2.2.3 English: Equality or Enmity?

Korea’s demand for English education lies in assumptions that a good education and English proficiency will improve one’s or one’s children’s socioeconomic status (J.-K. Park, 2009; J. S.-Y. Park, 2009; Seth, 2002). However, some have argued that this belief actually benefits those who are already wealthy as they have the means to send children abroad for schooling or hire expensive private tutors (see S. Kim & Lee,
2010; S. Lee & Koo, 2006; Song, 2011). According to Song (2011), the status of English in Korean society is actually a force that keeps traditional, established power structures in place: “English has been recruited,” he writes, “in the guise of globalization, to exploit the meretricious ideology of merit to the advantage of the privileged classes” (p. 35). When it comes to education, the lower and middle classes have trouble keeping up. There is some evidence for this hypothesis in both educational and employment sectors.

According to economists S. Kim and Lee (2010), demand for private education has risen along with economic growth. In this trend, as incomes rose, so did the percentage spent on education. Wealthier families have a competitive advantage for the limited openings in elite universities, which are a path towards the more sought after careers in Korea.

In the job market, English proficiency became “a mechanism of elimination” (Song, 2011, p. 42). Lack of competency in English precludes consideration for employment in many fields, including primary education, regardless if one ends up teaching English or not (see 3.3 below). Performance on proficiency tests (e.g., TOEIC) is sometimes used for performance evaluation, even though in most workplaces English is rarely, if ever, used for communication (J. Choi, 2002; see also Booth, 2012).

The current situation has made it so that “not knowing English has negative consequences” (J. S-Y. Park, 2009, p. 75). One must acquire English competency—as measured by standardized tests—to enter the better university programs, and after graduating to find a job, regardless of whether or not that skill will be utilized (S. Y. Choi, 2002). These issues are something KETs are aware of and Study 2 suggests that it influences their approaches and underscores their concern for low-level students (Chapters 7 & 8).

**2.2.4 Everyday English?**

Students need to learn English and the curriculum is focused on building communicative competence, but the role of English in Korean society is idiosyncratic. While evident everywhere, English is seldom spoken anywhere. J. S-Y. Park (2009) argued that the role of English has led “to an anxiety that triggers the fetishism of English in Korea” (p. 224).
Because public opinion associates English with globalization and modernity, Korean businesses increasingly use it for branding (H. H. Moon, 2009). As of 2000, 51% of company names listed on Korean stock markets were English or Korean-English compounds (H. H. Moon, 2009). In Gangnam, Seoul, nearly 33% of business signs are only in English (J.-H. Lee, 2000). English in some form appears in over 80% of TV advertisements (J. S. Lee, 2006). Over half of Korean popular music (K-pop) song titles have English words or derivations (J. S. Lee, 2007). English—in some form—can be seen and heard virtually everywhere.

However, the ubiquity of English and demand for learning it contrasts with the realities for the average learner. Korea remains one of the most monolingual countries of the world (Song, 2011) and English is almost never used for communication among Koreans (J. S.-Y. Park, 2009). According to J. S.-Y. Park, “ultimately, Koreans strive to learn English for the symbolic capital it offers rather than for linguistic competence per se” (p. 48).

Even capable users avoid speaking English and J. S.-Y. Park (2009) argues that there are “ideologies that work against openly demonstrating one's proficiency” (p. 35). First, there is externalization. English is seen as a language for outsiders. In public space, he describes, it would be a head-turning event to see a group of Koreans communicating with each other in English; English use is incongruent with Korean identity, which is inextricably linked with the Korean language (J. S.-Y. Park). Further, externalization of English relates to nationalism; only a few generations ago Korean was banned outright under Japanese rule (Rhee, 1992).

Second, there is an ideology of self-deprecation. It is commonly believed that Koreans are not able to learn English and that they lack “sufficient competence to use English meaningfully, despite the abundance of English education they receive” (J. S.-Y. Park, 2009, p. 26). Self-deprecation is reinforced by the media. Variety shows and other comedic programming consistently use derisive Korean-English satire that projects Koreans' use of English as illegitimate. One form this takes is the “hyper-Koreanized pronunciation,” and another is stylizing what is understood as “bad English,” in other words, English “inadequate for communicative use” (J. S.-Y. Park, p. 148).

Public English education, then, faces a contradiction. English is not learned for communicative purposes and is not used in public domains in Korea, but the curricular aims for English are communicative competence for citizens (MOE, 1998). Its
necessity contrasts with how English is used in society and this is an issue that policy makers must grapple with and that KETs must reconcile with, both in their own experience as learners, and later in the classroom as teachers.

2.2.5 English Fever Summary

In the surge of globalization, with English already established as lingua franca for commerce, science, and medicine (Crystal, 1997; Gradol, 2006), English came to be seen as a critical and vital national resource in Korea (J. S-Y. Park, 2009; Song, 2011). Necessitation—this ideology which views English as indispensable in a globalized world (J. S-Y. Park, 2009)—is perhaps the biggest driver of the English frenzy. At the national level, English fluency is seen as essential for competing in international markets. For individuals, English education is universal, and as such, unavoidable. English test scores have become benchmarks in higher education and employment applications. For most, this ideology has become a reality. English is needed whether or not competency serves any functional communicative purpose.

As discussed above, seeing English as a resource, a means to improving social, political, and economic status (e.g., see Bourdieu, 1984), can be traced to historical precedents beginning a century ago. However, in the past few decades education policy, in tandem with public sentiment, has stimulated an English fever unlike anything that had come before (J.-K. Park, 2009). After the Asian Financial Crisis, sociopolitical pressure fueled equalization attempts for English education in the SNC and its revisions (1997-present). At the same time, English became as important as Korean and Math on university entrance exams (Song, 2012).

Under the impetus of globalization, public policy elevated the status of the English language, the outcome resulting in this English frenzy (Song, 2011). Every student needs to learn English. How they do so, however, is influenced to a large degree by both policy and teaching practices, for example, washback from English testing and traditional, grammatical approaches to language teaching. Necessitation, the perception of needing English to succeed, percolates through the school system. It impacts who teaches English, who they teach, what they teach, when they teach, where they teach, and why.
2.3 Teacher Education and English Policy in the National Curriculum

The first sub-section below describes the process for becoming an English teacher in Korea and the factors attracting people to the field. Then, pre-service teacher education and the job application process is described. The last subsection provides an overview of English within the public school system and a discussion of the national English curriculum.

2.3.1 The Social Status, Legal Status, and Working Conditions for Teachers

As part of the civil service, teaching offers attractive working conditions in Korea. In her policy reports, E.-G. Kim (2009, 2011) described three factors drawing people to teaching in Korea: (1) the social status, (2) legal status, and (3) working conditions. These factors are discussed below.

In Korean, seonsaengnim ‘teacher’, like its Japanese counterpart sensei, is a loan word the Chinese word, xiansheng (先生), and literally means ‘one who was born before’. The term is associated with status and respect. Teaching—going back centuries to Korea’s Confucian heritage—is a well-regarded profession (Seth, 2002). Traditionally, teachers were role models “required to have superior morality, integrity, and sincerity” (E.-G. Kim, 2011, p. 149).

In Korea, teaching is part of the civil service, a high-status sector beginning in the Koryo Dynasty (935-1392 CE), when an aristocratic class, the yangban, were appointed after a rigorous civil service exam (Seth, 2006). As civil servants, “teachers in Korea enjoy a relatively stable social status as professionals with correspondingly appropriate incomes” (S. Jo, 2008, p. 376).

The status of teachers is supported by parliamentary decree, and interestingly this includes provisions for social status. Article 14.1 of the Framework Act on Education states, “Professionalism of teachers in school education shall be respected, economic and social status of school teachers shall be privileged, and their status shall be guaranteed” (MEST, 2008b, p. 5). Equality among women and men is also stressed, which is a reason it is a highly sought after vocation for young women (E.-G. Kim, 2009). Further, teachers have guaranteed employment until the age of retirement (i.e., 62 as of 2011) (E.-G. Kim, 2011). In addition, they have shorter work weeks and receive far more vacation time than employees in other sectors.
The school year has 34 weeks of class, and depending on the school, teachers have up to six-week summer and winter vacations. Most sectors have one to two weeks holiday, but many employees are pressured to work through them. Recently, the school week was reduced from six days to five and teachers now have weekends off. An average teacher has 21.6 contact hours per week. Including other responsibilities such as grading and administration, this averages 42.9 hours during the school year (E.-G. Kim, 2009). In 2008, an average Korean worked 2246 hours, 25% more than the OECD average (OECD, 2012). At 34 weeks a year, this would put the annual average working hours for teachers at 1458.6, more than a third less than the average worker.

Teachers’ salaries also compare favorably to other sectors in Korea, and to cohorts in other OECD countries. Salaries are guaranteed, well above the national average, with experienced-based pay raises (E.-G. Kim, 2009). Measuring teacher salaries against per capita GDP demonstrates the relative high income for teachers and the government’s commitment to education, coming out well ahead of the national average and compensation for teachers elsewhere.

Data from 2006 showed that Korean teachers with 30 years’ experience made nearly four times the per capita GDP average (E.-G. Kim, 2009). Data from 2003 showed that while the average OECD teacher salary was even with per capita GDP, a Korean teacher with 15 years’ experience still made 2.42 times higher than the national average.

A better way to compare the salaries in different countries is to look at Purchasing Power Parity (PPP), which accounts for differences in relative costs of goods and services. Data from 2003 show that while a new teacher would rank 13th out of 30 OECD nations in PPP per capita, those in the highest pay bracket would be first at $75,965 USD (E.-G. Kim, 2009). See Table 2.1 below for a chart about new and experienced teachers. In addition to holidays and salary, vacation allowances, a generous benefit program, and secure welfare and pension schemes add to the allure of teaching in Korea (E.-G. Kim).
The status, working conditions, and compensation for teachers in Korea make it a sought after career (E.-G. Kim, 2009). A 1998 survey of Korean youth placed teaching high on the list of desirable careers: More high school students wanted to be teachers than office-based civil servants or doctors (B.-S. Kim et al., 1998). However, recent research suggests this is changing and teachers are less respected than in the past (Lim, 2011; see Chapter 3).

It is interesting to note that E.-G. Kim (2009, 2011), a KEDI researcher, reports the status of the teaching profession as the main impetus for becoming teachers. Interest in teaching or children are not even mentioned, but educational researchers have emphasized how important that is for efficacy (P. L. Choi & Tang, 2009; Day & Gu, 2007). This thesis seeks to address this point and the topic of teacher commitment is discussed further in Chapters 9 and 10.

### 2.3.2 Pre-service Education Tracks for Becoming a Korean English Teacher

This section describes tracks for becoming public school English teachers in Korea. There are different education tracks for primary and secondary teachers (see Table 2.2 below for a summary). Secondary teachers specialize in subject areas (e.g., English, Mathematics) and generally teach only their areas of expertise throughout their tenure. For English teachers, this requires majoring in English education or a related degree in a recognized university department (E.-G. Kim, 2009). Therefore, the process

---

**Table 2-1 OECD Rankings of Purchasing Power Parity (PPP) for Korean Teacher Salaries in 2003**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher experience</th>
<th>PPP (USD)</th>
<th>OECD Rank (of 30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New</td>
<td>$27,214</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 years</td>
<td>$46,640</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 years</td>
<td>$74,965</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(E.-G. Kim, 2009, p. 42)
of becoming an English teacher is relatively straightforward in secondary schools compared to primary schools. There are 394 universities offering secondary school teacher education, including 309 private and 85 public institutions (E.-G. Kim). Future KETs generally major in English education or a related subject. In 2008, admission quotas allowed nearly 58,000 entrants in secondary teacher education (E.-G. Kim). With that number of future teachers, the entire secondary school system could be turned over in four years. Competition for secondary school positions is extreme, amplified by this oversupply of qualified teachers (see below).

To become a primary school teacher, one must major in elementary education at one of 12 National Universities of Education (NUE), or Ewha Women’s University, the only private school sanctioned for primary school teacher qualifications (E.-G. Kim, 2009). Entrance into these programs is very competitive: Data from 2008 showed prospective applicants needed to be in the top 95th percentile of high school graduates to get in (E.-G. Kim, 2011). Graduates earn four year degrees in Elementary Education, then must take a qualification exam to get a placement (see below).

The track for teaching English in primary schools is more complex and problematic than in secondary schools. First, it is necessary to distinguish two kinds of teachers: subject teachers and homeroom teachers. In primary schools, the most common subjects with designated specialty teachers are usually English, physical education, and music. Subject teachers generally teach only their assigned subject; homeroom teachers are responsible for the remaining core subjects (see Table 2.3 below). As E.-G. Kim (2009) described, the MOE is responsible for policy and administration nationally. The MOE delegates responsibility for teacher assignments to Provincial and Municipal Offices of Education, who in turn pass on the day-to-day administration over to individual school principals. In practice, primary school principals delegate who will teach English in their schools. Assigning these English subject teachers depends on many factors such as school size, the skill set of existing faculty (E.-G. Kim, 2009), the willingness of teachers to teach English, and/or the decisions of individual principals (Jung & Norton, 2002). Therefore, intra-school and regional considerations affect who will teach English and who will be a homeroom teacher. All full-time teachers have degrees in Elementary Education, are hired through the same process, receive the same contracts, and are part of the civil service. In practice, English teachers can become homeroom teachers and vice versa. These distinctions are important as there are no pre-service teacher degrees for English
education in primary schools. Pre-service teachers select areas to specialize in; however, in practice that does not mean they will necessarily teach those areas of expertise. This issue is discussed further in Chapters 9 and 10.

There are legal and historical precedents for the bureaucracy upholding this system of administration and teacher selection (see above). However, for English education, these procedures have left a pedagogical void where existing faculty, in the aggregate, have lacked the skills and knowledge to effectively teach English within the system (see Kwon, 2000). Recently, three major policies have been developed to address this issue: (1) the English Program in Korea (EPIK), which introduced NEST co-teachers, (2) hiring full- and part-time Korean English instructors on yearly contracts, and (3) intensive in-service English language education programs for teachers. These policies are outlined below and the research is discussed in Chapter 3.

*Table 2-2 Paths to Teaching English in Korean Public Schools*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary School English Teachers (civil service)</th>
<th>Secondary School English Teachers (civil service)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Major in elementary education at one of 12 Universities of Education, or, Ewha Women’s University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Pass application examination</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Volunteer to teach English and/or be designated by principal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Take in-service English education (re)training</td>
<td>• Major in English education or related field as undergrad or graduate student in one of 394 university departments recognized by the MEST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Pass application examination</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2.3.3 Running a Gauntlet: The Application Process for Teachers**

As discussed above, the MOE regulates policy nationally, but delegates hiring of teachers to 16 Provincial or Metropolitan Offices of Education (E.-G. Kim, 2011, p. 151). These regional offices determine the number of openings and final selection criteria according to their own needs, but the initial screening stage is standardized. Teachers apply to a province or metropolitan area and are assigned a school if they pass employment exams, which is a three-stage application process.
The Teacher Employment Exam was developed in 1991, after an earlier constitutional court ruling that sought to amend systemic bias favoring graduates of national universities (E.-G. Kim, 2009, p. 57). Previously, national university alumni generally had little trouble finding a position. Currently, all prospective teachers must compete through the examination process regardless of where they studied (E.-G. Kim, 2011). Though content varies for primary and secondary school applicants, the process is the same.

The first stage is a standardized multiple-choice exam focusing on pedagogical knowledge, general aptitude, school curricula, and teacher policy (E.-G. Kim, 2009). There are also items for assessing personality attributes with the aim of ensuring applicants are compatible with curricular objectives (S. Jo, 2008). This stage filters candidates down to twice the number of available positions. If applicants pass, they are called back for the second stage, an essay-type exam. These exams are developed regionally, tailored to specific needs. The final stage is an in-depth interview and teaching demonstration. In many regions, primary teachers must demonstrate English competency in this stage, regardless of whether they will be assigned to teach English. There are very high stakes in this third stage. Three people for every two openings are called back for the third stage but if an applicant is not hired they must re-apply the following year and repeat the process.

Chances of attaining a position are much better in rural areas than in metropolitan areas. In 2010, only 1 out of every 23 qualified secondary school applicants passed the exam (E.-G. Kim, 2011, p. 151), but in more popular regions, applications exceed 200:1 for openings. Successful applicants are assigned a school, which may require new teachers to move, as was the case with the two novice teachers in Chapter 8. Furthermore, because of the teacher rotation system, even experienced teachers have limited agency in choosing where they will work, what they will teach, or for how long (see below).

**2.3.4 Korea’s Teacher Rotation and Transfer System**

In an attempt to equalize the quality of education nationally, the MOE adopted a complex rotation system which cycles teachers through different schools and districts (E.-G. Kim, 2011). The primary aims of this system are to ensure quality teachers are assigned to underprivileged areas, and to distribute talent within individual schools (E.-
G. Kim, 2011). There is also a converse effect in that lower quality teachers are also rotated through better schools and districts. Depending on the region, teachers must transfer every four to five years. Most districts also have service limits (e.g., 20 years in the city in Study 2).

Teachers select a list of schools where they wish to work, but transfers are competitive, mediated through a point scheme. Schools and districts are ranked and experience in less desirable locales increases a teacher’s point total. Teachers up for transfer are then ranked and slotted into schools by district superintendents (E.-G. Kim, 2011). As described above, the principals decide what grades teachers will be assigned, and in primary schools this also includes assigning teachers to subjects (e.g., English), but there are usually internal teacher committees and point systems for assigning grades and subjects that principals take into consideration.

To some degree the teacher rotation system does suit the purpose it was intended for, namely, improving the quality of education in rural areas (E.-G. Kim, 2009). However, it has also led to difficulties in holding teachers accountable for performance. This is an issue addressed by a recent overhaul of the evaluation scheme for teachers.

2.3.5 Teacher Evaluation: 360-degree Assessments

In the late 20th century, reforms successfully attracted younger and more educated teachers into the school system by providing generous, guaranteed salaries until the age of retirement (E.-G. Kim, 2009). This system, however, enabled complacency within teacher ranks; teachers were not evaluated in a meaningful way and faced few external pressures for professional development. There was a “recognition shared by the Minister of Education and the general public that enormous demands” were “emerging for a higher quality of teaching and professionalism of teachers” (S. Jo, 2008, p. 380). To address this, the MEST developed a multidimensional evaluation model gathering assessments from colleagues, principals, parents, and controversially, students (E.-G. Kim, 2011). Assessments successfully encouraged more teacher engagement in professional development and Korean teachers now participate in more in-service training programs than cohorts in many other OECD nations (E.-G. Kim, 2011). However, for English the programs are not without issue (see Chapters 3, 9, & 10).
2.3.6 In-service ELT Training: Paid Leave and Time Abroad

Enrollment in training programs boosts evaluation scores for teachers. Currently, 1300 institutions across Korea offer diverse in-service teacher training programs (E.-G. Kim, 2011). Between 2003 and 2005 total enrollment in all programs offered reached 454,050 (S. Jo, 2008, p. 379). The major English course is the six-month Intensive In-service English Teacher Training (INEST) program. There are also many three-week courses called Teaching English in English (TEE). Teachers receive travel and food allowances for TEE courses. For the INSET, they receive six months of English language and ELT training, room and board—including one month overseas—and retain full salaries. Understandably, entrance is competitive. In-service ELT research is addressed in Chapter 3.

2.3.7 Division of Labor: English Program in Korea (EPIK) and Korean English Instructors

The EPIK program was created in the 1990s to address deficiencies in public school English education, in particular the lack of English proficiency among Korean teachers (M. Jeon, 2009). EPIK recruits NESTs from six countries: Australia, Canada, New Zealand, South Africa, the US and the United Kingdom. The minimum qualification for a NEST is a four-year university degree in any subject (EPIK, 2013). EPIK brings NESTs to schools in the provinces outside the capital region. Seoul and some other cities have their own recruitment program.

EPIK employees are co-teachers. KETs are responsible for class planning and administration, although these duties are often shared (Balanyk, 2009; I.-J. Jeon, 2010; M. Kim, 2010). Participants in Study 2 worked with co-teachers for roughly a third of their classes. Research on co-teaching is reviewed in Chapter 3.

Korean English instructor positions were also recently introduced (S. Jo, 2008). The position allowed Koreans majoring in English education to apply for coveted full- and part-time positions in the schools. Applicants go through an application examination, based on the process for regular teachers, but are hired as non-tenured staff (B.-C. Lee, 2010). This position is a source of controversy with tenured teachers in Korea who perceive the hiring of instructors in schools as a threat to the status quo (Kwon, 2000; Yook, 2010).
2.3.8 Overview of the Korean Education System: Facts and Figures

Korea offers universal education. This includes six years of primary school, followed by three years each of middle school and high school, and for most, two to four years of tertiary education. Primary and middle school are compulsory. High school is optional, but is attended by 92.8% of eligible students (MEST & KEDI, 2011). Tertiary education enrollment is 71%, with 61% of high school graduates going directly to university, one of the highest rates in the OECD (OECD, 2010).

To get into university, however, students must take the CSAT (see 2.2.2 above). Outcomes determine university programs and majors that may be selected. These exams are so fundamental in determining academic and professional opportunities that, according to Song (2012), “it is not unfair to say that South Korean students prepare for it even before entering primary school” (p. 33; cf. Seth, 2002). As discussed above, negative washback is a major issue for ELT (see also Chapter 3).

In 2011, there were just under 7,000,000 students and over 420,000 teachers (MEST & KEDI, 2011). Student numbers are decreasing due to falling birthrates. Primary school enrollment dropped over 22% between 2000 and 2011 (MEST & KEDI, 2011, p. 20). The same time period saw the number of teachers increase by over 20%. Average primary school classes in 2011 had 25.5 students, middle school 33.0, and in high school 33.1. Class sizes dropped remarkably since the 1970s, when the average was 60 per class (E.-G. Kim, 2009).

Most teachers are female, a notable change occurring in recent decades. In 1970, 70.9% of primary school teachers were male, but by 2008 they were 26% of that cohort (E.-G. Kim, 2009), a crossover signifying the feminization of education in Korea (S.-K. Shin, 2012). North Gyeongbuk Province (the research context) is a conservative area and the trend has been slower there with 60.4% female, well below Daegu, the metropolitan area it surrounds, which has 80.7% female primary school teachers.

2.3.9 Overview of Public English Education

English education begins in Grade 3 of primary school. Currently, Grades 3 and 4 have 136 English classes per annum, with 204 for Grades 5 and 6. Class periods are 40 minutes in elementary school. Table 2.3 below charts the number of class periods per subject in primary schools. Middle school students have 340 English classes per
year, each 45 minutes and high school students have 255 fifty-minute classes (MEST, 2009).

Table 2-3 Allocation of Contact Periods by Subject Area at Primary School Level
(MEST, 2009a, p. 4; Song, 2012, p. 30)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Areas</th>
<th>Grades 1 &amp; 2</th>
<th>Subject Areas</th>
<th>Grades 3 &amp; 4</th>
<th>Grades 5 &amp; 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>Social/Moral Studies</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correct living</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wise living</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoyable living</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>Physical Education</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative/Experimental activities*</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>Fine Arts (Music, Painting, etc.)</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>English</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Creative/Experimental activities*</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Periods**</td>
<td>1680</td>
<td>Total Periods**</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>2176</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Club activities, volunteer work, self-directed activities, etc.

**One contact period=40 min; 34 weeks per academic year.

Over the years there have been many changes to the English curriculum. There is still a large gap between policy and practice that is discussed in Chapter 3. Below, the policy is described, clarifying English education policy in the SNC and revisions.

2.3.10 English in the Revised Seventh National Curriculum

The Seventh National Curriculum (SNC) (1997-present) saw two major revisions since inception (MEST, 2007, 2009b). This section outlines the English curriculum, with most attention given to the primary English curriculum for the teachers in Study 2.

Curricular policy is determined by the MOE with input from two other government bodies: (1) the Korean Institute for Curriculum and Evaluation (KICE) and
(2) the Korean Educational Development Institute (KEDI). The primary curriculum has the following objectives. Students should:

1. Acquire interest in English.
2. Build confidence in basic use of English.
3. Build a foundation for basic communication in English in everyday life.
4. Understand foreign customs and cultures through English education.

(National Curriculum Information Center [NCIC], n. d.)

The MOE delegated materials development to local publishing companies whose textbooks are subject to approval (Kwon, 2000). Schools may choose textbooks as they see fit. Curricular revisions encouraged teachers to develop supplementary materials and this included payment schemes for teachers (MEST, 2009a). Each grade level has standardized guidelines, for example, the range of vocabulary permitted (see Table 2.4 below).

Table 2-4 Number of English Words to be Learned in Schools (MEST, 2008a; Song, 2012)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>Number of words</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary School</td>
<td>Around 520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle and High school</td>
<td>Around 1290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Around 1810*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Allowed to increase up to 2315 words (Song, 2012).

The curriculum is constructed with detailed objectives for designers with example notions, functions, and activity types. Teachers receive guidelines for instruction; however, their directives are vague (see Appendix A). For example, the first and second instructions for teaching methods with primary English teachers are to:

A. Apply various teaching methods appropriate to the learning objective.
B. Use games to allow an activity-centered class. (NCIC, n. d.)

An issue for research is that the ambiguity of the instructions allow many practices to be interpreted as following the curriculum, even if the efficacy of practices might be questionable from an ELT perspective. Therefore, I focus on thematic analyses of the SNC as other researchers have done (e.g. K. Ahn, 2009; E.-J. Kim, 2008; Yook, 2010).
For example, E.-J. Kim’s (2008, 2010) content analysis of the curriculum manual (MOE, 1998) described the following themes in the reforms:

1. Dissatisfaction with existing teaching methods;
2. Communicative competence as instructional goal;
3. Student-centered communicative activities as essential classroom activities; and

First, traditional grammatical approaches to L2 instruction were criticized as being ineffective (Kwon, 2000) and the SNC adapted Canale and Swain’s (1980) description of communicative competence, stressing its necessity for improving Korea’s international profile (see above). The MOE recognized that teachers’ general lack of English proficiency was hindering student development (MOE, 1998) and introduced in-service training programs (see above). Teachers were encouraged to use only English through TETE policy (Kwon, 2000), and revisions codified the policy by evaluating teachers’ language use in class (MEST, 2009a). The curriculum outlined CLT and task-based language teaching (TBLT), encouraging teachers to focus on meaning, use collaborative activities, and stimulate TL use in class (see also K. Ahn, 2009).

However, according to K. Ahn (2009) the SNC “reflects the wholesale importation of a western view of CLT” (p. 116) and because of this it “lacks consideration of the local context embedded in Korean English classrooms, including socialization patterns of teachers and English in Korean schooling, as well as institutional constraints” (p. 116). These issues are major obstacles for English education, particularly evident in looking at two major plans: exclusive TL use and CLT (see Chapter 3).

Curricular aims contrast with the sociolinguistic reality where, as discussed above, English remains a foreign language seldom used in public domains (J. S.-Y. Park, 2009). The socialization of students is an obstacle for changing classroom culture because students are unaccustomed to using English (K. Ahn, 2009, 2010). This leads to anxiety over oral production and decreases students’ willingness to communicate (S. Y. Yim & Yu, 2011). Furthermore, even highly proficient English teachers are socialized into norms of teacher-centered, L1 instruction (S.-K. Shin, 2012). In secondary schools, washback from exams that test receptive skills impede curricular
imperatives of TETE and CLT: Students, aware of the importance of CSAT performance, expect to be prepared for the kinds of questions on it (Yook, 2010). Further, there are relatively few contact hours throughout the year and the curriculum does not meet diverging needs of students who range from beginner to native-like at all levels (S. A. Chang, 2008; K. Ahn, 2009). The shortcomings of public education pressure families to rely on tutoring and hagwon, which roughly 75% of the student body attend (S. Kim & Lee, 2010). It is with these issues in mind that this thesis was designed. The next chapter takes a closer look at the research on LTC in Korean public schools.
We cannot properly understand teachers and teaching without understanding the thoughts, knowledge, and beliefs that influence what teachers do.

Borg (2009, p. 163)

This chapter reviews research on LTC, starting with studies from the wider field before focusing on local research. Since the 1990s, LTC research has drawn considerable interest from applied linguists in other contexts. Borg’s (2013) updated bibliography included over 1500 articles, more than 800 since his state-of-the-art article review of LTC research (Borg, 2003). A recent review of qualitative research in language teaching included over 500 citations, the bulk of them since 2000 (K. Richards, 2009). While much attention has been given to LTC, much of it has come from western contexts (and Hong Kong), with a great deal focused on cognitions of pre-service teachers (Borg, 2009; Wright, 2010; Zheng, 2009). Less attention has been paid to in-service teachers in EFL contexts teaching under state curricula (Borg, 2006; Kubanyiova, 2012), but the trend is changing (Borg, 2012).

In AL/TESOL research, attention to local contexts is critical (D. Atkinson, 1999; D. Freeman, 2002; Kubanyiova, 2014; Kumaravadivelu, 2006), and therefore this review focuses on recent research from Korean public schools. Local researchers have produced over 1200 studies on ELT in recent years (Moodie & Nam, forthcoming); however, the quality of much of this work is questionable, particularly regarding qualitative research standards in the field of TESOL (see Edge & Richards, 1998). The literature review for this thesis grew into a survey on local research for Language Teaching (Moodie & Nam, forthcoming), and the articles most relevant to this thesis are reviewed below.

Themes from Borg’s (2003) survey serve as the organizing principle and are described as phases of language teacher experience (see Chapter 1). This fits with a constructivist stance (Chapter 4) that sees experience in these phases influencing LTC in different ways (cf. D. Woods & Cakir, 2011; Xu & Connelly, 2009).

This chapter continues by addressing terminology in LTC, followed by a discussion of research relating to the four phases. Each section begins with a discussion
of important studies from wider contexts, then focuses on the literature from Korea. To finish, I discuss the methodological issues of research from Korea and revisit the terminology discussed below and the scope of LTC research.

3.1 Defining Language Teacher Cognition

In order to understand the planning, actions, and decision-making occurring in language classrooms, one needs an idea of what is happening in the minds of teachers. Over the past few decades a growing body of LTC research has begun to describe the thoughts, beliefs, and knowledge of language teachers, and the relationships between these cognitions and in-class practices (Borg, 2003, 2006). Before turning to the research, however, it is necessary to navigate a semantic issue regarding studies on teacher cognition—the “bewildering array of terms” (Clandinin & Connelly, 1987, p. 487).

On reviewing the literature, Borg (2006) collated over 40 terms associated with LTC research:

- beliefs, assumptions, knowledge (BAK), beliefs, conceptions of practice,
- culture of teaching, epistemological beliefs, folklinguistic theories,
- idealized cognitive models (ICMs), image, images, knowledge about language, maxims, pedagogic principles, pedagogical knowledge, pedagogical reasoning, perception, personal pedagogical systems, personal practical knowledge (PPK), personal theories, practical knowledge, routines, specific pedagogical knowledge, teacher cognition, theoretical beliefs, theories for practice. (pp. 47-49)

And this list is by no means exhaustive. It does not include established teacher knowledge typologies such as pedagogical content knowledge (Shulman, 1986), a construct receiving some attention in AL (but see D. Freeman, 2002, for a critique of the term with LTC research). Nor does it include the concept of a professional knowledge base for language teaching (Andrews, 2003; D. Freeman & Johnson, 1998; Kubanyiova, 2014). Moreover, the list continues to grow and recent additions include theoretical knowledge, personal knowledge, impersonal knowledge and understandings (Woods & Cakir, 2011); teacher knowledge and knowledge-for-teachers (Xu & Connelly, 2009).
Semantically, a case can be and has been made for distinguishing terms. A great deal of literature is devoted to this task (e.g., Borg, 2003, 2006; Clandinin & Connelly, 1987; Elbaz, 1983; Golombek, 1998; Pajares, 1992; Verloop, Van Driel, & Meijer, 2001; D. Woods, 1996; D. Woods & Cakir, 2011). However, in the same way that Pajares (1992) criticized education literature, issues for LTC research are caused by “definitional problems, poor conceptualizations, and differing understandings” (p. 307) of terms. Further, Pajares commented on the disentangling of beliefs and knowledge as a “daunting undertaking” (p. 309; see D. Woods, 1996). The belief/knowledge problem is not new: It is central in Plato's *Theaetetus*. Applied linguists attempting to resolve it take on an age-old challenge. Nonetheless, distinguishing what is learned through experience versus what is taught in coursework is helpful for understanding teacher development (e.g., see Xu & Connelly, 2009). However, confining research to one term or another can be limiting. For example, a recent article specifically reviewing research on the relationship between stated beliefs and teaching practices turned up only three peer-reviewed articles (Basturkmen, 2012).

This brings up a question of necessity, then, because all of the above terms have something in common: They all refer to an “unobservable cognitive dimension of teaching” (Borg, 2003, p. 81). According to Borg (2006), the diversity is superficial: “Collectively, they highlight the personal nature of teacher cognition, the role of experience in the development of these cognitions and the way in which instructional practice and cognition are mutually informing” (p. 49). Pragmatically, LTC works as an “enveloping term” (Feryok, 2010, p. 272) for overlapping concepts (Borg, 2006; D. Woods & Cakir, 2011). As Verloop et al. (2001) argued, “in the mind of the teacher, components of knowledge, beliefs, conceptions, and intuitions are inextricably intertwined” (p. 446). So as a term, LTC is broad, but in its breadth lays its strength: It is inclusive of related concepts and thus forms a significant body of research for review. In this chapter, terms are distinguished if necessary to describe research or to aid readability.

### 3.2 Phase One: The Apprenticeship of Observation and Prior Language Learning Experience

For teachers, their experience as learners influences understandings about education, and continues to influence beliefs and practices throughout the other phases
of professional experience. Lortie (1975) described this phase as an “apprenticeship of observation” (p. 61). With all their experience observing, learning, and interacting with and in close proximity to teachers, students develop personal theories about education. In addition to being the first exposure to the practice of teaching, this apprenticeship is influential because of the time it spans that overlaps with the formative years in a future teacher's life. By the time one graduates from high school, a typical American student will have about 13,000 contact hours with teachers in class (Lortie). For the average Korean student that number is much higher, especially when accounting for time spent in hagwon. High school seniors reported studying between 14 and 18 hours a day (M. Lee & Larson, 2000). One estimate for English alone exceeds 15,500 hours of study between middle school and the end of university (H.-C. Jeon, 2006, p. 2). Consequentially, this affects LTC in Korea, but has not been addressed explicitly in many studies (see below).

Borg (2003) asserted “there is ample evidence” that this phase influences language “teachers throughout their career” (p. 81). For example, the sociocultural turn (Johnson, 2006) in SLTE research has shown how LTC development begins in the respective educational backgrounds of trainees (see also Johnson & Golombek, 2010).

Influential studies from recent decades are reviewed here that highlight the apprenticeship of observation in LTC. Discussion on this phase arose in a number of studies in the 1980s and 1990s (e.g., Bailey et al., 1996; Borg, 2005; Farrell, 1999; D. Freeman 1989, 1996; Golombek, 1998; Johnson, 1994; Medgyes, 1983; Numrich, 1996; J. Richards, Ho, & Giblin, 1996). The following paragraphs describe some notable findings.

Johnson (1994) wrote about the emerging beliefs and practices of four pre-service ESL teachers. All participants reported having experience in teacher-centered, grammar-focused classes and how that experience shaped their intention to approach their own classes differently by making sure that learning is fun. One trainee, however, did report her “love” of the grammatical approach, expressing the personal nature of language learning experience and its influence on LTC. Each person's experience is unique; so, too, are their conceptions of teaching, and the research underscores the importance of bringing that to the attention of trainees (see Borg, 2006; Wright, 2010).

Prior beliefs formed as learners have been found to sway decision-making and methodological approaches of teachers. Unsurprisingly, positive and negative L2 learning experience often corresponds with applying or avoiding practices. For
example, Numrich (1996) found that some of the 26 pre-service teachers avoided error correction due to their negative experience as learners. Others planned cultural aspects to language lessons because it was something they enjoyed as students. This association has also been made with in-service teachers. In Golombek’s (1998) study, one participant made sure to give students explicit rationales for in-class activities because of her preferences as L2 learner. The other participant's experience with a hyper-correcting Russian teacher created tensions for attending to fluency and accuracy in her classes.

Johnson (1994) argued that for pre-service teachers during the practicum, their L2 education will in “all likelihood represent their dominant model of action” (p. 450). Teachers need to become aware of how their experience as learners shapes their beliefs so that they may move beyond them.

However, the methods used to elicit beliefs influence what can be said about them (Borg, 2006). Studies from Korea rely heavily on surveys (see Moodie & Nam, forthcoming), but this is limiting for discussions of LTC because of the influence of instrument design on results. Reflective writing is one way to address this problem. Numerous studies have demonstrated how journaling and reflecting on experience expose beliefs rooted in prior learning (e.g., Bailey et al., 1996; Farrell, 1999, 2006; D. Freeman, 1992; Johnson, 1994, 1996; Numrich, 1996). Moreover, reflective writing is attractive as a research instrument because of the potential of preserving context in data, which is the impetus for including it in this thesis.

Guided self-reflection has been shown to heighten awareness of how experience filters conceptions of SLTE pedagogy and decision-making in classrooms. An early representative study came from Bailey and seven MA students (Bailey et al., 1996). Thematic analysis of their learner autobiographies revealed a generalized set of positive and negative learning experiences, some of which were unexpected. For example, findings showed that styles and personalities were more influential than teaching methods. Further, motivation was important for overcoming shortcomings of formal language education. Through analyzing their reflective writing, participant authors found deeper awareness of the influence of language learning on their beliefs about language teaching.

One comment, however, relates to the context since most studies above are from western or ESL settings. While context does not determine beliefs, it matters. Warford and Reeve’s (2003) study of nine participants enrolled in a TESOL course in the U.S.
explored this point. All had very limited prior ELT experience. Six were NESTs, but three were NNESTs from EFL contexts planning to teach in their home countries. Through qualitative analysis of interview data, they found important differences between the two groups. Notably, for the NNESTs, prior experiences seemed to be stronger influences than for the NESTs and this was apparent in the “sensitivity to the norms of teaching in their country of origin” (p. 47).

Studies from Hong Kong have found that as the local context changed, so, too, did beliefs of pre-service teachers (Cheng, Chan, Tang, & Cheng, 2009; Urmston, 2003). In the 1980s and 1990s, ELT was characterized by teacher-centered, exam-based education with large classes and heavy workloads. Education reforms sought to improve the situation and recent innovations implemented over the past few decades supported more constructivist approaches to education. Urmston (2003) surveyed 30 BA TESL students in the late 1990s and found that they favored teacher-centered approaches because of their experience as learners (cf. J. Richards et al., 1996). Cheng et al. (2009), however, showed that as reforms were implemented, they became evident in the beliefs of their 31 participants. Specifically, teacher trainees had a better understanding of ELT methods coursework if they had experienced similar methods themselves as students, for example, TBLT. This is an important point considering reforms in Korea (Chapter 2) and one this thesis will address. While there have been many policy changes since the 1990s, reforms are often met with resistance (J. Jeon, 1997, 2009; E.-J. Kim, 2008; S.-K. Shin, 2012), an issue that arises frequently in this review.

In summary, there is ample evidence that the apprenticeship of observation influences teachers' beliefs about language teaching and learning and continues to be an influence throughout their careers (Borg, 2003, 2006). However, the context of that experience is an important influence with implications for curricular reforms. Research on prior learning in ELT comes mostly from western/ESL contexts with pre-service participants. There is a need for further research in EFL contexts with centralized curricula (Borg, 2006, 2009, 2012), which this thesis seeks to address.

### 3.3 Prior Language Learning Experience of Korean English Teachers

The experience of KETs as students in the public school system is an underlying factor in studies from Korea but the relationship is rarely explicit, and the reader is
often left to imply the connection. I should point out that a few sociocultural studies have addressed this topic (K. Ahn, 2009; Butler, 2005; E.-J. Kim, 2008; S.-K. Shin, 2012). These are discussed below at further length in relevant sections. First, however, I will address the most frequently discussed issue related to prior language learning, that of the English proficiency of KETs.

The influence of language proficiency on beliefs and practice is worth consideration (Llurda, 2005). In their influential study, Reves and Medgyes (1994) surveyed 216 NESTs and NNESTs in ten different countries. Results supported the following hypotheses: “(a) NESTs and NNESTs teach differently; (b) differences found in their teaching behavior largely derive from their divergent language proficiency; and (c) an awareness of these differences affects the non-NESTs’ general self-image and attitude to work” (p. 363). One major finding was that 84% of NNESTs reported language-related difficulties while teaching. Studies in the Korean context appear to corroborate these hypotheses.

Numerous articles report the avoidance of practices mandated by policies—using English exclusively in class and CLT—due to a lack of proficiency and/or confidence using English (K. Ahn, 2009; Butler, 2005; Choe, 2005; I.-J. Jeon, 2010; I.-J. Jeon & Han, 2006; Jung & Norton, 2002; B.-C. Lee, 2010; Yang, 2009; Yook, 2010). For example, Yook’s survey of 150 KETs found the most frequently reported urgent need for improving their own teaching was improvement in English proficiency, noted by 84 teachers. This was well ahead of the second most cited concern, improving teaching methods, referred to 61 times.

Proficiency, as Reves and Medgyes (1994) hypothesized, influences teaching methodology and in-class decision-making. In Korea evidence for this is found in the tendencies of KETs towards teacher-centered, L1-mediated classes and avoiding CLT. However, proficiency is not the only factor related to prior learning.

Research has shown that KETs generally lack an effective model for CLT in their own learning, which also inhibits enactment of this policy. For example, in a survey of 76 teachers, Guilloteaux (2004) found participants had misconceptions about CLT because they lacked an example as learners. Looking deeper, K. Ahn's (2009) sociocultural study of four pre-service teachers had two participants educated only in Korean public schools, but two with some overseas English immersion as students. During the practicum, she found the degree to which participants enacted policy, that is, taught communicatively and in English, was influenced by their prior experience as
EFL learners. Both participants with overseas schooling were able to incorporate CLT in lessons more effectively because of exposure to the approach as learners abroad.

Studies investigating Korean and western co-teaching pairs make the apprenticeship of observation particularly salient. Balanyk (2009) attributed fundamental epistemic differences regarding education to the differing educational backgrounds of western NESTs and KETs. Furthermore, KET proficiency influenced collaboration and the respective roles of co-teachers (I.-J. Jeon, 2010). More studies on co-teaching appear in Section 3.6.2.4.

In summary, the main topics addressed were as follows. First, lack of English proficiency influences teaching methodology and decision-making; for example, it reinforces tendencies towards maintaining teacher control. Second, lack of experience with CLT as learners has inhibited enactment of curricular reforms. However, the influence of prior learning on beliefs and practices is a connection that often must be inferred from research studies. There is a gap in the literature regarding the apprenticeship of observation, particularly for primary school ELT in Korea.

The apprenticeship of observation is important because it acts as a filter in the uptake of SLTE, the second phase of experience. Below research on pre-service SLTE and the practicum experience are discussed.

### 3.4 Phase Two: Pre-Service Language Teacher Education and the Practicum Experience

The prior learning experience of trainees influences how they make meaning during SLTE. This experience occurs in diverse cultural, educational, and social contexts that are important to understand for efficacious language teacher education. Many studies over the last two decades have borne this out (Borg, 2003, 2006; D. Freeman, 1993; Johnson, 1994, 2006; Kumaravadivelu, 2006; Numrich, 1996; J. Richards, 1998a, 2008; Wright, 2010). There has also been a sociocultural turn in SLTE and research (Johnson, 2006), but it has only recently begun in Korea (e.g., K. Ahn, 2009; E.-J. Kim, 2008). Before turning to local research, it is helpful to highlight some of the issues and influential studies from other contexts.

First, Borg (2003) noted how SLTE research revealed that teacher trainees often enter programs with “inappropriate, unrealistic or naive understandings of teaching and learning” (p. 88). Prior language learning often leads to folk-linguistic theories about
SLA, which are important to address for SLTE efficacy (e.g., Johnson, 1994; Pasquale, 2011; D. Woods, 1996, 2006). This issue was central in J. Richards et al.’s (1996) study of trainees in Hong Kong. They reported on participants’ successful uptake of methodological and pedagogical concepts; however, the student teachers internalized these concepts according to their own interpretations based on experience as learners. While they showed an understanding of key TESOL terminology, they failed to apply the underlying concepts in the way intended by the instructors.

Second, while trainees bring diverse and often unrealistic expectations into SLTE programs, sometimes it is the education programs themselves that are inadequate. In a review of 40 studies, Kagan (1992) discussed some of the ways that training failed to suit the needs of novice teachers, for example, inadequate timeframes, unsuitable resources, or instructors unfamiliar with the context in which trainees are teaching. These complaints are echoed in studies from Korea discussed below.

Third, during practicums, tensions surface between the intentions and practices of pre-service teachers. Demonstrating concepts from coursework is a consistent challenge for trainees. For example, Johnson (1994) discussed the emerging beliefs of four pre-service ESL teachers. Desires to teach communicatively contrasted to “realities faced during the practicum” (p. 450). Through reflection, participants noticed how they cut off students to get through lesson plans and failed to provide as much authentic input as they hoped. Johnson explains that trainees need to “understand who they are” as teachers to “make sense of what they do” (p. 451), and understand why this may differ from their intentions.

Relatedly, in a study with an MA TESOL student, Johnson (1996) described “the vision versus the reality” (p. 30). The enthusiasm of her participant, Maja, contrasted with student apathy towards the coursework and disruptive students, which tested her limits. In Maja's case, tensions were heightened because she was unfamiliar with the local context of her practicum.

The practicum was also the focus of Numrich’s (1996) study analyzing diaries from 26 MA TESOL students. Numrich highlighted four areas of interest for teacher educators: “(1) the preoccupations of novice teachers with their own teaching experience; (2) the transfer (or conscious lack of transfer) of teaching methods/techniques used in the teachers' own L2 learning; (3) unexpected discoveries about effective teaching; and, (4) continued frustrations with teaching” (p. 134). Trainees experienced frequent frustrations, having difficulties managing class time,
giving clear directions, responding to students' needs, teaching grammar effectively, and assessing students' progress. These were also common themes in the case studies (Chapters 7 & 8) and discussion (Chapter 9).

In summary, these studies have shown that understanding trainees’ prior beliefs and expectations are important for SLTE efficacy; that efficacy of SLTE is an issue for institutions that do not come to an understanding of pre-service teacher perspectives; and that during the practicum, tensions arise between intentions and actions of trainees, and in their expectations and the realities faced in the classroom.

SLTE in many western/ESL contexts has adapted constructivist approaches, emphasizing sociocultural aspects of teaching, learning, and the processes of learning to teach (D. Freeman & Johnson, 1998; Johnson, 2006; Wright, 2010). However, some researchers expressed concern over the marginalization of SLA knowledge and the implications this has for future student teachers (Yates & Muchiskey, 2003). In Korea, however, the issue runs much deeper (K. Ahn, 2009; J. Jeon, 1997, 2009; Yook, 2010). Not only is SLA marginalized, but the research also shows pre-service SLTE is ineffective in many other areas, particularly regarding curricular reforms for CLT and TETE (see 3.6.2).

3.5 Pre-service Education for Korean English Teachers

Some of the general themes from SLTE research above are salient in Korea. For example, prior language learning affected taking up pedagogical concepts and adapting ELT methods from coursework created tensions during practicums (K. Ahn, 2009, 2010b; J. Choi, 2008). Also, research adapting instruments to stimulate reflection has demonstrated how reflection helped trainees become more aware of issues during the practicum (Y. Kim & Yi, 2010). Moreover, the research points to issues in the uptake of curricular reforms.

In Korea, top-down policies for CLT and TETE have been consistent challenges for pre-service teachers to meet during their practicum experience, in part because their beliefs have not always aligned with policy. For example, in J. Choi’s (2008) study, findings from 20 pre-service teachers suggested that they tended to think teacher-centered, grammatical approaches were more appropriate than CLT, and they gave little consideration to student TL use. J. Choi associated these findings with the fact that they had little exposure to CLT as learners (see 3.2 above). However, even studies that had
participants with favorable attitudes towards CLT found implementation to be an issue (K. Ahn, 2009; Y. Kim & Yi, 2010).

K. Ahn's thesis (2009) investigated four pre-service teachers’ development in light of recent curricular reforms. She found that “each individual’s development was largely dependent on their language and schooling biographies, the nature of their participation in practicum activities, and the institutional context in which the practicum was situated” (p. 300). The four student teachers “showed uneven and nonlinear development in their understanding and internalization” (p. 301) of the “tenets of the curricular reforms” (p. 300) such as learner-centered classes, TBLT, using English in class, and focusing on communicative competence. The teachers in general held positive views towards CLT, although some had more difficulties than others applying it in their practicum, which is discussed below.

For the practicum, trainees were split into two pairs; the first had been educated only in the Korean public system (Pair A), but the second pair had at least one year of English emersion overseas as students (Pair B). Each pair was assigned different mentor teachers. All trainees exhibited individual differences in conceptualizing course content and putting it in practice, but K. Ahn (2009) found clear differences between the two pairs because of their different educational backgrounds. Pair A did not demonstrate a deep understanding of the main concepts of the curricular reforms (i.e., CLT and TETE), “nor were they able to enact” (p. 301) them. Pair B participants were much more successful at incorporating reforms as they drew on their personal experience as learners. Pair A tended to revert to Korean as the medium of instruction, exert more control over their classes, focused more on grammatical accuracy, and “on teaching knowledge about L2” (p. 301). Pair B, however, was “able to enact the curricular goals of developing learners’ communicative competence and supported their use of English more extensively” (p. 302). This was a significant finding demonstrating the link between teacher prior learning experience with willingness and ability to enact the mandated reforms. KET trainees who were educated in English abroad implemented the curricular reforms in class, while the KETs who were educated in the Korean school system found this much more challenging.

In K. Ahn's (2009) study, mentor teachers also influenced the degree to which trainees incorporated curricular reforms in class. Both mentors had lesson goals differing from the curriculum, feeling they needed “to solve more immediate problems such as classroom management and exam preparation” (p. 307). Also, they “understood
and implemented the curricular mandates in their own unique ways” and “adapted them to fit the institutional context of the practicum” (p. 307). The student teachers were “exposed to institutionalized lesson goals and teaching methods such as teaching the content of the textbook for school exams and using traditional approaches (e.g. grammar-translation methods)” (K. Ahn, 2010b, p. 243). Through their mentorship, the model teachers introduced trainees to the status quo of Korean English education (see also S.-K. Shin, 2012).

In a follow-up article based on her thesis, K. Ahn (2010b) discussed the challenges for one participant from Pair B, Bohee. In her practicum, Bohee wanted to foster student participation through interesting activities, have them speak only English in-class, and complete the goals of her lesson plans. However, she was not entirely successful in meeting these goals. K. Ahn described the contradictions Bohee faced. First, interesting activities led to boisterous classes and concerns over managing noise during communicative activities. Secondly, students were reluctant to use English during these activities. Bohee noticed that students “used Korean in small group activities in the way they had been socialized” (p. 245). She attempted to overcome this, but had difficulties doing so, complicated by the fact that classes had students with mixed-level English abilities. Third, although Bohee was successful to some degree in incorporating CLT and teaching in English, she reverted from a communicative approach to a more traditional approach in her model class as she felt pressure to conform to the educational norms of the school system and the beliefs she perceived in her observers: the professor, mentor teachers, and peers. This final contradiction is an interesting finding, which arises again in a discussion of in-service teachers in Korea.

One study investigated pre-service KET identity, and was the only one found including data on participants’ initial commitments to ELT (Lim, 2011). This elaborate study included 90 participants, a mixture of undergraduate and graduate students. First, the researcher collected and analyzed reflective writing from each group, developing about 100 statements per group. These were rated by participants on a Likert scale according to how much the statement was true for influencing them to become English teachers. Responses were clustered thematically on concept maps. Analysis showed some interesting differences between graduate and undergraduate students. For example, graduate students were associated more with the theme “qualities and knowledge necessary for teaching English”, but undergraduates were associated with “goals and aspirations for becoming a good teacher” (Lim, 2011, p. 974). Furthermore,
undergraduates seemed less committed to teaching because of (1) lacking positive
teacher models, (2) the competitive employment examination, and (3) teachers not
being respected as much as before (cf. E.-G. Kim, 2009).

One study specifically focused on reflective practice with encouraging results. Y. Kim and Yi (2010) instructed 33 trainees to focus on lesson breakdowns and critical incidents during the practicum. Their study cleverly fused research methodology with SLTE pedagogy. Participants kept weekly journals and were asked to describe and then analyze their own critical incidents. Findings showed that many breakdowns occurred early in the lessons. The main cause, unsurprisingly, was inexperience. Trainees had challenges preparing level-appropriate materials and allocating adequate time for completion of activities. Although critical incidents were often stressful, the researchers found that through “describing and analyzing critical incidents, student teachers became more aware of their assumptions about language teaching and learning” (p. 373). The reflective process facilitated adapting concepts from coursework into the classroom. A post-practicum survey revealed that “self-observation of critical incidents in their own classroom helped them to generate powerful insights about teaching” (p. 373). Reflections through journaling facilitated a cognitive shift in trainees and aided their development as teachers.

This last point has relevance considering changes in SLTE in Korea during the past few decades in that it provides empirical evidence of educators adapting new approaches and the potential efficacy of changing from a lecture-based education to one more learner-centered. In the early 1990s SLTE curricula were dominated by English literature and linguistics classes (over 60%) at the expense of ELT pedagogy and language classes (under 40%) (Kwon, 2000). Following curricular reforms, by 1999 the percentages were roughly 50/50. Recent studies (e.g., K. Ahn, 2009; Y. Kim & Yi, 2010; Lim, 2011) suggest further changes have been made for secondary school SLTE.

One article specifically addressed changes in primary school SLTE. I. O. Kim, Kim, Kim, and Lee (2011) showed how over two years SLTE was reformed at an NUE, including,

1. creating courses on TETE,
2. providing administrative support for trainees,
3. establishing a mentor program for underprivileged students giving opportunities for trainees to practice ELT, and
4. extending an overseas exchange program.
Their study included analysis of student evaluations of these new programs, but the questionnaire data did not seem to support their interpretations and assertions of improved pedagogy. Further, researcher positionality was unclear, so one might wonder if their positive interpretations were due to the fact that participants might have been students of the researchers. Nonetheless, it is included here because it documented change since the 1990s when SLTE for primary teachers was nonexistent (see Kwon, 2000).

In summary, the main issues in the studies reviewed above revolve around the challenges for trainees to enact TETE and CLT reforms during the teaching practicum. Findings showed that (1) student KETs faced challenges because they lacked a model for TETE and CLT in their own experience, (2) trainees initially attempted CLT during practicums but tended to revert to more familiar methods (i.e., grammar-translation, structure drills, etc.); (3) teacher-centeredness was used to maintain control of classes; (4) students were not socialized into using English with each other making TETE challenging; (5) Korean was used to transmit knowledge about English, to facilitate student participation, and to maintain control; and (6) reflective practice enhanced trainees’ development as language teachers.

3.6 Phase Three: A Teacher's Experience in the Field

The third phase of a teacher's experience is reciprocal in its effect upon LTC: Beliefs about teaching lead to choices, choices lead to actions in the classroom, actions lead to results, results lead to an outcome, and the outcome may either reinforce the original belief or lead to a change in belief, and thus, a change in cognition. However, untangling the relationship between cognitions and practices is not so straightforward. Many factors make it challenging. For one, the process is not linear. Further, unique personalities and experiences influence beliefs and practices. Educational contexts are also a powerful shaper of practices and beliefs about what can be done in a language class. Nevertheless, the understanding that cognitions relate to in-class practices is relatively undisputed (Borg, 2009, p. 166). In this section I review important findings and themes from research on in-service language teachers since the 1990s.

Many studies have shown how cognitions and practices differ between novice and experienced teachers (e.g., Farrell, 2008c, 2011; Nunan, 1992; J. Richards, 1998b; Smith, 1996, Tsui, 2003; Vásquez, 2007). Also, some have investigated the relationship
between cognitions and working contexts (Breen, Hird, Milton, Oliver, & Thwaite, 2001; D. Woods, 1996). Research has aggregated maxims (J. Richards, 1996) and principles (Bailey, 1996; Breen et al., 2001) explaining the practices of teacher populations within similar contexts. Teacher maxims are also central to the notion of personal practical knowledge (PPK) used in NI (Clandinin & Connelly, 1987; Golombek, 1998; Tsang, 2004). Reflective practice is shown to elicit beliefs and facilitate change (Farrell, 1999, 2007b). Furthermore, like SLTE research, reflective writing is increasingly used for investigating LTC of in-service teachers (Borg, 2009).

The influence of experience on decision-making is well documented (Borg, 2006). For example, J. Richards (1998b) showed how experienced teachers improvised more in class, gave less attention to behavioral issues and focused more on language-related issues than less experienced teachers. An earlier study by Nunan (1992) of ESL teachers in Australia described similar findings. Smith (1996) found that experienced teachers are less attached to lesson plans than novice teachers and often depart from lesson plans in response to students' needs or moods. Farrell (2006) also showed how novice teachers may face challenges regarding socialization, professional identity, and confidence.

In her influential study on language teaching expertise, Tsui (2003) compared four teachers of varying experience in a Hong Kong school, finding that one teacher, Marina, was able to articulate her knowledge better than the other less experienced teachers. Tsui summarized Marina’s pedagogical knowledge as being “much richer, more elaborate, and more coherent” (p. 223). An interesting interpretation was that other teachers tended “to dichotomize different aspects of teaching that are inextricably linked, such as fun and learning, student interest, and learning objectives” (p. 223). (Tsui’s study is further described in Chapter 9, where the differences of experienced and novice teachers are discussed.)

In one of the most comprehensive studies on LTC to date, D. Woods (1996) looked into the decision-making and planning of eight experienced university ESL instructors in Canada. This included the processes of teaching and learning as perceived by participants, from broader theoretical aspects to the details of lesson planning and decision-making. Noting a gap in the literature, D. Woods focused on beliefs in relation to curricula and syllabi for their respective programs. For triangulation, he interviewed teachers, observed their classes, and video-taped think-aloud sessions. This study led to the hypothesized system of beliefs, assumptions, and knowledge (BAK). BAK,
according to D. Woods (1996), filters teachers' interpretive processes and influences teaching methods and practices. He summarized BAK thusly:

This study suggests that each teacher has an individual system of interwoven beliefs, assumptions, and knowledge, a system which has evolved in an individual and organic fashion when aspects of that teacher's BAK have interacted with experience, especially experiences that resulted in a conflict with the BAK's current state. As a result, each teacher's system differs from other teachers' not only in terms of its individual 'components', but also in terms of the interrelationships among the beliefs, assumptions, and knowledge. (p. 248)

D. Woods recognized issues raised by D. Freeman (1991, 1993) regarding terminology overload in AL. He proposed the new term anyway, discussing the semantics of beliefs/knowledge and the challenges in teasing out relevant differences for teaching practices (cf. Pajares, 1992). This study brought a richer understanding of the thought processes of in-service teachers and how cognitions and practices are related. No studies from Korea approach this depth of investigation. The present thesis seeks to make a modest contribution in that regard.

As D. Woods (1996) demonstrated in unparalleled detail, understanding the individual nature of LTC is integral for understanding language teacher development. Breen et al. (2001) further contributed to understanding beliefs in relation to practices. Through interviews and observations with 18 ESL teachers in Australia, they described over 300 different teaching practices and about 200 principles. This was an important study because of the contribution for understanding collective practices and the challenges of doing so.

Breen et al. (2001) summarized their findings. First, individual teachers have favored sets of practices realized through “a personal configuration of pedagogic principles” (p. 495). Second, any given principle may motivate several different practices. Third, different teachers prioritize principles in different ways. Fourth, teachers in similar contexts may share principles, although they are manifest in different ways in the classroom. Fifth, they found a pattern between shared principles and some specific practices. Sixth, a thematic grouping of principles showed that different sets of principles justified different kinds of practice. Seventh, “there appeared to be a collective pedagogy” underlying the “individual diversity in action in the classroom and the personal dispositions that guide it” (p. 496). For example, teachers of
children enacted the principle of “accounting for individual differences” (p. 490) in different ways such as encouraging risk-taking, moving around class, giving individual attention to students, and/or providing positive feedback “to all contributions from students” (p. 491). This was an important study and the findings reveal the complexity of LTC (see Feryok, 2010), even for teachers in the same context.

3.6.1 Recent Studies on Curricular Reform in Asia

This section reviews studies on reform in Asia sharing similarities to Korea’s SNC. Selected studies from Hong Kong, Vietnam, Singapore, Japan, and Taiwan are discussed.

Curricular reforms in Hong Kong encouraged CLT and English-only instruction in public schools. Not only were these changes mirrored in Korea, the research has shown that issues for implementation were also similar. J. Richards and Pennington (1998) followed five first-year teachers, finding that while their beliefs initially aligned with CLT principles, they all diverged from CLT as the year went on due to factors such as exam washback, large classes with unmotivated students, and socialization from more experienced co-workers. A study published two decades later reinforced these findings, concluding that CLT innovations are unlikely to be implemented under the exam-centered Hong Kong education system (Urmston & Pennington, 2008).

Hong Kong administrators also recommended TBLT. Carless’ (2004) case study of three primary school teachers found that participants interpreted the reform according to their existing beliefs about language teaching (cf. D. Freeman, 1993). The main issues for TBLT revolved around classroom management, extensive L1 use during activities, and the quality of TL utterances. Secondary teachers also faced similar issues (Carless, 2007); however, like the studies above, exam washback created pressures for teaching content directly. Carless (2007) concluded that a strong-version of TBLT may not be appropriate for ELT in Hong Kong.

Barnard and Nguyen (2010) investigated TLBT in Vietnam, an approach contrasting with traditional grammatically-focused English instruction. As in Hong Kong, there were contradictions between this policy and practice. They found that while teachers recognized the pedagogic value of TBLT, and CLT in general, they were reluctant to use it in practice. Some reasons were (1) teachers’ strong beliefs about the
necessity of explicitly teaching grammar and composition; (2) teachers’ lack of training for TBLT; and (3) washback from national exams testing grammar and vocabulary.

In case studies from Singapore, Farrell (2006, 2008b) found similar themes to those above. His first-year teacher participant, Wee Jin, was reluctant to experiment with CLT. Wee Jin faced challenges with (1) adapting appropriate teaching styles for CLT, (2) the course content, and (3) relationships with other teachers. Wee Jin wanted to use a learner-centered approach; however, contextual restraints such as the socialization of students and the status quo demonstrated by veteran teachers made it difficult. Second, regarding the syllabus, he wanted to select interesting materials, but felt pressure to choose exercises that prepared students for exams. Third, Wee Jin kept to himself, not wanting to impose on the norms of socialization among experienced staff. Therefore, he missed out on opportunities for professional development through discussions with senior teachers.

English education in Korea has more similarities to Japan than Hong Kong or Singapore, and research in Japan has found similar issues with curricular reforms for English-mediated instruction and CLT. Studies have shown how teachers face pressures to conform to traditional, teacher-centered classes; that large classes, exam washback, and insufficient training inhibit CLT, but also that teacher English proficiency is an issue (Butler, 2005; Hiramatsu, 2005; Iwamura, 2008). As happened in Korea (see below), the top-down reforms came with little administrative oversight, and insufficient training to be enacted, thus mitigating teachers’ interest in changing practices (Hiramatsu, 2005).

Butler (2005) compared 22 primary teachers’ perceptions of CLT and TL use in Korea, Japan, and Taiwan. Important findings from this study indicated that (1) teachers in all three countries had challenges implementing CLT due a lack of understanding about what constitutes CLT; (2) teachers had further uncertainties about SLA in young learners; and (3) CLT contrasted to norms for education styles in all three contexts. However, like many studies from Korea, this study had notable methodological limitations. First, it relied on self-reported data, making claims about CLT practices unreliable. Second, data were collected in group discussions, bringing up an issue of reflexivity among group members. In these cultures, deference to seniors is the norm and disagreements can be perceived as being impolite; therefore, one might question if the findings would be similar had participants been interviewed individually. Third, participants were selected because of their interest in professional
development so the findings may not be indicative of the larger population of primary school English teachers in these countries.

Nishino’s (2012) mixed-methods study extended knowledge of the influences on LTC for NNEST EFL teachers. There were 139 survey participants, and 4 who were interviewed and observed in order to follow up on themes in the survey results. Her survey suggested that (1) student expectations influenced how communicatively-oriented teachers were, (2) there was no statistically significant influence found on positive belief towards CLT and communicative teaching, (3) exam washback was complex but it did hinder CLT in Japan, (4) in-service SLTE had a weak influence, and (5) pre-service SLTE had no statistically significant influence on reported practices. Qualitative findings both supported results and underlined the complexity of understanding LTC. However, her conclusion that positive beliefs towards CLT alone cannot lead to implementation of CLT underscores the necessity for in-depth qualitative research in order to discover how change might occur in EFL contexts such as Japan and Korea.

3.6.2 In Service of Reforms: Research on ELT in Korea

Elbaz (1981, 2005) described the importance of understanding how teachers’ perceptions of reforms influence the successful implementation of curricula. As Clark and Peterson (1986) wrote, “the thinking, planning, and decision making of teachers constitute a large part of the psychological context of teaching. It is within this context that curriculum is interpreted and acted upon; where teachers teach and students learn” (p. 255). Instilling language policy in teaching practice is a complicated process, and it is “vitally important for language policy strategists to understand the crucial role that teachers play in the enactment of language policy” (Farrell & Kun, 2007, p. 399). Particularly in Korea, the stakes for ELT are high with English being such an important subject in determining students’ future education and career possibilities (Choi, 2002; J. S-Y. Park, 2009; Song, 2011, 2012). The literature from Korea points to an overwhelming consensus that teachers in general have not enacted policies for CLT and TETE. The small but growing body of research on KETs has repeatedly borne this out and the evidence is particularly strong for secondary school ELT. Primary school contexts, however, are relatively unexplored, which is one of the reasons it is the central focus in this thesis (but see M. Park & Sung, 2013, for issues on general
curricular implementation in Korean primary schools). In the following sections research on CLT and TETE are discussed, with particular attention to local research occurring after the recent reforms (MEST, 2007, 2009a; See Chapter 2).

3.6.2.1 Studies on CLT in Korea.

After announcement of the SNC, Li (1998) reported that teachers were very concerned about the new policies. Interviews with 18 experienced teachers found that they felt insufficiently trained for CLT: They doubted its effectiveness and did not feel proficient enough for teaching in English. They expressed concerns regarding large classes, student participation, and washback from grammatically-focused exams. Research since that time shows that to a large extent these concerns have not gone away even after revisions and government investments to improve public ELT.

J. Jeon (2009) replicated a previous study (J. Jeon, 1997), a report on key issues inhibiting CLT in Korean schools under the SNC. Eighteen issues were rated by 172 participants on a Likert-type scale. Interestingly, after twelve years the top five issues had remained the same. First, classes were perceived as too large. This was still the case even though the average size had shrunk by a third between studies. Second, teachers felt a need for systematic in-service training in CLT. Although in-service programs had come online by the second study, they found them insufficient. Third, teachers felt that improved pre-service SLTE was needed and would have preferred a more practical education focusing on improving trainee L2 proficiency and more in-class teaching practice rather than linguistics, literature, and theory (see above). Fourth, teachers felt that they lacked appropriate supplementary materials. Fifth, they wanted more interesting, practical, and communicative textbooks. J. Jeon (2009) noted one significant change, however: CSAT washback rose from the thirteenth to the sixth most important issue. Although descriptive statistics revealed a lot of variability in teachers’ responses, the results were important for showing how little the major issues for CLT had changed regardless of government efforts to improve the situation, such as in-service training discussed below.

Reforms and SLTE have not been effective for changing teaching practices. Even if teachers believe they are doing CLT, observations of in-class practices have shown little evidence of communicative approaches (cf. Butler, 2005). For example, Y. Jeon (2010) observed and interviewed three teachers of varying experience, including an award winner for a regional English teaching contest. Findings showed that her classes
provided few opportunities for meaningful, interactive, or creative language use. Nam (2011) analyzed interactions during four middle school classes: Teacher talk was dominant, taking up more than three quarters of classroom interactions, with about two-thirds in the L1. She found little evidence of meaningful communication; most student utterances were repeated after the teacher or read from the textbook. These studies included strong content analysis of transcripts; however, without prolonged engagement, it is hard to say how indicative these observations were of the teachers’ regular practices.

There is a small but emerging body of sociocultural research from Korea that included persistent observation (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). E.-J. Kim’s (2008) work provides one such example (see also K. Ahn, 2009 with pre-service participants above). E.-J. Kim included observations and interviews spanning seven weeks with two middle school teachers and seven students. Discussion below will focus on findings from one participant, Hee-Won (E.-J. Kim, 2010). Hee-Won’s stated image of herself as a professional aligned with CLT policy, but observations showed that she relied on teacher-centered activities using grammar-translation and audio-lingual methods. Using the tools of activity theory, E.-J. Kim explained this contradiction. Maintaining control provided a means for Hee-Won to cover materials in the syllabus. Further, Hee-Won lacked confidence speaking English so she resisted using it in class. She “simultaneously resisted” and “doubted her ability to implement the mandates” (p. 235). Although she wanted to teach differently, she doubted that students would be receptive to communicative activities because they knew grades were determined by paper and pen exams. E.-J. Kim concluded that “individual, institutional, and social factors made local-level implementation of the CLT-based curricular mandates improbable” (p. 236). The researcher’s rich descriptions of the complex relationship between beliefs and teaching practice made an important contribution to understanding the issues for CLT in Korea.

Yook (2010), interested in teacher beliefs regarding CLT reforms, observed and interviewed ten KETs, including three primary school teachers. The following is a summary of her six major findings. First, participants believed CLT was superior to traditional grammatical approaches, but they held on to beliefs in the necessity of explicit instruction, particularly for grammar. Second, overseas living experience and/or in-service teacher training programs had a strong impact on CLT advocacy among teachers. This is notable because it contrasts with what E.-J. Kim (2008) found
of her two participants who said in-service training seemed to have little impact. Third, positive perceptions about CLT were mitigated by the lack of suitable materials. Fourth, although teachers were positive towards in-service training programs, they were dissatisfied with the unavailability of such programs. Fifth, teachers who valued CLT did not necessarily teach communicatively when observed. Sixth, teachers were discouraged from CLT (and TETE) because of exam washback, large classes, too many classes, and burdensome administrative duties (cf. J. Jeon, 2009).

The curriculum manual (MOE 1998) also recommended TBLT to foster communicative learning. Through interviews with 10 participants, S. H. Yim (2009) found that these teachers generally had positive perceptions of TBLT and thought it was particularly helpful for increasing student participation. However, teachers reported it was not widely used for the following reasons: (1) incompatibility with exam preparation, (2) time constraints in class because of curricular objectives, (3) lack of proficiency of both students and teachers, and (4) lack of institutional support (cf. Barnard & Nguyen, 2010). However, this study had significant limitations. First, participants came from a pool of 89 graduate students. Only 16 participants volunteered, but 5 were excluded because they had insufficient knowledge about TBLT to participate, which suggests the issue of TBLT is deeper than discussed in the findings. Also, it relied on self-reported data for teaching practices, unlike the three studies above. More research into TBLT in Korea is warranted, particularly from studies providing evidence of how it may be successfully applied in classrooms.

Overall, research has shown that CLT policy remains controversial in Korea (see K. Ahn, 2009; Chapter 2). Perhaps it could be argued that the policy should be revised, but there is not much evidence that the approach has been widely applied in the first place. S. A. Kim (2009) asserted that there is a gap between the educational policy and practice, and inconsistencies between expectations for primary and secondary education. She pointed out that stated curriculum guidelines were not generally implemented in regular secondary school English classes except during specially prepared demonstration classes. In addition, due to the differing educational contexts from elementary to high school, the communicative teaching methods more prevalent in the primary school lose their place to the grammar-translation approach as the students go up to the higher levels of school.

However, there is also an issue for connecting SLTE with classroom practices. As Nam (2011) concluded, “Motivated teachers try to use the teaching methods or
techniques they learned from universities and teacher education programs without possessing a way to understand how to adapt them to the particular Korean classroom context” (p. 145). Pre- and in-service education has not been able to bridge the gap between policy and theory on the one hand and how to apply it in classrooms on the other. Moreover, Butler (2009) also raised important issues regarding KETs’ understanding of how to assess learner motivation, confidence, and communicative ability. These themes arise repeatedly in the discussion (Chapter 9) and conclusion (Chapter 10).

The test-driven nature of education in Korea inhibits CLT (see 2.2); however, the fact that over 75% of students receive private education (S. Kim & Lee, 2010) suggests traditional methods are not perceived as sufficient for exam preparation either. The CSAT creates systemic contradictions for educators who can neither effectively address stakeholder expectations for exam preparation nor effectively apply the communicative approach recommended in the curriculum, so that reform issues remain unresolved 15 years later. Therefore, it is important for further research (such as this thesis) to explore and address the issue of ELT efficacy in Korea.

3.6.2.2 Studies on TETE: Language use and interaction in English classrooms.

Traditionally, language teaching in Korean public schools has tended towards grammatical or audio-lingual approaches instructed exclusively in the L1, practices criticized for hindering language learning (Kwon 2000). In the SNC, TETE policy recommended that teachers use only English in the classroom. The revised SNC includes evaluations of teachers’ in-class English use (Chapter 2). KETs are expected to use English exclusively, but research suggests that this generally does not happen, particularly in secondary schools.

The consensus of multiple studies on TETE in Korea showed that English is avoided for the following reasons:

- Classroom management problems (e.g., Hwang, Seo, & Kim, 2010; Nam, 2011; S.-K. Shin 2012)
- Lack of teacher L2 proficiency (e.g., J., Jeon, 2009; Hwang et al., 2010; G. Shin, 2010; Yook, 2010)
- Large classes (e.g., J. Jeon, 2009; J. H. Moon & Pyo, 2010; Yook, 2010)
- Limited contact hours to cover materials (e.g. J. Jeon, 2009; J. H. Moon & Pyo, 2010)
- Socialization from colleagues (e.g. K. Ahn, 2010b; S.-K. Shin, 2012)
- Socialization of students (e.g. K. Ahn, 2010b; Hwang et al., 2010; S.-K. Shin, 2012)
- Testing washback (e.g. J. Jeon, 2009; Yook, 2010; S.-K. Shin, 2012)
- Traditional (i.e. Confucian) values (e.g. Hwang et al., 2010; S.-K., Shin 2012)

The body of research discussed here reflects multiple approaches to analyzing language use. This section reviews four mixed-method studies, one qualitative and one quantitative study, and one meta-analysis of three quantitative studies from public school English classes. However, a critical look at these studies raises research issues, the most salient being data collection methods.

For stakeholders and policy makers it is important to have an understating of in-class teacher language use; however, research has generally relied on self-reported instruments to measure this. For example, results from a survey of 204 teachers suggested that on average English is used just over 50% of the time (G. Shin, 2010). On another questionnaire sent to 16 SS participants, S.-K. Shin (2012) asked participants to estimate their English use in categories such as greetings and classroom management. Ratios of L2 use by category ranged between 9% and 49% on average, although this excluded data from four participants who reported using no English at all. In another study with secondary teachers, they reported using English between 60% and 100% of the time (H. Park & Kim, 2011). However, self-reported data is an unreliable source of actual practices. For example, other studies found that teachers seem to be overestimating how much English they use in class. (e.g., Hwang et al., 2010; Nam, 2011). Nam (2011) analyzed utterances from four middle school classes and found that teacher-talk took up 77% of class time, with two thirds in the L1. In contrast, Lui, Ahn, Baek, & Hahn (2004) found their 13 participants underestimated TL use, reporting they used it 32% of class time when they actually used it 60% of the time during observations. These studies show that quantifying language use has been a major challenge for research, confounded by variable teaching practices, self-reported data, and the ostensible influence of observers. There is room for more naturalistic studies on
language use that take careful consideration of the influence researchers may have on classroom practices.

Kang’s (2008) article provides an example of one such study. He observed and described patterns of code-switching in one fifth grade teacher’s class during a semester. He found that the teacher used Korean for (a) maintaining order, (b) disciplining students, (c) describing complex tasks, and (d) facilitating student comprehension of activity instructions or language features. English was used for (a) procedural language during activities, (b) giving simple instructions, (c) modeling language from the textbook, and (e) complimenting and encouraging students. The teachers used both the L1 and L2 for (a) translating complex English sentences, (b) repeating long activity instructions, and (c) reiterating meaning. Interviews with the students corroborated the teacher’s rationale for choosing when to use Korean and English. The researcher concluded that because of large mixed-level classes, exclusive use of TL may not be the optimal condition for student learning in Korea.

Another issue for research, however, is the ambiguity over what is meant by TETE. In a meta-analysis of three prior surveys, I. Jo (2011) discussed incoherent interpretations of TETE. Teachers seemed uncertain about whether the policy meant using L2 exclusively or only for specific functions, such as giving instructions for activities and socializing with students. Prior research suggested maximizing L2 use in classrooms (e.g., Kang, 2008; S. Y. Kim, 2008), but the question remains as to what that should look like in practice.

Qualitative (and mixed-method) studies in secondary schools provided a richer understanding of classroom language use and also revealed the complexity and variability of language teaching. Two studies found teachers differed considerably in classroom management, teaching philosophies and language learning beliefs. H. Park and Kim’s (2011) study with six participants included analysis of journals, observations, and interviews. Teachers thought it was their duty to provide exposure to and opportunities for L2 use in class. Student-centeredness was prevalent in observed classes, and the teachers wanted to present themselves as models of successful L2 learners. In contrast, action research by Hwang et al. (2010) described how using English could be a source of disempowerment for secondary teachers. It explored how the incongruence of traditional Confucian values with TETE policy weakened the authority of the teacher (and first author). First, students addressed the teacher by his surname (i.e., Mr. Hwang), a taboo in other classes, and this lowered the distance
between himself and the students. Second, peer pressure discouraged English use among students. Third, group solidarity disempowered the teacher, for example, when students shared knowledge with each other rather than asking him for help. Furthermore, excerpts from class sequences reflected low rapport among the teacher and students. Code-switching to Korean enabled the teacher to assert his status.

In Hwang et al.’s (2010) study, institutional issues came to the forefront of TETE practices. These took a central focus in discussion from other studies as well. For example, J. H. Moon and Pyo’s (2010) observations of three middle-school teachers found that level gaps in student L2 proficiency created challenges. TETE seemed to benefit higher-level students while demotivating lower-level ones. The teachers also felt constrained by the large class sizes and limited contact hours with each class.

However, perhaps the strongest study on TETE in secondary schools came from S.-K. Shin’s (2012) research on the socialization of 16 highly proficient novice KETs. When starting as English teachers, all 16 reported attempting exclusive L2 use; however, within months all 16 abandoned English in favor of Korean. Questionnaire findings suggested that student proficiency, classroom management, and exam washback were the biggest in-class constraints for TETE. However, interviews revealed deeper themes discouraging the use of English in English classes. First, teachers felt institutional constraints. Teachers had little control over material selection, needed to keep pace with their colleagues, and felt pressure to prepare students for exams (cf. Yook, 2010). Second, the participants were socialized by senior teachers and administrators to the norms of English education, that is, teacher-centered classes with L1 instruction. The novice teachers felt that they needed to maintain the status quo to avoid creating problems for other staff. Third, beliefs about language learning and teaching from students and fellow teachers discouraged L2 use. Teachers generally believed traditional approaches were better than CLT, particularly for exam preparation. While prior studies described the inhibiting influence of teacher proficiency on TETE (e.g., S.-Y. Kim, 2002; Kwon 2000; Yook, 2010), S.-K. Shin’s (2012) research suggested that institutional constraints were stronger, since even highly proficient teachers abandoned L2 instruction.

In summary, research from Korea shows that CLT and TETE policies are beset by uncertainties, but so is the research. First of all, evidence of teaching approaches and language use generally came from self-reported instruments (see below). Further studies investigating methods and authentic language use in classrooms with persistent
observations are warranted. Like Kang (2008), researchers need to consider their own influence as observers and adapt appropriate paradigms (see Chapter 5).

Second, research on TETE has not come to a consensus on what it should look like and how it can best be applied in Korea. Literature critical of the policy is common (e.g., Hwang et al., 2010; I. Jo, 2011), but it seems necessary to explore CLT and TETE looking for evidence of effective practices in terms of the disciplinary knowledge of ELT methodology and SLA. Further, the role of students in TETE policy is unclear, for example, whether or not they should also maximize English use in class. There is little evidence of students using English even for basic communication. This is an important issue addressed in this thesis (Chapters 7-10).

Third, until the CSAT is reformed, instruction is unlikely to change in secondary schools, and that creates pressure on teachers to disregard the policies. Researchers have an important role in continuing to communicate the contradictions between policy and practice and suggest solutions for dealing with negative testing washback.

Syllabi for primary ELT are more amenable for TETE, and teachers face fewer institutional constraints such as the demand to teach to the test. However, there is a gap in research. No in-depth studies were found addressing cognitions and practices in primary schools in Korea. In this thesis case study methods were applied to address shortcomings in the research from Korea and a systematic means was developed for describing practices of teachers in terms of activity types and ELT approaches recommended in the curriculum (see Chapter 5).

3.6.2.3 Early English Policy: ELT in primary schools.

This section looks at a study on the Early English Policy (EEP) as ELT was phased into primary schools. It is also the only study found addressing the English teacher selection system in Korea. Jung and Norton's (2002) case studies provided important insights into the process and rationale for assigning English teachers in primary schools.

The study was set in three schools in different socio-economic areas in Seoul in 1998 as English classes were introduced to the third and fourth grade. MOE policy allowed for designating teachers to teach English full-time or having homeroom teachers teach it (Jung & Norton, 2002).

In the first school, two female teachers volunteered to teach English full-time because they (1) were interested in English, (2) believed teaching it would provide
opportunities to study it, and (3) were given less administrative duties than other teachers. Although these teachers were eager to teach English, as subject teachers they consistently “encountered difficulties with classroom management and discipline” (Jung & Norton, 2002, p. 260).

In the second school no one volunteered. The teachers were concerned about extra duties for English teachers and the lack of administrative support for subject teachers in the school. The principal decided that English would be taught by homeroom teachers, and he assigned the youngest teachers to Grades 3 and 4 on the assumption that they would be better at teaching English than older staff.

In the third school, the principal was enthusiastic about the new English classes. He decided that homeroom teachers would teach English, believing that this would provide extra opportunities for students to practice English during the week. Not all teachers shared his enthusiasm. Two teachers felt sorry for their students because they perceived themselves as incompetent English teachers.

Jung and Norton (2002) also surveyed 29 teachers in these schools. Most participants strongly favored having specialized English teachers as opposed to having homeroom teachers teach English. Roughly 75% found that the biggest barriers to successful ELT were insufficient materials and large classes. Ninety percent found they used less English in class than they believed would be the ideal amount. They also found some positive influences of the new policy. Students and teachers were more interested in English than before because of the CLT-oriented curriculum, and teachers were inspired to use new methods for teaching other subjects.

This was an important study showing the different rationale for assigning subject teachers in primary schools (see E.-G. Kim, 2009 on teacher policy). This issue needs deeper investigation, which is why the first aim of the thesis is to look at the reasons people end up teaching English in Korea.

3.6.2.4 Education backgrounds and co-teaching in Korea: East meets west.

There is one further policy important for the context of ELT in Korea: the pairing of native speaking English teachers (NEST) with Korean counterparts. The case studies are bound to KETs only, but all teachers shared duties with co-teachers so it is necessary to discuss research in this area.

The English program in Korea (EPIK) was developed more than 20 years ago to address deficiencies in English education with the central aims of (1) improving the
communication abilities of students, (2) improving the English proficiency of teachers, (3) developing materials, (4) improving ELT methodologies, (5) facilitating intercultural awareness, and (6) improving Korea’s image abroad (EPIK, 2013). As explained in Chapter 2, NESTs must be citizens from one of six places: Australia, Canada, New Zealand, South Africa, the United States, or the United Kingdom. The minimum educational requirement is a Bachelor’s degree from an accredited university. Applicants require no teaching qualifications or experience.

Research on co-teaching in Korea has drawn a fair amount of attention over the years leading to some convergence in findings. Many qualitative studies with co-teaching teams discussed (1) the ambiguous roles for NESTs and KETs, (2) the paucity of training, and (3) the lack of successful co-teaching models (e.g., Balanyk, 2012; I. J. Jeon, 2010; M. Kim, 2010; S. Y. Yim 2012). Both NESTs and KETs have largely been left on their own to figure out how to teach.

One factor found to be influencing co-teaching pedagogy is the differing cultural and educational backgrounds of teachers. For example, in a study with five co-teaching pairs, Balanyk (2009, 2012) described underlying epistemic differences between NESTs and KETs due to their prior experiences in different education systems. The groups revealed diverging assumptions about the best conditions for learning. For example, thematic analysis of interview and questionnaire data found that all five KETs referred to teacher-student interactions, while four of five NESTs described situations involving independent learning. All KETs tended to interpret learning as knowing about something, in other words, learning content. The NESTs interpreted learning as knowing how to do something, for example, learning skills. Further, KETs tended place much less value on student participation. This fit with their understanding that the role of a teacher is to transmit knowledge, not lead students to discover things on their own as the NESTs believed. These diverging beliefs led to dissonance in the classroom regarding materials selection and teaching methods. This is an important issue for stakeholders to consider as all teachers may benefit from becoming more aware of their beliefs and how they might influence teaching approaches.

In addition to cultural backgrounds, interviews with five pairs suggested that communication skills, positive attitudes and shared expectations were factors in successful pairings (E. Kim & Sung, 2012). E. Kim and Sung also discussed the complex nature of co-teaching and how different personalities, attitudes, management styles, teaching experience, and beliefs influenced the teams.
Another issue is how willing teachers are to cooperate with each other, a factor discussed by I. J. Jeon (2010). For the three pairs in this study, cooperation seemed somewhat dependent on the KETs’ English ability. Interestingly, the NESTs lack of Korean proficiency was not addressed.

In Korea, co-teaching roles are not clearly defined and as result need to be negotiated between NESTs and KETs as they work together. This ambiguity results in considerable variance in how co-teaching is practiced. In one study, the KET filled various roles for her co-teacher such as “an instruction partner, a crisis manager, and a secretary” (M. Kim, 2010, p. 200). Often KETs become de facto administrators for NESTs who may require help with housing and banking, duties outside the purview of their usual work. From interviews with six NESTs, S. Y. Yim (2012) described their development of professional identities and relationships with co-teachers. While NESTs felt as equals in class, for example, by leading in-class activities, outside of class they were marginalized and there was little evidence of collaboration. In one extreme example, M. Jeon (2009) reported that a NEST felt they were “performing monkeys” (p. 238). Researchers also discussed the inefficiencies of co-teaching in the classroom. Many pairs were observed turn-taking, where one teacher led while the other did little (e.g., I. J. Jeon, 2010; S. Y. Yim, 2012).

At the time of writing, the EPIK program was nearly 20 years old, but early criticisms of the policy remain relevant (cf. Kwon 2000). First, the ambiguity of co-teaching needs addressing. The government invested heavily in bringing native English speakers to Korea but provided little guidance for how co-teaching should be put into practice. S. Y. Yim (2012) argued that new models of team teaching in Korea are needed, along with more dialogue between stakeholders such as administrators, policy makers, teachers and parents. Second, hiring inexperienced NESTs conflicts with two program goals, namely, to improve teaching methods and to develop materials. Although not a central focus in this thesis, these are peripheral factors in the practices of KET participants (see Chapters 7 & 8) and have implications for policy (see 10.3.1.3).

3.7 Phase Four: Professional Development and In-service SLTE

D. Freeman (2002) discussed the impossibility of pre-service education to prepare teachers for the realities faced in class. Due to the “socially developed and situated”
nature of language teaching, the assumption that “teacher education could fully equip a first-year teacher with the knowledge and skills to last a career” is “patently absurd” (p. 11). Thus, ongoing SLTE can be an efficacious medium for continuing development.

For successful in-service training, D. Freeman (1993) suggested that SLTE should enable trainees to rename experience and reconstruct practices. He argued that programs should be grounded in the experiences of trainees and support their understandings of their own practices and rename that experience according to the disciplinary knowledge from the field of AL/TESOL. This process enables trainees to “renegotiate the meaning of their actions and thus construct different, more critical, ways of understanding what they are doing in their classrooms” (p. 486). D. Freeman’s implications for in-service SLTE were that it (1) needs a consistent professional language (i.e., discourse), (2) must demonstrate the discourse in action, and (3) involve teaching practices in the working context. D. Freeman’s (1993) discussion influenced many research projects on SLTE (e.g., Borg, 2011; Kiely & Davis, 2010; Kubanyiova, 2012), and it seems these concepts could contribute further to in-service programs in Korea. Research from Korea suggests that in-service SLTE is struggling to provide efficacious training (see Chapter 10).

In relation to professional development, this thesis also considers language teacher cognitive change (LTCC), an area in need of research (Borg, 2003, 2006; Kubanyiova, 2009, 2012). Kubanyiova (2012) described her research on an in-service program as an “anatomy of failure” (p. 197), but through research adapting the construct of possible selves (i.e., ideal, ought to, and feared self images), significant contributions were made regarding the identities of eight participating language teachers and towards understanding LTCC and the complexities in the process of change. Kubanyiova’s model for interpreting change (p. 60; cf. Gregoire, 2003) is discussed further in Chapter 9.

3.7.1 In-Service SLTE in Korea: English Proficiency over Pedagogy

The experienced teachers in this thesis have had considerable in-service ELT training and this section looks at recent studies conducted in Korea. Curricular reforms, particularly the EEP and the emphasis on CLT and TETE, created challenges for in-service teachers who, in the aggregate, lacked L2 proficiency and teaching skills to be able to implement the new reforms (Kwon 2000). Further, primary teachers resisted
plans for hiring teachers specializing in ELT (but not specifically trained in primary education) to share teaching duties for English teaching. Therefore, a significant increase in in-service training became necessary. Recently Korea became one of the largest providers of in-service teacher training in the OECD (E.-G. Kim, 2011). The largest and most expensive of these programs are for English.

The major programs are six-month Intensive In-service English Teacher Training (INSET) programs and two-week Teaching English in English (TEE) courses (see Chapter 2). To review, INSET trainees receive six months of English language and ELT training, paid leave, and, room and board including one month abroad. Understandably, then, entrance to this program is competitive. The INSET costs roughly 13 million won per participant (Hayes, 2012). However, because that figure excludes salaries for substitute teachers, it underestimates the actual expenses.

A number of studies have reported on the (in)effectiveness of INSET programs. In one mixed-methods study, Yang (2009) obtained program documents including the post-course evaluations. Previous studies on the INSET relied mainly on these survey data and in-house evaluations in which teachers’ INSET evaluations tended to be largely positive. However, Yang (2009) criticized survey items for merely eliciting “superficial impressions” (p. 176) and found “very little evidence” (p. 181) to support the efficacy of the programs. In-depth interviews with three participants uncovered more critical responses. Yang found problems with “redundant courses, unqualified instructors, and differences in the English levels of trainees” (p. 175). A later survey of some 449 participants had contrasting and overlapping results (S.-Y. Kim, Kim, Lee, & Woo, 2010). In this study, teachers criticized the “inefficiency of overseas training”; however, they also “expressed concerns about unbalanced curriculum [and] lack of follow-up service” (p. 199). This final point remains a source of criticism and uncertainty regarding the effectiveness of INSET programs.

The key aims of INSET are improving communicative competence and reinforcing teaching skills; however, administrators have prioritized teacher language learning at the expense of ELT pedagogy (Hayes 2012). Furthermore, while there is evidence for changes in teacher beliefs, there is scant evidence for changes in practice. In an extensive research project, K. Chang et al. (2010) provided evidence for improvements in participants’ L2 proficiency during the INSET on pre- and post-tests. Survey results suggested that teachers believed the course improved their teaching. S.-Y. Kim et al. (2010) found that a vast majority of their participants felt the language
courses increased their ability to teach in English. However, as these authors acknowledged, data came from self-reported instruments; therefore, questions remained as to how the INSET experience is reflected in actual in-class practices of trainees.

In a qualitative evaluation of an INSET course, Yeum (2012) recruited a range of stakeholders including participants, instructors and supervisors. Data collected over six-months included recorded classes, lesson plans, interviews, survey, diaries, and course documents. Pre- and post-program questionnaires demonstrated clear improvements in teaching confidence; however, by the end of program, nearly half of 75 teachers still felt that their English ability was merely adequate to very weak and would limit them as English teachers. Central to this study was analysis of a course focusing on English for the classroom. The author recorded classes over five-months and interviewed the 16 trainees and the NEST instructor. Trainees had near-unanimous praise for the classroom English course. However, Yeum (2012) described an important theme from her observations:

Urgency to improve their own language proficiency made them resistant to or less appreciative of other dimensions of language teaching capacities. The overall attitudes were rooted in the assumption that they knew how to teach, even when language improvement would not guarantee improved language teaching skills. (p. 31)

This comment relates to earlier reports from the late 1990s (Kwon 2000). Teachers believed that as experienced teachers, their biggest obstacle for the new reforms would be L2 proficiency. Yet, as Yeum (2012) commented, increased language proficiency may not correlate to improved ELT pedagogy. The emphasis on teacher language learning, then, has led to questionable results for such a significant investment in teacher training.

This urgency stated above was also evident in Hiver’s (2013) study of seven KETs’ possible selves during a training program, whose “lack of language self-efficacy was found to be near synonymous to lack of teaching self-efficacy” (p. 210). His attention to the identity and emotions of KETs regarding proficiency and development seems worthy of further attention by researchers and stakeholders, as does his implication that “top-down policy changes … are unlikely to be internalized and lead to real change if these are incompatible with individual teachers’ possible selves” (p. 221).

Another point worth mentioning relates to INSET instructors. Regarding the aforementioned criticisms of unqualified staff (S. Y. Yang 2009), in Yeum’s (2012)
study, all seven instructors happened to be NESTs including the coordinator. Six of seven had MAs, but only two in AL or TESOL. Apart from the coordinator, none had any experience teaching in Korean public schools. Perhaps improvements for in-service teacher education would be met by involving instructors experienced in the context for which they are ostensibly training teachers (cf. Kagan, 1992). This is further evidence that designers of the INSET prioritized language learning over ELT pedagogy.

One study did find evidence for improved teaching practices during the INSET, although not without significant limitations (B. Ahn, 2011). In this study, 24 primary and 26 secondary teachers did peer-teaching demonstrations at the beginning and end of a course, roughly five months apart. They were instructed to use their own school textbooks but teach the same unit for both classes. Expert, peer and self-evaluations of peer-teaching sessions were correlated. B. Ahn (2011) found evidence that (1) both L2 proficiency and teaching skills improved after the course and (2) primary teachers apparently improved more than secondary teachers. These findings suggested that perhaps priority should be given for primary in-service training because of the inadequacy of pre-service ELT training (B. Ahn, 2011). The author rightly pointed out, however, that the results may not be indicative of actual in-class practices. The course was internal; furthermore, all participants taught the same content for both lessons, which was likely a factor attributable to improvements in the ratings.

If the INSET is to continue, more research is needed to investigate long-term influences on situated teaching practices. While INSET research since 2009 shows some evidence for the positive evaluations from trainees, there remain some issues regarding the effectiveness of these programs. Uptake of INSET pedagogy is generally left to self-assessment, and there has been little follow-up to investigate the impact on classroom practices, although as Hayes (2012) noted, that is not unlike many other contexts. Furthermore, questions remain about resource allocation. The costly INSET comes at the expense of other alternatives that might be more effective, such as observations of expert teachers or mentoring on site (D. Freeman, 1993; see Chapter 9). It seems that researchers and policy makers should consider alternative approaches to in-service training that are more connected and synchronous to actual ELT practices of individual teachers, a point reemphasized in Chapters 9 and 10.
3.8 Methodological Issues in LTC Research

Researching the thoughts, beliefs, and knowledge of language teachers requires exploring the hidden side of language teaching (D. Freeman, 2002). What is known about LTC suggests cognitions are complex and dynamic (Feryok, 2010), shaped through experience in the four phases of a career described above. Further, they are “practically-oriented, personalized, and context-sensitive” (Borg, 2006, p. 272). Because we are not privy to the cognitions of others—let alone aware of much of our own (Eagleman, 2011)—they need to be stated or inferred. However, a critical issue for research is “what is considered to be evidence of cognition” (Borg, p. 72).

Data on LTC generally come from some combination of the following:

(1) **Self report instruments** such as questionnaires and tests

(2) **Verbal commentaries** elicited through structured and semi-structured interviews, repertory grid interviews, stimulated recall interviews, and think-aloud protocols

(3) **Observation**, of simulated or real classroom practices

(4) **Reflective writing** in the form of journals, autobiographical accounts, retrospective accounts, and concept maps. (Borg, 2009, p. 167)

Borg (2006) raised an important concern for research in that:

- cognitions may assume different forms depending on the manner in which they are elicited; i.e., teachers may express a particular belief when responding to a survey but state an apparently contradictory view when talking about actual examples of their practices. (p. 107).

This concern underscores the necessity for data triangulation to strengthen credibility of LTC research (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Studies from western/ESL contexts employing multiple data sources and prolonged engagement provided significant contributions to the field (e.g., Bailey, 1996; Breen et al. 2001; Golombek, 1998; Johnson, 1994; Tsui, 2003; D. Woods, 1996). However, due to the personal nature and context-sensitivity of LTC, many findings are not readily transferrable to EFL contexts, and this is an impetus for this research.

For this review, there were several studies found on LTC in Korea, but methodological shortcomings underlie much of this body of research. A major issue is that evidence of LTC came extensively from self-reporting (see Table 3.1 below). Looking at research on CLT and TETE, surveys and questionnaires dominate; there is
little interview data used, a paucity of observation, and limited reflective writing with in-service teachers (see also Moodie & Nam, forthcoming). Studies on CLT without observations face credibility issues regarding practices in that one cannot be certain of whether participants were familiar with CLT methods or merely mapping terms onto existing practices (Carless, 2004; D. Freeman, 1993; J. Richards et al., 1996).

Strikingly, there were no observations in five studies specifically focused on TETE, and this is a problem because of studies that have shown significant differences between reported and observed language use. This thesis was designed with these criticisms in mind and therefore it includes longitudinal collection of all data types discussed by Borg (2006).

Table 3-1 Methodology Issues in Research on CLT and TETE in Korea

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Example Studies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Study only uses self-report instruments (i.e., questionnaires) for discussing CLT beliefs and/or practices.</td>
<td>Butler (2005); Guilloteaux (2004); J. Jeon (1997, 2009); S.-Y. Kim (2002, 2008); S. H. Yim (2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Study discusses in-class language use but has no observation data.</td>
<td>I. Jo (2011); S.-Y. Kim (2002, 2008); G. Shin (2010); S.-K. Shin (2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Study includes observations, but with no longitudinal data.</td>
<td>Y. Jeon (2010) – 4 participants, 1 each; Nam (2011) – 4 with 1 participant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.9 Summary: Revisiting Terms and the Scope of LTC Research

In this chapter I have reviewed research on LTC, with a focus on local studies investigating ELT in public schools in Korea. Through this process gaps in the research were identified and the rationale for research further justified.

In the opening section, LTC terminology was addressed and here it is revisited, setting the theoretical framework for the present studies and foreshadowing the discussion (Chapter 9). As argued above, LTC is a useful term for its inclusivity of interrelated concepts; however, this inclusivity can hide differences that are important.
In this section I revisit the LTC terminology to describe one such difference and refine what is meant by *cognitions* in this study.

First, it is important to address considerations for evidence of cognitions (Borg, 2006). For example, a self-report instrument like a questionnaire might elicit stated beliefs or knowledge that are declarative or semantically held memories. Such data differs from what may be elicited in reflective writing, for instance, which might be more procedural and episodically held memories relating to specific events or experiences (see Feryok, 2010). The later form is important for connecting LTC with language teaching practices. Differences between the two kinds of knowledge facilitate understanding, for example, where declarative knowledge differs from the disciplinary knowledge of AL observed in many studies (e.g., Carless, 2004; D. Freeman, 1993; J. Richards et al., 1996). These different perspectives on cognition help to explain the phenomena described by Borg (2006) where stated beliefs may contrast with observed practices.

In Chapter 1 I introduced the theoretical framework as grounded narrative inquiry (GNI), and this framework embedded a particular focus on LTC in these studies that is primarily concerned with procedural and episodic knowledge of participants, akin to what to Bruner (1986) described as *narrative knowing*. This aspect of LTC involves retrospective meaning making—the shaping or ordering of past experience … a way of understanding one’s own and others’ actions, of organizing events and objects into a meaningful whole, and of connecting and seeing the consequences of actions and events over time. (Chase, 2005, p. 656)

For research on LTC, this kind of knowledge preserves an assumption that LTC is socially-situated and embedded in experience. Therefore, LTC in this thesis aligns more with Tsui’s (2003) characterization of language teacher knowledge as a holistic concept (see also Verloop et al., 2001). The discussion of narrative cognition is considered in more depth in the following chapter.

Moreover, the GT methods undertaken in this study (see Chapter 5) led to two strands of research relatively rare in AL, that of (1) commitments to the profession of ELT (see Moodie & Feryok, 2015) and (2) a *professional knowledge base* (PKB) for language teachers (D. Freeman & Johnson, 1998; Kubanyiova, 2014; see Chapter 9).

First, three studies from Korea did look at why people become teachers (E.-G. Kim, 2009), the differences between graduate and undergraduate ELT trainee identities, including why they entered the field (Lim, 2011), and how English teachers are
assigned in primary schools (Jung & Norton, 2002). However, this topic requires much more attention than it has received in Korea and elsewhere. Workplace commitment can be understood as a type of motivation (see Meyers & Herscovitch, 2001, 2004), and one that has implications for teacher retention and teaching efficacy, as suggested by large-scale education studies (P. L. Choi & Tang, 2009; Day & Gu, 2007, 2009). However, commitment is a concept absent in Borg’s (2003, 2006) surveys, not necessarily because it was overlooked; rather, possibly because it had not gained much attention from researchers in AL.

Second, discussion of what might constitute a PKB (see D. Freeman & Johnson, 1998) was not explicitly discussed in Borg’s (2003, 2006) influential reviews, but the concept seems important for discussions of what might constitute language teaching expertise in a given context (see Andrews, 2003; Kubanyiova, 2014). Some AL/TESOL research has adapted the notion of a PKB to some degree (e.g., Andrews, 2003, Bartels, 2005; Gabhonton, 1999; B. Johnson & Goettsch, 2000; Mullock, 2006; Sanchez & Borg, 2014). However, Kubanyiova reiterated that there is a gap in need of addressing, particularly in foreign language contexts with non-native speaking instructors. Further, a related concept is the idea of pedagogical content knowledge (PCK) (Shulman, 1986, 1987; Turner-Bissett, 1999; Gess-Newsome & Carlson, 2013). Although D. Freeman (2002) doubted PCK could be a workable concept for language teaching, as other researchers have suggested (Andrews, 2003; Tsui, 2003), the idea of PCK seems promising for discussing what expert teachers do.

As D. Freeman and Johnson (1998) argued, a knowledge base for language teachers needs to be one grounded in data. The GT process in this thesis leads to a PKB model that encompasses the data on the LTC of the Korean participants in these studies, and revisits the notion of PCK as a means of discussing ELT expertise (see Chapter 9).
CHAPTER 4: GROUNDED NARRATIVE INQUIRY

AS THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK:

THE EDGES OF A PARADIGM

Narrative remains as elusive, contested and indeterminate in meaning a concept as ever, variously used as an epistemology, a methodological perspective, an antidote to positivist research, a communication mode, a supra-genre, a text-type; more generally, as a way of making sense of the world, at times equated with experience, time, history and life itself.

Georgakopoulou (2007, p. 1)

Narrative inquiry (NI)—investigation of human experience through stories—provides a personalized and context-sensitive approach for researching LTC, features that were argued for in the previous chapter. A subset of qualitative research (Chase, 2005; Polkinghorne, 1995), NI is used in a range of contexts for a variety of purposes throughout the social sciences (De Fina & Georgakopoulou, 2011; Riessman, 2008). In education, narrative approaches have “emerged as a predominant means of understanding and documenting teachers’ ways of knowing” (Johnson, 2006, p. 242) and NI has gained increased attention in AL/TESOL (Barkhuizen, 2011, 2014a; Barkhuizen, Benson, & Chik, 2013; Benson, 2014; Cortazzi, 1994; Pavlenko, 2007). However, as indicated by the epigraph above, NI means different things to different scholars so it is necessary to clarify NI as both a field of inquiry and the theoretical framework for the present studies.

The core of NI involves stories of experience (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000). In scope, these range from the grand narratives of history and cultures (Lyotard, 1984) to life-history studies, down to smaller narratives-in-interaction, the colloquial stories arising in conversation (Bamberg, 2006; Georgakopoulou, 2006). Through stories we make sense of who we are, what we know, where we came from, and what we have done and plan to do. To Bruner (1986), this is knowing, that is, a mode of cognition complementary to another way of knowing, paradigmatic cognition, the logico-scientific mode of thought that enables categorizing and explaining phenomena. The
telling of stories is a sense-making activity in and of itself (Ochs & Capps, 2001). This is deeply rooted in who we are—not just as individuals—but as a species (Dennett, 1992, 1993; O. Flanagan, 1992). According to Dennett (1992), identity emerges from “a center of narrative gravity” (p. 275); our sense of self is wrapped up in minds evolved for narrative thinking. This is what enables us to understand the actions and intentions of others (Bruner, 1986).

NI begins with stories, although reporting a story is not enough. What distinguishes narrative inquiry from narrative as the genre is analysis. Analysis facilitates describing positioning, context, critical events, and in this thesis, experience influencing LTC. However, analytical approaches vary (cf. Barkhuizen, 2011; Clandinin & Connelly, 2000; De Fina & Georgakopoulou, 2011; Mishler, 1995; Polkinghorne, 1995; Riessman, 2008). To some, NI produces narratives (e.g., Clandinin & Connelly, 2000), for others it codifies them (see Polkinghorne, 1995). Analytical approaches depend on both the phenomena under inquiry and aims of research.

In educational research, for example, NI is relatively entrenched as an approach creating narratives of teacher experience (e.g., Clandinin & Connelly, 2000). However, as Fenstermacher (1994) described, terms such as image, story, narrative, and narrative unity in this area “remain puzzling concepts for many individuals outside this research program” (p. 11). This phenomena-and-method (PAM) NI “risks being blurred by its own abstractions” (p. 12; see Section 4.4.3 for discussion). For this thesis, I take the position that PAM NI is not quite scholarship; that it lacks a certain academic rigor, namely, principled methodology commensurate to other analytical traditions such as grounded theory (Strauss & Corbin, 1990). Although criticized as a research program, contributions from PAM NI have been influential in SLTE, where it has been argued that narratives provide the most promise for understanding teaching and learning to teach from the perspectives of teachers (Johnson, 2006). Therefore, in this thesis I interpret PAM NI as a means of teacher development rather than an empirical research approach.

Outlining a theoretical framework for NI involves navigating diverse understandings of the term narrative. The discrepancy arises in part from the many denotative senses used in the field of NI, which are presented in Appendix B. Lexicological issues notwithstanding, situating NI remains controversial as it is different things to different researchers (cf. Bamberg, 2006; Chase, 2005; Connelly & Clandinin, 1990; Georgakopoulou, 2007; Polkinghorne, 1995; Spector-Mersel, 2010).
NI is described in places as a methodology on the borderlands of established qualitative paradigms (Clandinin & Rosiek, 2007; Pinnegar & Daynes, 2007), as an “antidote to positivism” (Georgakopoulou, 2007, p. 3), and elsewhere as emanating from a distinct narrative paradigm (Spector-Mersel, 2010). NI remains “a field in the making” (Chase, 2011, p. 429). This indeterminate status presents a challenge for researchers, but as noted in Chapter 1, it also provides opportunities for exploratory research, making it attractive as a research framework (Barkhuizen, 2014). Below, I describe the framework for this thesis by situating NI within the field of qualitative research and further justifying grounded narrative inquiry (GNI) as an approach for researching LTC.

4.1 The Narrative Turn in Social Science

First, this section describes the place of NI in social science. Then, I discuss its fit with qualitative research methods, describing approaches to analysis and highlighting issues most relevant to the current studies. Tracing the history of narrative research in qualitative traditions is important for exhibiting the rationale for GNI as the theoretical framework for this thesis.

The term NI is attributed to Connelly and Clandinin (1990) who used it to describe an emerging approach in teacher education focused on personal storytelling (Webster & Mertova, 2007, p. 7). Social scientists have used the term for the growing field of research based on narrative, as is done here (Polkinghorne, 1995). While the term is relatively new, formal analysis of story is not, having roots in western scholarship with Aristotle’s interpretations of Greek tragedy in Poetics (Bruner, 1986).

Qualitative research has made space for NI, but this was not always the case. Chase (2005) highlighted historical precedents in the turn towards NI in the social sciences: (1) life history studies from anthropology and sociology in the early 20th century; (2) feminist research in the 1960s and 1970s; and (3) sociolinguistic research in the latter half of the 20th century. One study in the latter phase warrants particular attention.

Labov and Waletzky (1967/1997) “argued that oral narratives are a specific form of discourse characterized by certain structures serving specific social functions” (Chase, 2005, p. 655). They induced the five-part framework for evaluating oral narratives: orientation, complicating action, evaluation, resolution, and coda (Labov &
Waletzky). Their study established the use of naturalistic data for narrative research, and their lasting influence lay in “a groundbreaking presentation of the idea that ordinary people’s oral narratives of everyday experience … are worthy of study in themselves” (Chase, 2005, p. 655). Further, Labov and Waletzky’s study helped shape NI epistemology. For Bruner (1997) it was the progenitor of the idea that narratives are not only a genre, but also a mode of thought (see 4.3.3 below): “It set many of us thinking about the cognitive representation of reality imposed by narrative structure on our experience of the world and how we evaluate that experience” (p. 64).

Georgakopoulou (2007) clarified that Labov and Waletzky’s (1967/1997) framework represents only one kind of narrative. For example, Ochs and Capps (2001) showed that “in terms of these five dimensions, most of the stories we tell as we go about our day-to-day business (communicating with friends, family, colleagues, etc.) look quite different from those narratives told in a research context” (Vazquez, 2011, p. 537). This is an important point influencing the design of this thesis and is the reason I am including narratives-in-interaction occurring on and off site as data.

The influence of recent sociolinguistic research also saw focus move from the big stories (i.e., autobiographical narratives) towards narrative arising in everyday speech, that is, narratives-in-interaction, also called small stories (Bamberg, 2006). Georgakopoulou (2007) describes this as a shift from focusing on the precious stories “lived and told to the messier business of living and telling” (p. 153).

For defining GNI as a theoretical framework, it is necessary to trace its roots through the shifting paradigms of the prior century (Guba, 1990; Kuhn, 1970). De Fina and Georgakopou (2011) explain that “the narrative turn has been ubiquitous in the social sciences, and it has profound implications for how social scientific qualitative methods are currently being conceived” (p. 21). In the following section I outline four turns for qualitative research that made room for NI (Pinnegar & Daynes, 2007), with particular emphasis on the design of the present thesis.

4.1.1 Four Turns in Qualitative Paradigms for Narrative Inquiry

Shifting paradigms concurred with the narrative turn. Positivist and post-positivist criteria, with conditions for proof and requirements for falsifiability, respectively, were criticized for not being realistic approaches for describing human experience, and more interpretive and constructivist approaches were called for to
describe its complexity (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011b). Pinnegar and Daynes (2007) traced the narrative turn in four parts following field-wide research trends. They are:

1. a change in the relationship between researcher and researched,
2. a move from the use of number toward the use of words as data,
3. a change from a focus on the general and universal toward the local and specific, and finally,
4. a widening in acceptance of alternative epistemologies or ways of knowing. (Pinnegar & Daynes, 2007, p. 7)

These turns are discussed below with a description of their influence on the methodology.

**Turn 1: Researcher-participant relationship.** This first turn saw a reconceptualization of researchers from neutral, authoritative observers of phenomena creating valid, reliable, and generalizable results towards accepting the co-construction of knowledge and the researchers as interpreters of meaning (Lincoln, Lynham, & Guba, 2011). New paradigms “called into question the authority of the researcher for knowing or asserting knowledge” (Pinnegar & Daynes, p. 14). Ideals for disinterested, objective observers no longer fit with inquiry into human experience. Narrative researchers, for example, enter “a landscape and join an ongoing professional life” (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000, p. 76). By doing so they become “intimately implicated in research activities” (Barkhuizen, 2011, p. 393). Participants “stand at the center of narrative studies; not as informants, as seen in some qualitative traditions, but as active agents, inseparable from the phenomenon under inquiry” (Spector-Mersel, 2010, p. 217). This notion of reflexivity is recognized in the design of the current studies: It is the impetus for outlining the *emic/etic* distinctions made in Chapter 5, where my role as researcher is discussed.

**Turn 2: From numbers to words.** The turn from numbers to words is relatively straightforward. Most simply, it is the bifurcation of quantitative and qualitative paradigms. Qualitative approaches emerged that were critical of empiricism and doubtful regarding positivist assumptions about verifiable and measurable facts concerning human interaction and experience. This was not a rejection of quantitative research; rather, it was an understanding that quantification and statistical analyses decontextualize data. They create “sterile discourse” (Pinnegar & Daynes, 2007, p. 17) and do not capture the richness of experience. Through the 20th century, narrative accounts gained acceptance as representations of reality (Polkinghorne, 1988).
The use of words over numbers also influenced this thesis. As discussed in Chapter 3, many studies in Korea rely on quantitative data (e.g., Likert scales) for comparative analysis of ELT practices and discussing the cognitions of English teachers. While surveys contributed to the growing body of research on KETs, it is important to consider how data collection instruments influence results or findings (Borg, 2006). A narrative approach conserves and highlights the contextual, social, and temporal (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000) aspects in data, but this is rare in studies from Korea (see Chapter 3).

**Turn 3: From the generalizable to context-specific.** In turning from numbers to words came changes in research scope. Quantitative research has potential for generalizability and results that are predictive across a population. The ideal of capturing “the universal is an ethos that occupied all branches of human science” (Pinnegar & Daynes, 2007, p. 22). However, autobiographies, case studies, historical accounts, and ethnographies provide richness in their preservation and explication of context, something lost through the generalization of larger sample sizes. There is power in “the particular for understanding experience” (p. 24).

In regards to this thesis, examining LTC in Korea requires considering the experiences of individual teachers within that context. Generalizations from other contexts, for example, the experience of pre-service teachers in the U.S. (e.g., Johnson, 1994, 1996), are problematic for applying to Korean classrooms because the context is so different.

**Turn 4: Changing epistemologies.** Qualitative research turned from positivist interpretations towards alternative paradigms founded on different assumptions towards the nature of knowledge (Lincoln, Lynham, & Guba, 2011). Constructivism, for example, rejects the objectivity of positivism and assumes knowledge comes from interactions of an individual with and within their environment (Guba & Lincoln, 1985). For NI, this turn would see narrative cognition (Bruner, 1986) emerge “as a valid and important tool for knowing in the human sciences” (Pinnegar & Daynes, 2007, p. 25). The changing epistemologies ostensibly required new methodologies. Ideals of objectivity, reliability, generalizability, and validity under the positivist paradigm made room for “establishing findings through authenticity, resonance, or trustworthiness” (Pinnegar & Daynes, 2007, p. 25). Prediction and control gave way to understandings of experience that are “culturally rooted” (Spector-Mersel, 2011, p. 212) and “unashamedly interpretive” (De Fina & Georgakopoulou, 2011, p. 19). These
changing epistemologies influenced the design. Rather than strive for validity, reliability, and objectivity, I adopt Lincoln and Guba’s (1985) criteria for research trustworthiness (see Chapter 5).

These turns have made room for NI (Pinnegar & Daynes, 2007), but the question remains as to where. Below I discuss divergent perspectives of NI within qualitative paradigms, introduce ontological, epistemological, and methodological assumptions behind this project, and make the case that GNI fits best with constructivism.

4.2 Situating Narrative Inquiry: The Edges of a Paradigm

Simply defined, a paradigm is “a basic set of beliefs that guides action” (Guba, 1990, p. 17). For GNI, however, uncovering these basic beliefs requires finding cohesion among various interpretations of scholars. The differing perspectives described above in the introduction to this chapter section to some degree depend on differing assumptions about the nature of narrative research. For example, some researchers see narrative as the method and phenomena (e.g., Clandinin & Connelly, 2000). Others analyze narrative forms or content (e.g., De Fina & Georgakopoulou, 2011; Ochs & Capps, 2001; Riessman, 2008). Some see narratives as means of interpreting professional knowledge (Johnson, 2006; Johnson & Golombek, 2002), others as windows to identity (Bambarg, 2007; Barkhuizen, 2010; De Fina & Schiffrin, 2007). More radically, some argue all research is narrative (Hendry, 2009). These differing perspectives provide impetus for this chapter in general and the following sections in particular.

4.3 Ontology and Grounded Narrative Inquiry

4.3.1 Dewey’s Pragmatic Theory of Experience

For many researchers, situating NI within qualitative research begins with Dewey’s (1938, 1981, 1997) theory of experience (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000; Clandinin & Rosiek, 2007; Johnson & Golombek, 2002). To Dewey, experience is something like a cauldron of cognition—where thoughts and knowledge arise, where we make sense of the world and ourselves in it. Reminiscent of William James (1890),
Clandinin and Rosiek liken Dewey’s conception of experience as “a changing stream … characterized by continuous interaction of human thought with our personal, social, and material environment” (p. 39). Below I discuss four themes in Dewey’s theory of experience helpful for framing an ontology for GNI as the theoretical framework.

1. Temporality of experience. As experience occurs temporally, so do cognitions. Thoughts, knowledge, and beliefs change. Identity also shifts. As experience and cognitions change, so do narrative representations. Further, temporality is inherent in narrative form. Stories relate events and experience to the past, present, and future. In this way, narratives can represent “human experience as it unfolds through time” (Clandinin & Rosiek, 2007, p. 40). This aspect of experience influenced the design. It is the reason for delineating four phases of experience for LTC introduced in Chapter 1. For teachers, each phase distinctly influences teacher cognition. The temporality of experience—and a narrative representation of it—meshes with what Dewey (1938) described as the continuity of experience.

2. Continuity of experience. Clandinin and Connelly (2000) summarized this notion: “Experiences grow out of other experiences, and experiences lead to further experiences. Wherever one positions oneself in that continuum—the imagined now, some imagined past, or some imagined future—each point has a past experiential base and leads to an experiential future” (p. 2). As experience grows, so, too, do our knowledge and perceptions. This interpretation of experience aligns with Piaget’s (1929) conception of schema, and the constructivist assumption that knowledge is built on prior learning.

Importantly, an ontology drawing from Dewey has an implication in this regard for an epistemology and methodology. In his view of cognition, “representations arise from experience and must return to that experience for their validation” (Clandinin & Rosiek, 2007, p. 39). So for NI, experience is not readily generalizable: Understanding (narrative-represented) experience requires understanding prior experiences of an individual. This understanding is also context-sensitive. This is something a constructivist methodology needs to account for. Constructivism assumes that “as researchers, we must participate in the research process with our subjects to ensure we are producing knowledge that is reflective of their reality” (Lincoln, Lynham & Guba, 2011, p. 103; see Chapter 5).

3. Contextuality of experience. For Dewey (1981) “experience is constituted by interaction between … a self and its world” (p. 251). Experience is not some ephemeral
concept: It arises in context as an individual does things in their physical and social world. In this way, Dewey’s ontology is also relativist. Individuals experience the world differently. Contexts also change and NI finds particular strength in its attention to context (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000). The working context and prior experiences of participants are central to the present studies, and regarding context, a crucial aspect involves the sociocultural milieu.

4. Sociality of experience. The Deweyan view of experience is “both personal and social” (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000, p. 2). A salient part of the context of experience is that it involves observing and interacting with others. The “emphasis on the social dimension of our inquiries and understanding” makes Dewey’s “pragmatic ontology of experience … particularly well suited for narrative inquiries” (Clandinin & Rosiek, 2007, p. 41). It is through narrative that we make sense of who we are in relation to others (Bruner, 1991), and also how we reveal a positioned self (Bamberg, 1997, 2007). As Spector-Mersel (2010) argued, “social reality is primarily a narrative reality” (p. 211). These four themes are summarized in the Table 4.1 below.

Table 4-1 Summary of Themes for a NI Ontology Based on Deweyan Theory of Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Temporality</th>
<th>Continuity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>narratives relate past, present, and future experience</td>
<td>experiences grow from prior experiences and narratives provide the best data for understanding that experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contextuality</td>
<td>Sociality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>experience is context-sensitive; narrative research is attractive for a particular attention on context</td>
<td>experience and identity are also social phenomena that are revealed through narratives</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dewey’s (1933, 1976, 1981) understanding of experience complements GNI as a theoretical framework: “Experience is the fundamental ontological category from which all [qualitative] inquiry—narrative or otherwise—proceeds” (Clandinin & Rosiek, 2007, p. 38). Dewey’s (1976) description of experience is pragmatic and can be understood in an everyday sense of the word. He clarifies that “experience” is not something “remote and transcendent;” rather, “it is so immediately engrossing and matter of course” (p. 325) it need not be made explicit because we all know what it is. To Dewey “our own thinking and explicit knowledge” are “constituted by and within”
Dewey’s (1933, 1976, 1981) theory foreshadowed modern epistemological philosophy and findings from cognitive science. Dewey (1981) wrote, “In an experience, things and events belonging to the world, physical and social, are transformed through the human context they enter, while the live creature is changed and developed through its intercourse with things previously external to it” (p. 251). Here Dewey gives a sense that cognition occurs in an embodied mind (see Lakoff & Johnson, 1999; Shapiro, 2011) situated in and interacting with the environment (see Robbins & Aydede, 2009). Beyond the philosophical implications, cognitive science is beginning to show how this works (e.g., Casasanto & Boroditsky, 2008; Dijkstra, Kaschak & Zwaan, 2007).

4.3.2 Narrative Selfhood as Adaptation

Narrative inquirers assume that as “storytelling organisms” we “lead storied lives” (Connelly & Clandinin, 1990, p. 2). It is through story, then, that we can provide a representation of human experience (Clandinin & Rosiek, 2007). Connelly and Clandinin’s reference to “storytelling organisms” (p. 2) is not mere metaphor. Philosopher and cognitive scientist Dennett (1993), relating the human propensity for narration to the dam-building of beavers or web-weaving of spiders, elaborates:

Our fundamental tactic of self-protection, self-control, and self-definition is not spinning webs or building dams, but telling stories, and more particularly concocting and controlling the story we tell others—and ourselves—about who we are. (p. 418)

Dennett emphasizes that this is not a conscious choice; rather, the phenomenon is innate:

And just as spiders don’t have to think, consciously and deliberately, about how to spin their webs, … we (unlike professional human storytellers) do not consciously and deliberately figure out what narratives to tell and how to tell them … Our human consciousness, and our narrative selfhood, is their product, not their source. (p. 418)

Narration, he explained, in an environment filled with words, became an adaptation:
Our human environment contains not just food and shelter, enemies to fight or flee, and conspecifics with whom to mate, but words, words, words. These words are potent elements of our environment that we readily incorporate, ingesting and extruding them, weaving them like spider webs into self-protective strings of *narrative*. (p. 417)

Three ontological implications arise with an understanding of *narrative* as adaptation. First, *narrative cognition* (Bruner, 1986) is fundamental to our cognitive makeup as a species. Narrative cognition works as “an organizing principle for human action” and we “think, perceive, imagine, and make moral choices according to narrative structures” (Sarbin, 1986a, pp. 8-9). In this way narratives construct, not just construe, reality (Bruner, 1991). Further, “narrative imposes order on the chaos of human experience” (De Fina & Georgakopoulou, 2011, p. 18). As Dennett (1993) explained, this is not a conscious choice but a property of minds evolved for narrative perception.

Second, innateness implies universality. Although forms and structures may have differing parameters across cultures, everyone (assuming normal genetic conditions) is born with a capacity and propensity to narrate. As Barthes (1974) stated, narrative “is present at all times, in all places, in all societies; the history of narrative begins with the history of mankind; there does not exist, and never has existed, a people without narratives” (p. 237).

Third, our understanding of others—and our own selfhood—is a result of minds predisposed to constructing narratives (Dennett, 1993). Through narratives “we gain a sense of continuity and identity (Alasuutari, 1997; McAdams, 1993), connect with others (Gergen & Gergen, 1988), learn about our culture (Kenyon & Randall, 1997), and adjust our behaviours” (Spector-Mersel, 2010, p. 211).

As innately storytelling beings, with cognitions embodied and embedded in the context of experience, we make sense of the world and our place in it through narrative. In this way, a paradigm for NI sees a blurring of ontology and epistemology (Spector-Mersel, 2010): Who we are emerges from how we know it. I discuss features of an epistemology for NI below with a central focus on narrative cognition (Bruner, 1986) and how it operates (Bruner, 1991).
4.3.3 Epistemology and Narrative Inquiry: Narrative and Paradigmatic Cognition

Framing an epistemology for NI begins with Bruner’s (1986) description of narrative cognition. In *Actual Minds, Possible Worlds*, Bruner discussed what he called two complementary but irreducible modes of thought: *paradigmatic* and *narrative*.

Paradigmatic cognition is “the logico-scientific mode” (p. 13) of thought that enables classifying and categorizing phenomena. As Bruner wrote, “we know a great deal” (p. 13) about this kind of thinking. It is foundational to positivist and post-positivist epistemologies; it facilitates scientific, mathematical, and logical thought. At its widest scope, paradigmatic cognition is what western academic traditions were built upon, held as a generator and facilitator of “trustworthy and valid knowledge” (Polkinghorne, 1995, p. 9). At its narrowest, this is what allows us to call an apple a fruit.

In contrast, narrative cognition is the mode of thought specifically geared to “understanding human action” (Polkinghorne, 1995, p. 11). It is a sense-making act that describes events and human experience (Ochs & Capps, 2001). It “gives us explanatory knowledge of why a person acted as he or she did; it makes another’s action, as well as our own, understandable” (Polkinghorne, 1995, p. 11). According to Bruner (1986), “narrative knowledge is more than mere emotive expression; rather, it is a legitimate form of reasoned knowing” (Polkinghorne, 1995, p. 9). Narrative cognition works through emplotment and it explains and communicates human experience (Polkinghorne, 1988). This is what allows us to make sense of imagining an apple falling on Newton’s head.

To Bruner (1991), narratives are much more than genres or text: They “organize the structure of human experience” (p. 21) and are “the primary form by which human experience is made meaningful” (Polkinghorne, 1988, p. 1). For NI, this assumption is what connects the ontology to an epistemology.

To Dewey (1933) “we are all knowers who reflect on experience, confront the unknown, make sense of it and take action” (Johnson & Golombek, 2002, p. 4). The emphasis for NI, then, is how experience is made explicit. As Bruner (1986, 1991) discussed, narrative knowing allows a cognitive representation of experience emploted through story. This organizes “our experience of the world and how we evaluate that experience” (Bruner, 1997, p. 64). Stories reveal, whether explicitly or tacitly, social,
contextual, and temporal dimensions of experience (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000). Further, narrative data is what makes the tacit available for inquiry.

Narratives open experience for inquiry, but narratives are the phenomena of study, not actual experience. This distinction is important for NI: How we make sense of the world affects how we interpret it. This is true for the meaning-making occurring as participants contribute stories, but also for researchers as stories are interpreted. Thus, co-construction of research findings are assumed (Guba, 1990; Lincoln, Lynham & Guba, 2011).

Further, while there is a blending of ontology and epistemology in NI (Spector-Mersel, 2010), there can also be a blending of epistemology and method (De Fina & Georgakopoulou, 2011). Interpretation of experience in an environment of words (Dennett, 1993) also involves narrative cognition. Beyond representing reality, we understand and interpret our experience narratively (Bruner, 1986; Polkinghorne, 1988).

This is why narrative has been interpreted as a phenomenon and method (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000), a way of representing reality (Bruner, 1991), and a mode of cognition (Bruner, 1986). Presumably, these abstractions are why Georgakopoulou (2007) opened her book with a rant on the definitional quagmire surrounding narrative (see epigraph). Although NI may be ubiquitous in social science (De Fina & Georgakopoulou, 2011), methodologies diverge, and it is important to discuss the differences. The two modes of cognition discussed above delineate two broad approaches for NI. These are discussed in 4.4.3. First, I clarify data-types in narrative research.

4.4 Methodology and Narrative Inquiry

4.4.1 What is a Narrative? Key Characteristics of Narrative Data

NI involves the collection and analysis of narrative data. Polkinghorne (1995) defined narrative as “the linguistic form that preserves the complexity of human action with its interrelationship of temporal sequence, human motivation, chance happenings, and changing interpersonal and environmental contexts” (p. 7). This understanding is central to a narrative-based approach for investigating LTC and highlights the appeal of using narrative data.
In this section I discuss narrative data according to three characteristics that distinguish them from other qualitative data: (1) narratives come in many different forms; (2) they are diachronic (Bruner, 1991; Polkinghorne, 1995); and (3) narratives are situated in and reveal information about context (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000; Polkinghorne, 1995).

First, narrative data arise from stories of experience, but those stories can take many forms. This ranges from canonical big stories (i.e., life-history research) to the “snippets of often mundane talk” (Barkhuizen, 2011, p. 399), the hallmark of small story research (Bamberg, 2006; Georgakopoulou, 2006). Narratives can also be defined somewhere in between, such as “a short topical story about a particular event and specific characters such as an encounter with a friend, boss, or doctor” or “an extended story about a significant aspect of one’s life such as schooling” (Chase, 2005, p. 652). However, narrative data need not only be stories. Data can come from many sources, for example, reflective journals, diaries, or interviews (Connelly & Clandinin, 1990). Further, field notes might describe actions and events that are also “narrative expressions” (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000, p. 79).

Narratives may be multi-modal, but a key facet inherent in form is the personal nature of narrative data and what this reveals about experience. This relates to the second and third characteristics of narrative data: that described experience is temporal and arises in particular contexts.

Second, unlike many other forms of data (e.g., survey or questionnaire results), narrative data are diachronic, revealing “temporal information about the sequential relationship of events” (Polkinghorne, 1995, p. 12). As such, narrative content—the actions, events, emotions, reasoning, etc.—occur and relate to a continuum of experience (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000). They can be set in the present, relate to the past, or describe an imagined future (Bruner, 1986, 1991). For participants, generating narratives can provide “meaning making through the shaping and ordering of experience” (Chase, 2011, p. 421). Herein lies potential for NI as framework for LTC research: It can reveal prior experiences leading to stated cognitions and observed practices.

Third, narrative data are situated in context. Important within context are social, cultural, and locative aspects; in other words, who is in the story and who it is for, information about the cultural milieu, and where the story takes place. Narratives have been described as “socially situated interactive performances” (Chase, 2005, p. 657).
They can reveal information about cognition, that is, what one thinks and knows, but they also reveal something about both the context of experience and the identity of the narrator (e.g., Bamberg, 1997). This extends to “the social, cultural, and institutional narratives within which individuals' experiences are constituted, shaped, expressed, and enacted” (Clandinin & Rosiek, 2007, pp. 42-43; e.g., see Barkhuizen, 2008).

In summary, narrative data provide a richer data set than can be elicited in surveys and questionnaires, two dominant data sources for research on ELT in Korea (see Moodie & Nam, forthcoming). These characteristics of narrative data highlight the fit of NI for investigating LTC (see Table 4.2 below).

Table 4-2 General Characteristics of Narrative Data for NI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(1) Data are derived from various sources, e.g., autobiographical stories, reflective writing, interviews, discussions.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(2) Data are diachronic, i.e., relate experience to past, present, and future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Data are situated in context, indicating social, cultural, and local aspects.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4.2 Stories Big and Small

To improve the strength of the studies, this thesis uses multiple sources of narrative data collected longitudinally, including narratives-in-interaction (see below). As discussed above, narrative data come in many forms of varying scope, with differing methodological implications. Bamberg and Georgakopoulou (2008) distinguish two cannons of narratives, big and small, each used in this thesis.

Big story narratives relate ourselves in the world and our positions and perspectives within it. They are “the grander narratives we tell ourselves, the big retrospectives” (Watson, 2007, p. 371). Researchers have generally assumed these autobiographical accounts provide unmediated representations of participant experience; this is a concern as narratives are an account of experienced reality, not experience itself, and need to “be viewed as a form of social action” (P. Atkinson & Delamont, 2006, p. 170).

Small stories, on the other hand, are “ephemeral narratives emerging in everyday contexts” (Watson, 2007, p. 371). These are stories occurring in discussions, that is, narratives-in-interaction (see Appendix B). Small story research is uncommon but has potential for research in LTC (see Barkhuizen, 2008, 2010; Benson, 2014; Vásquez, 2011). They can reveal tacit and explicit beliefs, thoughts, and knowledge in
the context of interaction and this data may be different to what might come through a fixed interview protocol. However, small story research needs to consider reflexivity and the influence of interlocutors on data (see Talmy, 2010).

Big stories have dominated NI research, particularly when the focus is on identity (Bamberg & Georgakopoulou, 2008). However, Vásquez (2011) gave four reasons to consider small story NI. First, big stories occur less frequently than small stories. It is rare that one gives an autobiographical account and most stories occur as narratives-in-interaction. Second, “big stories are too coherent” (p. 538) and provide “polished accounts of who we are” (Watson, 2007, p. 372). Third, the context of the findings “tends to get erased in reports based on interview data” (Vásquez, p. 539). Narratives are mediated “representations of social realities” (Bamberg, 2007, p. 202) and should be treated as such (P. Atkinson & Delamont, 2006). The influence of the researcher requires consideration for both composition and analysis. Fourth, “identity is always situated;” it is “both contingent and relational” (Vásquez, p. 539). Small story research is valued “for showing how identity gets renegotiated and reconstructed in and through social interaction” (M. Freeman, 2006, p. 132). This is why small stories are useful for studies in the workplace, such as a school. As Vásquez wrote, “we stand to learn a great deal by listening to teachers’ small stories—about teachers’ cognition, the ways they conceptualize their practice, their understandings of their roles and responsibilities, their decision-making, and their interpretations of the teaching and learning process” (p. 541). This summarizes the impetus for including small story data in this thesis (see Chapter 5).

4.4.3 Two Approaches to Analysis: GNI Versus PAM NI

Polkinghorne (1995) found that Bruner’s (1986) cognitive typologies (paradigmatic and narrative) paralleled two branches of NI methodology, each stemming from different approaches to the phenomena under inquiry. The first type, analysis of narratives, applies paradigmatic-type reasoning for thematic analysis. The second, narrative analysis, synthesizes narrative data in configuration of a story. Analysis of narratives looks for themes and categories in narrative data, whereas narrative analysis seeks to “produce explanatory stories” (Polkinghorne, 1995, p. 5).

In the first approach, a researcher seeks “to locate common themes or conceptual manifestations” (Polkinghorne, 1995, p. 13) within narrative data. These
procedures are more common in AL (Barkhuizen, 2011; Benson, 2014; Pavlenko, 2007). Analysis often draws from other qualitative methods such as content analysis (Miles & Huberman, 1994) or grounded theory (Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Strauss & Corbin, 1990). This is the case in this thesis; thus the framework is defined as grounded narrative inquiry (GNI).

In contrast to analysis of narrative, the aim of narrative analysis is to produce a narrative. The end result of narrative analysis “is a story—for example, a historical account, a case study, a life story, or a storied episode of a person’s life” (Polkinghorne, 1995, p. 15). This type of analysis “treats lived experience as both the beginning and ending points of inquiry” (Clandinin & Rosiek, 2007, p. 55). As discussed above, I am calling the branch of NI from education phenomena-and-method narrative inquiry (PAM NI) to differentiate it from the wider field of NI as Polkinghorne had defined it. While both approaches contributed to the body of research in the human sciences (Polkinghorne, 1995), two methodological issues with PAM NI remain. First, it is criticized for lacking rigorous scholarship and the formatting of reports contrast with conventions for academic publishing (Bell, 2011). Second, it risks creating “the realities they purport to describe” (P. Atkinson & Delamont, 2007, p. 198). Therefore, trustworthiness for PAM NI can be problematic (see Willinsky, 1989). However, as discussed above, PAM NI has value for professional development.

4.4.4 Narrative Knowledging: NI from Beginning to End

From start to finish, NI involves conceiving a topic, formulating an approach, collecting and analyzing data, and publishing reports. Barkhuizen (2011) described this process as narrative knowledging, calling it “the meaning making, learning, and knowledge construction that takes place at all stages of a narrative research project” (p. 395). Below I adapt this concept of narrative knowledging in summary of four methodological considerations for situating NI within the constructivist paradigm: that knowledge is (1) fluid and (2) co-constructed, (3) analyses are interpretive, and (4) reporting relies on verisimilitude over objectivity.

Knowledge is fluid. Narratives are descriptive. They represent experience and events from the perspective of a narrator; however, that representation is fluid and subject to change. Researchers must accept “temporality and the constant reinterpretation of events” (Bell, 2011, p. 575). Further, the meaning making extends
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beyond data; it continues into analysis, interpretation, and reading research (Barkhuizen, 2011). However, NI retains “faith in the power of storytelling as a tool for eliciting people’s local knowledge and understandings of social phenomena and of narrative analysis as an instrument for analyzing them” (De Fina & Georgakopoulou, 2011, p. 18). This is an assumption for LTC research in this thesis.

Knowledge is co-constructed. Workplace-oriented NI necessitates engaging with the professional lives of participants (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000). Therefore, researchers are involved in the processes of knowledge construction. Narrative inquirers “elicit, co-construct, interpret, and, in their retelling, represent participants’ accounts of lived and imagined personal experience” (Barkhuizen, 2011, p. 393). Doing so may involve recursive consultation with participants (Bell, 2011). Mishler (1986) explained the importance of recognizing co-construction in interviews and the embedded cultural assumptions that both the interviewer and interviewee bring. Canagarajah (1996) described how AL researchers are often intimately involved in the co-construction and selection of data for analysis, yet are “looming behind the text as an omniscient, transcendental, all-knowing figure. This convention hides the manner in which the subjectivity of the researchers—with their complex values, ideologies, and experiences—shapes the research activity and findings” (p. 324). Cultural paradigms of researchers also need considering (Bell, 2011), as is addressed in Chapter 5.

Analyses are interpretive. NI is interpretive. Findings emerge from narrative data collected in fieldwork. Researchers gather copious data and make decisions on how to present it (Barkhuizen, 2011; Clandinin & Connelly, 2000). Interpretations are recursive, strengthened by constantly comparing data as it is collected (Glaser & Strauss, 1967) and methods can be refined throughout the research process. Further, once presented, readers bring their own “positioned identities and cultural filters to interpretation” (Riessman, 2008, p. 111). Thus thick descriptions (Gertz, 1973), documentation, and cautious speculation (Lincoln & Guba, 1985) strengthen a study.

Verisimilitude of reporting. Narratives represent reality, albeit a subjective one (Mishler, 1995). Bruner (1986, 1991) stressed the verisimilitude of narrative representations. While not objective truths, they resemble a reality projected by the narrator. Just as narratives rely on verisimilitude, so does reporting NI findings (Polkinghorne, 1988, 2007). As Webster and Mertova (2007) explained, NI “does not produce conclusions of certainty. In narrative-based research, validity is more concerned with the research being well grounded and supportable by the data that has
been collected” (p. 90). Researchers strive for alternative criteria “such as access, honesty, verisimilitude, authenticity, familiarity, transferability, and economy” (p. 94). An approach to NI that includes member checks through a project strengthens the credibility and dependability of a study (Lincoln & Guba, 1985), as is clarified in Chapter 5.

Above, I have outlined an ontology, epistemology, and methodology for NI as a theoretical framework. From the onset, I am assuming a constructivist stance for NI; however, not all narrative inquirers agree with that fit (e.g., Clandinin & Rosiek, 2007; Spector-Mersel, 2010). In the next section, I discuss the fit of NI within qualitative research traditions and argue for placing the current project within the constructivist paradigm.

4.5 Mapping a Paradigm

In a chapter called *Mapping the landscape of narrative inquiry: Borderland spaces and tensions*, Clandinin and Rosiek (2007) discuss the fit of NI within qualitative research traditions. Their recurring metaphors of *maps* and *borders* suits NI, a field still establishing itself (Chase, 2011). In summary of GNI as the theoretical framework, I will discuss its fit with established research traditions and argue that the approach in this thesis is a particular representation of constructivism.

4.5.1 NI, Post-positivism, and Materialism

Some branches of NI draw from post-positivism. Some NI researchers seek “identification of generalizable patterns in human experience as its primary goal” (Clandinin & Rosiek, 2007, p. 60). The sociolinguistic predecessors of NI would fall into this category (e.g., Labov & Waletzky, 1967), as would some GNI projects (Polkinghorne, 1995). Post-positivist NI is consistent with “attempts to understand how contexts … influence, shape and are shaped by people’s actions” (Clandinin & Rosiek, 2007, p. 60). Generalizability, however, is not a primary impetus for most NI, and researchers usually seek tentative findings grounded in the experience of individual participants (Spector-Mersel, 2010).

Materialism is an ontological assumption in this thesis but it provides a point of departure for GNI as a methodology. Even though cognition is a result of complex neural processes, and consciousness likely arising through overlapping cognitive
processes (Dennet, 1993; O. Flanagan, 1992), we are not evolved to experience these processes per se; rather, we experience the world and make sense of it through our experiences as narratively constructed selves. It could be argued that everything, minds included, can be reduced to a stew of fermions and bosons. However, a materialist stance is not mutually exclusive to a pragmatic one. The narrative construction of reality (Bruner, 1991) may emerge through complex cognitive processes, but for inquiry into the cognitions of language teachers, abstraction beyond implied experience in narrative data is unfeasible.

4.5.2 NI and Post-structuralism

By problematizing positivism, post-structuralism made “compelling arguments for encouraging epistemic and methodological diversity in the social sciences” (Clandinin & Rosiek, 2007, p. 52). Post-structuralism maintains, however, that it is not the study of phenomena that is responsible for the stability and history of academic pursuit, but rather discourse within the disciplines. To the post-structuralist, the arbitrariness of the sign (de Saussure, 1959) percolates in academia: “Instead of the object of study defining the process of inquiry, the process of inquiry creates the object that it examines” (Clandinin & Rosiek, 2007, p. 53). These general criticisms are applicable to this thesis as much as any other research project would be.

Ontologically, for post-structuralism “the gap between our descriptions of the world and the actual world is … ultimately unbreachable” (p. 54). Therefore, narrative knowing “has an entirely discursive provenance. Signs can only rely on other signs for their meaning, and thus inquiry does not deal with lived experience itself” (p. 55). It is on this point that the pragmatic ontology described above presents a point of departure from post-structuralism.

4.5.3 The Narrative Paradigm?

The Handbook of Narrative Inquiry (Clandinin, 2007) treats NI foremost as a methodology, as do the most recent editions of the Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005, 2011). In a recent article, however, Spector-Mersel (2010) argued that NI is limited when reduced to merely a method. She called for the recognition of the narrative paradigm. Her argument centered on a discussion of ontology, epistemology, and methodology for NI.
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Regarding ontology, the narrative paradigm maintains “that social reality is primarily a narrative reality” (Spector-Mersel, 2010, p. 211). Ontology blends with epistemology because this reality is both shaped and interpreted through stories, and these interpretations are “subjective and culturally rooted” (p. 212). This may be compatible with other paradigms (e.g., constructivism); however, according to Spector-Mersel (2010), within a narrative paradigm, narrative is the way in which we make sense of the world and interpret our place in it. However, Spector-Mersel’s argument relies on defining the field of NI as PAM NI and seeing a story as a whole unit for investigation (see also Chase, 2005). Through defining NI in this way, a narrative paradigm would not be suitable for GNI. Further, when adapted as a theoretical approach or methodology, NI can be accommodated by other paradigms.

Accommodation and commensurability are two practical issues to consider in defining a paradigm (Lincoln, Lynham, and Guba, 2011). For situating NI, accommodation is key. Depending on project aims, post-positivist, post-structuralist, and constructivist paradigms readily accommodate NI as a theoretical framework (see Hollingsworth & Dybdahl, 2007). Specter-Mersel (2010) argued that one aspect in particular warrants special consideration: How exactly do we shape reality? How do we interpret it? … Through stories. Narrative is depicted as an “organizing principle” (Sarbin, 1986) of human experience and “narrative knowing” (Polkinghorne, 1988) is offered as one of the two primary modes of thought, alongside paradigmatic thought, relevant to social reality (Bruner, 1986). “Narrative intelligence”—the capacity both to formulate and follow stories—is proposed as a primary intelligence that enables major processes integral to human existence (Randall, 1999). (Spector-Mersel, 2010, p. 212)

Spector-Mersel (2010) argued that the inquiry aims, inquirer stance, and researcher-participant relations of NI “proffers a unique philosophical infrastructure that gives rise to particular methodological principles and methods” (p. 204). However, the proposed uniqueness of NI—the pragmatic ontology and interpretation of storied representations of experience—still fits within a constructivist paradigm. Narrative intelligence (Randall, 1999), after all, is a mental construct. The narrative construction of reality (Bruner, 1991) means little without the concept of an embodied mind experiencing life, and representing that life experience narratively.
The narrative paradigm is conceptually problematic. Most saliently, the blending of phenomena and methods with ontology and epistemology create an esoteric field blurred with abstractions (see also Fenstermacher, 1994, regarding PAM NI). While Spector-Mersel (2010) argued for the commensurability of the narrative paradigm (vis-a-vis constructivism, for example), the accommodation of NI with the above paradigms suggests this may be superfluous. For GNI as a theoretical framework, the best fit may be constructivism.

4.5.4 Borderland of Constructivism

Although conspicuously absent in Clandinin and Rosiek’s (2007) discussion of paradigms, NI has been associated with constructivism (Spector-Mersel, 2010; Hollingsworth & Dybdahl, 2007), and it is within this paradigm that I am situating this thesis. Constructivist ontology stems from a relativist perspective in that “realities exist in the form of multiple mental constructions, socially and experientially based, local and specific, dependent for their form and content on the persons who hold them” (Lincoln, Lynham, & Guba, 2011, p. 102). GNI fits well on this point. The ontology infers a subjective epistemology because individuals “construct their own understanding of reality” (p. 102). It is also transactional because “knowledge is cognitively constructed from experience and interaction of the individual with others and the environment” (p. 107). As discussed above, constructivist methodology is interpretive and researchers are assumed to be “co-constructors of knowledge and of interpreting the meaning of lived experiences” (p. 110). Table 4.3 below outlines features of constructivist GNI.

Table 4.3 Intersections of Epistemology, Theory, and Methods in Narrative Inquiry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Epistemological Perspective</th>
<th>Theoretical Position on Power, Relationship, and Identity</th>
<th>Methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constructivist:</td>
<td>1. Co-constructed to maintain intentions of narrators</td>
<td>a. Narrators are selected who reflect the theoretical frame</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unstable truth in context</td>
<td>2. Identity of researcher is considered in research design if warranted</td>
<td>b. Semi-structured interviews and conversations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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3. Varying relationship time with narrators, depending on design
4. Power is shared between researchers and narrators

   c. Semi-structured observations and field notes
   d. Structured and open-ended analyses; narrators give feedback

(Hollingsworth & Dybdahl, 2007, p. 150)

In summary, this chapter discussed the diversity of NI as qualitative research, attempted to bring clarity to the field, and defined the theoretical framework for the thesis based on a grounded theory (GT) approach to NI. In this vision, GNI provides a particular representation of constructivism (see also Charmaz, 2014). In the following chapter, the details of this approach are described, including clarification of GT methods used in this thesis.
CHAPTER 5: METHODOLOGY

The basic theme in our book is the discovery of theory from data systematically obtained from social research.

Glaser & Strauss (1967, p. 1)

The appropriateness of qualitative research for this exploratory study on LTC in Korea lies in its potential to enter the professional world of participants, providing a means of discovering and describing their experiences and coming to an understanding of their perspectives as language teachers (see Denzin & Lincoln, 2011; Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Chapter 4 described grounded narrative inquiry (GNI) as the theoretical approach, whereas this chapter describes the methods and procedures applied in the two studies.

The chapter continues with an overview of grounded theory (GT) methods and the critical incident (CI) approach adapted in this thesis. Then it defines emic and etic perspectives and uses them to describe research positionality and insider/outsider influences on design. There are two studies in this thesis; the first is a background study and the second consists of in-depth case studies. These are described sequentially, beginning with the participants, data collection instruments, collection procedures, and analysis of findings. Following this, procedures for synthesizing and interpreting findings are clarified. Lastly, I discuss L1/L2 use in the studies, steps taken to address trustworthiness, and ethical considerations.

5.1 Overview of Grounded Theory Methods in the Thesis

Grounded theory (GT) provides analytic methods for these studies, methods valued for “informing policy and practice” (Charmaz, 2014, p. 14), which is why GT is useful for a thesis such as this.

GT utilizes coding. Saldaña (2013) defines a code as “a researcher-generated construct that symbolizes and thus attributes interpreted meaning to each individual datum for later purposes of pattern detection, categorization, theory building, and other analytic processes” (p. 4). The two studies below apply open and in-vivo coding organized around categories and themes, looking for comparisons within and across
cases (Charmaz, 2014; Corbin & Strauss, 2008; Miles, Huberman, & Saldaña, 2014). This is the level of analysis used in the findings chapters (Chapters 6-8). The process of axial coding, that is, “relating concepts to each other” (Corbin & Stauss, p. 195), led to theory building for the discussion (Chapter 9). Figure 5.1 below summarizes GT processes in this thesis. These steps are described further below in the relevant sections.

![Flowchart of grounded theory methods for the thesis. (Adapted from Tweed & Charmaz, 2011, p. 133).](image)

**5.2 Critical Incident Approach for Investigating LTC**

Critical incident (CI) theory influenced the design in a few areas that are indicated below. In this section I define CIs and give an overview of the approach.
Broadly, CI analysis in the thesis adapted GT methods, but it was influenced by Webster and Mertova’s (2007) framework for NI. Webster and Mertova attributed CI theory to J. Flanagan (1954), who developed procedures to analyze pilot failure in aviation training. CI is common in education, but much rarer in AL (Farrell, 2008). The methods developed in this thesis present a novel, inductive approach for CI analysis in describing participants’ commitment to learning and teaching English and the changes in cognitions and practices that occurred during Study 2 (see below).

The following features define CIs as interpreted in the thesis. First, a CI refers to a vivid memory of an event (Brookfield, 1990); CIs are experiences “that for some reason people remember as being significant” (Brookfield, 1995, p. 114). Second, the criticality of an event arises from the interpretation of its significance (Tripp, 2011, p. 8). Interpretations require reflection and “incidents only really become critical when they are subject to this conscious reflection” (Farrell, 2013a, p. 81). Third, CIs might be positive or negative experiences (P. Woods, 1993/2012). Fourth, CIs are generally “unplanned, unanticipated, and uncontrolled” (P. Woods, 1993/2012, p. 1). Because the participants are teachers and planning is a big part of teaching, I focus on interpreting outcomes of their planned activities that were unexpected. Fifth, CIs influence cognition and behavior. For the experiencer, a CI is “likely to have changed their experience and understanding, informing future behavior and understanding” (Webster & Mertova, 2007, p. 74). Some researchers distinguish critical events from incidents (e.g., P. Woods, 1993/2012), but following Webster and Mertova (2007), this distinction is not considered in this thesis.

5.3 Emic and Etic Perspectives

The emic/etic distinction, commonly addressed in anthropology and social science, proves useful in describing aspects of the methodology. The lexemes emic and etic are back-formations, originating from the suffixes of phonemic and phonetic, respectively. Pike (1954) applied these terms to describe nonverbal behavior that seemed relevant to linguistic descriptions (Headland, 1990). Although there are differences in how the terms have been subsequently understood (see Harris, 1976), social scientists generally have applied the terms to refer to insider (emic) and outsider (etic) perspectives (Headland, Pike & Harris, 1990). To Lett (1990), emic and etic are
“adjectives modifying the implicit noun knowledge” (p. 132); therefore, emic can be understood as insider knowledge and etic as outsider knowledge.

Pike (1990) described an emic unit as a construct that cultural insiders view “as relevant to their system of behavior” (p. 28). Lett (1990) defined this further as “accounts, descriptions, and analysis expressed in terms of the conceptual schemes and categories regarded as meaningful and appropriate by the native members of the culture whose beliefs and behaviors are being studied” (p. 130). However, one challenge for research comes from what Ochs and Schieffelin (1994) described as the “paradox of familiarity” (p. 477) in that it is difficult for insiders to make these constructs explicit. Therefore, an etic approach provides a means of describing the emic phenomena. Lett defined an etic unit as a concept meaningful and appropriate according to observers, for example, researchers or the scientific community.

Beyond utility as epistemological constructs, the emic/etic distinction is useful for describing approaches to qualitative analysis (Harris, 1976; Kuttner & Threlkeld, 2008; Lett, 1990). Emic analysis starts with the words and perspectives of participants, while etic analysis begins with existing theory or concepts in order to see how they apply to the research context (Harris, 1976; Kuttner & Threlkeld, 2008). The emic/etic distinction may be better viewed as on a continuum rather than as mutually exclusive concepts. Table 5.1 below compares emic and etic research approaches.

Table 5-1 Comparison of Emic and Etic Research Constructs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Qualities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Emic Approach</strong></td>
<td>• Insider, inductive, bottom-up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Participants’ perspectives and voice central to analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Emic Coding</strong></td>
<td>• Emerge from data (e.g., in-vivo or themes in narratives)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Etic Approach</strong></td>
<td>• Outsider, deductive, top-down</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Existing concepts, theory, and themes central to analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Etic Coding</strong></td>
<td>• Concepts from prior research, literature reviews, and/or researcher experience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Kuttner & Threlkeld, 2008)
5.4 Researcher Positionality

The emic/etic distinction, then, is helpful for describing my position as researcher. My interest in the topic arose through personal and professional experience living in Korea. For ten years prior to the thesis I had taught English and ELT development courses including a year and a half in a primary school, a similar setting to Study 2. I had come to know many community members who were local teachers; their stories about their personal and professional experience contributed to my understanding of the challenges and opportunities unique to that context. As I was developing a research topic, it appeared the voice of teachers was under-represented in prior research from Korea and I felt that a project should strive to consider their voices (see Harris, 1976).

However, as a westerner with a different sociocultural and educational background, I would be considered an outsider, but one with prolonged engagement in the context. I assume this position is helpful for recognizing what might go unnoticed to participants (Ochs & Schiefflin, 1994). Further, the impetus for this thesis is to produce studies meaningful to the discipline of AL as much as to stakeholders in Korea (see Lett, 1990). To Harris (1976), an etic researcher begins with theories and concepts from the academic community, whereas an emic researcher is concerned first with understanding the voices of participants; my position straddles this spectrum. I aim to give a sense of the emic and etic influences on design as the methods of both studies are described below.

As discussed in Chapter 4, the thesis assumes a constructivist epistemology. Interviews are assumed to be both data collection instruments and social constructions arising in discourse between the participants and myself (see also Talmy, 2010). Likewise, conceptual frameworks offered in the discussion are not intended as objective descriptions or verifiable theory, rather they are interpretations, constructed from the process of GT methods undertaken in this thesis (Charmaz, 2014).

5.5 Study 1: Grounded Narrative Inquiry into English Learning and Teaching Experience

This exploratory study was designed to develop a better understanding of the experiences leading people to ELT in Korea, the influence of prior education and
language learning on LTC, and their professional developmental experience. It used narrative frames (NF), a form of writing scaffold, as data collection instruments (Barkhuizen & Wette, 2008). NFs outline story composition. In this case, topics were related to the four phases of teacher experience (Chapter 3).

5.5.1 Participants and Recruitment

Twenty-seven teachers (22 females and 5 males) participated in the study. All were teaching in Daegu or North Gyeongsang Province (see Figure 2.1). Twenty-five taught in primary schools and two in secondary schools. Recruitment was purposive (Miles & Huberman, 1994): Inclusion criteria stipulated that participants must be (1) full-time public school teachers, (2) Korean nationals educated in Korea, and (3) currently teaching English or have taught English in the past two years, and/or must be (4) participating in in-service ELT training programs. The fourth criterion was added to widen the participant pool.

Multiple strategies were used for recruitment including selective and referral sampling (Miles & Huberman, 1994). First, personal contacts were recruited and asked to forward ads and links to peers (gaining 7 participants). Second, a professor of education was contacted who forwarded information sheets to former students (2 participants). Third, advertisements were posted on teacher forums, but this seemed ineffective due to email filters. Lastly, I contacted a director of an in-service training course and planned reflective writing sessions during the two-week course. Four hours were set aside where participants could write their stories voluntarily (18 of 24 teachers in the course participated).

Participants were between the ages of 24 and 54, from first-year teachers to ones with over 30 years of experience. ELT experience ranged from first-year to 29 years. All teachers had degrees in education or English education, two also had MAs, and three had TESOL certificates. Government-supported in-service ELT training ranged from over 400 hours to none among participants.

Thirty-one teachers had agreed to participate but data from four were excluded: Two participants did not complete any stories, one had illegible stories, and one had no ELT experience or intent to teach English.
Demographics relevant for analysis (e.g., age and gender) are reported in the findings (Chapter 6). The advertisements and information sheets appear in Appendix C and the demographic questionnaire is in Appendix D.

5.5.2 Data Collection Instruments: Narrative Frames

As discussed above, narratives are prominent sources for understanding teacher knowledge; however, NI requires vast data sets, a challenge for including multiple participants. In providing a “supportive and guiding function” (Barkhuizen & Wette, p. 375), NFs make it feasible to include many participants. Further, NFs provided some consistency to content, form, and length within and across data sets, thereby aiding analysis.

Bygate (2012) wrote that NFs approach data collection with a net rather than a fishing pole and it was this mode of thinking that made them attractive for an exploratory study on the experiences of English teachers in Korea. NFs generate data comparable to what may arise in open-ended questionnaires, but there are some distinguishing features making them more appealing for this study. First, NF data are diachronic, enabling participants to relate past experiences with the present and possible futures in one data set. Second, NFs can embed a large number of subtopics and themes in one instrument. Table 5.2 below illustrates these points. Third, writing stories stimulates reflection and possibly limits the likelihood of respondents answering successive questions without much consideration of the topic. Fourth, ELT research in Korea tends to use surveys and questionnaires, and teachers’ voices seem underrepresented (Moodie & Nam, forthcoming). In this study participants were able to describe their beliefs and experience in their own words.

Table 5.2 Themes and Temporal Dimensions in Narrative Frame 1: On Becoming a Teacher

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Temporal Dimension</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reasons for becoming an English teacher</td>
<td>Past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thoughts about teaching English before and after starting</td>
<td>Past-Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future hopes related to teaching English</td>
<td>Future</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.5.3 Developing and Piloting Narrative Frames

There were etic and emic influences on NF design. Themes from prior research provided topics for prompts (Chapter 3) and CI literature influenced NF structure (e.g., Farrell, 2007b; Webster & Mertova, 2007). In order to develop instruments suitable for the context, I discussed topics with KETs as they were developed and drew on my experience as an English teacher and ELT educator in Korea.

The instruments went through a piloting stage before data collection. Ten frames were drafted, then tested by a dozen professional contacts, including several researchers and Korean educators. Volunteers commented positively about the process of reflection. Preliminary analysis and pilot feedback led to discarding a frame that was more factual than narrative, rewording prompts for clarity, and combining frames on similar topics. This reduced the set to seven frames. Input from other researchers further influenced the design after the methods were presented at a symposium (Moodie, 2012), for example, instrument length and spacing (Gary Barkhuizen, personal communication).

5.5.4 Narrative Frame Topics

The NFs were thematically grouped to cover topics on English learning and teaching experience. The themes are outlined in Table 5.3 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NF1 On Becoming a Teacher</td>
<td>Prior education (reasons to become teacher)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NF2 My English Learning Experience</td>
<td>Prior education (L2 learning)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NF3 My Memories of University</td>
<td>Prior education (teachers’ college)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NF4 My Opinions about English Teaching</td>
<td>Experience in the field (general)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NF5 Teaching Challenges</td>
<td>Experience (critical incidents)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NF6 Communicative Language Teaching</td>
<td>Experience (teaching methods)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NF7 My Curriculum and Materials</td>
<td>Experience (teaching materials)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Topics and subtopics embedded within frames stimulated a range of data. The entire set is collated in Appendix E. Originally there were seven NFs designed but only four are presented in Chapter 6 findings. This was because it became apparent during
data collection and constant comparative analysis that there would not be sufficient
space to present such a large data set. I decided to focus on the first four NFs, which
elicted life-history data regarding the four phases of experience, and excluded the final
three NFs, which had a narrower scope eliciting data on classroom-oriented opinions
and incidents.

5.5.5 Data Collection

To describe the process of data collection it is helpful to distinguish two
participant groups: (1) those recruited personally or referred and (2) those writing
during an in-service course. For the first, participants were contacted directly or
directed to an on-line advertisement with links to a background survey and information
sheets stored on Google Drive (see Appendix Y). Questionnaire submissions were
synced to my email account so that I received notice of participant interest after they
submitted the survey. After screening the demographic information, participants were
sent NF1 attached to an email. After completing the story, they sent it back to me. This
allowed me to read the stories, clarify participant responses if necessary, and comment
on their narratives before sending the next NF. After completing four NFs, participants
were sent a message expressing my appreciation. Lastly, they were offered 10,000
KRW (roughly $9 USD) gift certificate with a hand written note as a token of my
appreciation for participating. Instrument piloting indicated each story would take
between 15 minutes to over an hour so I decided to ask participants to write four
frames, with the option of completing all seven. Numbers of participants writing each
story are reported in Chapter 6. An example story is included in Appendix F.

For the second group, a one-hour time slot was assigned on Tuesdays and
Thursdays for two weeks. Participants were informed of the nature of the research,
given the information sheets, and told that they were free not to participate should they
choose. They were asked not to discuss the topics until everyone had finished writing,
but could ask me if they had uncertainties about the meaning of any prompts. I oversaw
the data collection during these sessions, but minimized my influence by sitting to the
side. A few teachers chose not to participate and they were given free time to read or do
coursework. Written stories were scanned and uploaded to Google Drive.
5.5.6 Data Analysis

This study adapted GT methods (Corbin & Strauss, 2008) with input from Miles et al. (2014). Data sets for each story were compiled in MAXQDA 11 where coding systems were developed and refined through constant comparative analysis (Glaser & Strauss, 1967) as the NFs were returned from participants.

Analysis began with open descriptive and in-vivo coding and sub-coding organized under initial categories based on NF prompts. Some codes were etic, that is, based on prior studies. For example, in NF1 under the category reasons to become a teacher, the codes working conditions, social status, and legal status were adapted from E.-G. Kim (2009). Others were emic, that is, emerging in the data, for example, parental pressure and Confucian values. Constant comparative analysis led to further descriptive and in-vivo codes and sub-codes (Miles et al., 2014). Memos were kept and codes were refined and the process continued until patterns emerged (Corbin & Strauss, 2008). Findings are presented on the level of themes and categories using thick description (Geertz, 1973) and supported by excerpts from participant stories. Example categories and codes are in Appendix G, while screen shots of the code systems appear in Appendix H. There are sample excerpts in Appendix I.

The process enabled cross-case synthesis of multiple cases. The 27 participants’ findings could be tabulated, providing an element of quantification to support the analysis. Although statistical generalization is not usually sought in case study research, the multiple study design supports the findings by offering a degree of analytical generalization (Yin, 2014). For example, the findings provided input to the design of Study 2. The final stages of GT occur in Chapter 9 where findings from both studies are interpreted (see below).

5.6 Study 2: Case Studies of Experienced and Novice Teachers

Study 2 consists of collective case studies (Stake, 2013) with four Korean primary school English teachers. Merriam (1998) provided the rationale for case study research:

A case study design is employed to gain an in-depth understanding of the situation and the meaning for those involved. The interest is in process rather than outcomes, in context rather than a specific variable, in
discovery rather than confirmation. Insights gleaned from case studies can directly influence policy, practice, and future research. (p. 19)

Thus case studies provide an appropriate genre for a thesis on LTC such as this.

Further, the choice for collective cases was made on the assumption that “understanding them will lead to better understanding, and perhaps better theorizing, about a still larger collection of cases” (Stake, 2005, p. 446). As in Tsui’s (2003) study, the cases include novice and experienced teachers to bring a better understanding of their differences through comparative analysis, and in doing so, provide stronger support for findings than might be gained in a single case. To clarify, statistical generalizability is not the intent, but rather “expanding or generalizing theoretical propositions” (Tsui, p. 67; see Yin, 2014).

The research was informed by the works of Yin (2014), Stake (2005, 2013), and Chase (2005), among others, using methods for GT (Corbin & Strauss, 2008; Charmaz, 2014) and a critical incidents approach for analysis (Webster & Mertova, 2007), supported by qualitative data analysis procedures in Miles et al. (2014). The procedures are described below, beginning with a description of the participants and my role as researcher.

5.6.1 Research Sites and Participants

This study took place in three primary schools in an industrial city in North Gyeongsang Province; two were in a lower socioeconomic area and one was in a middle class neighborhood. The setting was chosen because of the limited research on ELT in provincial areas in Korea (Chapter 3). Further, as in Jung and Norton’s (2002) study, having different socioeconomic settings provided further comparative data.

Four female teachers participated, two experienced and two novices. All participants have four-year degrees in elementary education and all had specialized in subjects other than English. Their teaching experience and assignments are summarized in Table 5.4 below. All names are pseudonyms.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Year Teaching</th>
<th>Year Teaching English</th>
<th>ELT Assignment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sami</td>
<td>Early 40s</td>
<td>20th</td>
<td>6th</td>
<td>Grade 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mia</td>
<td>Late 30s</td>
<td>16th</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Grade 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eunjeong</td>
<td>Mid 20s</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Grades 3 &amp; 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5-4 Participants’ Age, Teaching Experience, and Grade Assignment (2013-2014)
Although the experienced teachers, Sami and Mia, had no undergraduate ELT courses, they had extensive in-service training. Sami has attended a six-month intensive ELT training program and has a TEFL and a TESOL Certificate. Mia had over 400 hours of in-service ELT training, including a few 60-hour courses. The novice teachers, Eunjeong and Yuna, had two pre-service ELT courses. Eunjeong also had taken one 60-hour in-service course. Further details on the participants and setting are used for thick description in the case studies (Chapter 7 & 8).

Participants were purposively recruited through selective and referral sampling (Miles et al., 2014). I sought participants who would be comfortable having an outside observer making frequent visits and I looked for tenured teachers at different stages of their careers but teaching English full-time in 2013-2014. I approached potential participants through a network of personal contacts, discussing the research with a pool of 6 teachers whom I knew through living in the community. Sami and Mia were recruited this way. Mia referred Yuna, who taught at the same school. These participants were not former students nor did they have professional connections to myself. Eunjeong was recruited after a professional development course. I taught 16 of 60 hours of her course. Participation was voluntary and had no concrete incentives for the teachers. Information sheets and consent forms are in Appendix J. Gender was not a criterion, but that all were female should not be surprising (see Chapter 2).

5.6.2 Role of Researcher

Like ethnography, the studies involved prolonged engagement (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). The school principals offered open and ongoing access to the schools, and fieldwork included many staff lunches, meetings, coffee breaks, off-site conversations, and observations of after-school programs.

There were some procedures implemented to emphasize the importance of authenticity on the part of teachers regarding their practice. Prior to data collection, I established rapport with participants off-site. I emphasized that the study was descriptive, not evaluative, and I discussed the importance of observing authentic classrooms and asked them not to change routines on my behalf. I explained that the voices of teachers are under-represented in research from Korea and that I was there to
understand what they thought, believed, and knew about teaching English and that it was important to come to an understanding of their challenges and struggles as much as their knowledge and expertise. I assured the participants of their anonymity and the research aims and procedures were discussed at length.

5.6.3 Data Collection

Strength for case study research comes from prolonged engagement and triangulating multiple data sources (Yin, 2014). In this study, primary data came from semi-structured interviews, reflective writing including NFs and critical incident logs (CIL), and classroom observation data collected over 18 months. Secondary sources included field notes, textbooks, teachers’ guides, school documents, informal discussions off-site, and email exchanges. Key data sets for Study 2 appear in Table 5-5.

Table 5-5 Key Data Sets for Case Studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Data Collection Period</th>
<th>Days on Site</th>
<th>Interviews</th>
<th>Observations</th>
<th>Narrative Frame Entries</th>
<th>CIL Entries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sami</td>
<td>14 months</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mia</td>
<td>18 months</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eunjeong</td>
<td>9 months</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuna</td>
<td>9 months</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The experienced teachers, Sami and Mia, were the first participants, so the data collection period was longer with them and included more open-ended interviews. They started during the first semester, whereas Eunjeong and Yuna’s observation periods began during the second semester. Data collection procedures were narrowed for Eunjeong and Yuna to focus on emerging interview protocols and themes from initial analysis of Sami and Mia’s cases. Yuna choose not to write NFs, so her background interviews were longer to cover those topics. As experienced teachers, Sami and Mia were comfortable with frequent observations but the younger teachers had some concerns. Yuna and Eunjeong agreed to video-record four classes and let me observe two of those but I was onsite for seven and nine days, respectively. The core data sets are explained below, followed by a typology for describing pedagogic activities.
5.6.3.1 Open and semi-structured interview protocols.

Most interviews occurred onsite and covered topics on participants’ background and LTC (see Appendix K). Protocols were semi-structured and lines of questioning were adjusted based on participant responses. For background interviews, ethnographic and narrative approaches were adapted (Creswell, 2013), eliciting stories about their upbringing, prior language learning and education, teacher education, and previous HRT and ELT experience (Richards & Lockhart, 1996). The LTC portions often overlapped and I adapted question themes from LTC research (e.g., Borg, 1998). Example topics included beliefs about teaching English and the influences of prior experiences on beliefs and practices. In addition, there were post-observation and CIL interview protocols adapted from reflective practice research (Brookfield, 1995; Farrell, 2007b; Finch, 2010), focusing on incidents occurring in class. Stimulated-recall interviews were planned but abandoned because teachers did not have time to do them regularly, nor did they wish to watch their classes.

Interviews usually occurred after observations or after CIL entries were returned (see below). Schedules were arranged with participants individually, but generally occurred bi-weekly during the data collection period. Post-interview field notes, made while transcribing, guided follow-up interviews so that each participant was asked commensurate questions over the course of the study.

Interviews were recorded on a portable digital recorder, then fully transcribed. Most were between 30 and 60 minutes. Interviews are numbered according to day on site. Data reference and transcription conventions are in Appendix M.

5.6.3.2 Observation protocols.

There were a number of steps followed for observing classes. First, there was a warming period prior to data collection. Participants introduced me to their students and explained why I was there and I answered their questions. Students were instructed to ignore me during observations. Observations were not included in analysis until students (and teachers) appeared accustomed to my presence. Participants were asked not to plan anything unusual for the observed classes. During observations, I set up early, remaining as unobtrusive as possible sitting at the back. As a westerner in Korea, I had anticipated a more noticeable observation effect on students, but the procedures seemed effective in that regard (see Chapter 10 for limitations).
Observation data included video and audio recordings, full or partial transcripts of interaction, descriptions of pedagogic activities, field notes, and observation reports, the latter a template for systematically taking observation notes.

The observation reports were designed to create consistency within and across cases. First, the lesson topic, page numbers from the textbook, supplementary materials and their sources, and assigned homework were recorded. Then, pedagogic sequences were charted with descriptions of the activities and procedures, the approximate times of each sequence, language use and interaction observed, other comments, and questions for the teacher (see Appendix N). Following the observations, the reports were typed up, as were field notes written in separate notebooks. I developed the coding system for describing pedagogic activities and interaction (Appendix P). This system was also used for CIL analysis (see below).

5.6.3.3 Critical incident logs.

The CIL were designed to track teachers’ reflections about their practices during a unit of a textbook. The logs have two parts. First, omissions, extra activities, sources for lesson ideas, and assigned homework were noted. Then, a critical incident questionnaire was adapted for describing incidents occurring in class.

This twelve-item part expands on an instrument used by Brookfield (1995) and Finch (2010). Brookfield’s original five-part questionnaire elicited reflections on the following topics: most engaged moment, most distanced moment, most affirming action, most puzzling action, and most surprising event. I expanded the log and included items for eliciting teachers’ perceptions of what was engaging for students and the effectiveness of classroom activities. These were organized as opposing pairs, for example, most effective and least effective events. The CIL provided a record of teacher planning and a basis for describing teacher cognition in reference to specific sets of teacher practices (i.e., pedagogic activities). Table 5.6 below outlines the categories and topics of the CIL; the template appears in Appendix O.

*Table 5-6 Categories and Topics of Critical Incident Logs*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items 1-4: Teacher perception of student experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers’ assessment of (1) most engaging, (2) distancing, (3) helpful, and (4) puzzling activities or events for students during a unit of a textbook.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Items 5-8: Teacher reflections
Teachers’ assessment of (5) most effective, (6) least effective, (7) most affirming, and (8) most surprising activities or events during a unit.

Items 9-12: Problems, solutions, and changes
Documenting (9) problems, (10) solutions, (11) changes in routine, and (12) future changes for each unit.

Other comments
Participants were asked to write other important or interesting information not covered by the items above.

The items were clarified with each participant and they were instructed to write down the name of an activity or describe an event that best fit each item. Specifically, for Items 1-4 they had to make a judgment of the experiences of students, and for Items 5-8 they had to give their opinions about their teaching practices. Each participant completed ten CILs.

CIL entries were member-checked during interviews. They were asked to clarify responses and describe the activities (if needed) so that they could be accurately coded (see below). They were also asked to explain rationale for entries.

The CIL served several methodological functions. First, the logs showed a record of teachers’ perceptions of effective practices that could be analyzed in terms of specific activities or events occurring in class. In essence, each item represented a micro story of classroom incidents that connected beliefs, practices, and the context. This enabled LTC interviews to be grounded in actual practices. Second, CIL provided longitudinal data for each participant, revealing patterns and themes in their beliefs and practices over time. Third, CIL design allowed for collecting a large amount of data with relatively little time commitment from participants. Earlier plans for writing weekly journals (based on Farrell, 2007b) were not feasible because the participants did not have the time or will to complete them.
A typology for describing pedagogic activities.

The following typology was an important analytical feature for observation reports and CIL data. Three main activity types are classified here: task-based activities (TBA), communicative activities (CA), and language exercises (LE) (Nunan, 2004).

Task-based activity. This category refers to what Ellis (2003) defined as a pedagogical task, which is a “workplan that requires learners to process language pragmatically in order to achieve an outcome that can be evaluated in terms of whether the correct or appropriate propositional content has been conveyed” (p. 16). This definition was influenced by Skehan’s (1996) criteria for identifying tasks in that,

1. meaning is primary,
2. there is some sort of relationship to the real world,
3. task completion has some priority, and
4. the assessment of task performance is in terms of outcome. (p. 38)

Based on these criteria, Willis and Willis (2007, pp. 12-14) adapted six questions helpful for identifying tasks:

1. Will the activity engage learners’ interest?
2. Is there a primary focus on meaning?
3. Is there a goal or an outcome?
4. Is success judged in terms of outcome?
5. Is completion a priority?
6. Does the activity relate to real world activities?

They assert that the more we can confidently answer in the affirmative to these questions, the more accurately we can describe a given activity as a task. I applied these questions to determine which activities would be coded as tasks.

Communicative activity. These activities have a central purpose of facilitating communication in the classroom, either among students themselves, or between students and the teacher. Kumaravadivelu (1993) defined a communicative classroom as one seeking “to promote interpretation, expression, and negotiation of meaning” (p. 12). CAs are designed to do so, as are pedagogical tasks. A point of distinction, however, are degrees to which outcomes and relations to real world activities are priorities. Examples of CAs could include role plays and information-gap activities, and surveys and find-someone-who activities. Depending on how a teacher adapts them, these kinds of activities are not necessarily outcome-oriented apart from finishing the
activity itself. I will use an example from Yuna’s textbook to illustrate the CA/TBA distinction:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Interest</th>
<th>__________</th>
<th>__________</th>
<th>__________</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Music</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Art</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Computers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dancing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cooking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(H. R. Kim et al., 2011, p. 51)

For this activity, students interview three classmates by asking if they are interested in the topics and record the answers. This provides opportunities to communicate but it would depend on how it is administered as to whether it would be labeled a CA or a TBA. For example, if the teacher provided the prompts on the board, then it would not be a task. As another example, if students were instructed to finish the survey but nothing is done with the information and there is no feedback given or efforts to relate the information further to the real world, such as reporting the information or doing something with it such as recommending a job for a classmate, then I would code it as a CA rather than a task.

Language exercise. This category encompasses non-communicative activities, often with an emphasis on form and “lexical, phonological, or grammatical systems” (Nunan, 2004, p. 22). This includes structure drills, cloze activities, and other activities where communication is not a primary element, including many games.

Curricular policy recommends TBLT as an approach for CLT (Chapter 2) and this typology provides a means of analyzing practices systematically, giving an indication of how participants’ beliefs and practices align with policy. This has been a problematic area for research in Korea (Moodie & Nam, forthcoming).
5.6.4 Case Study Analysis

This section describes the case study methods and analytical process for Study 2. A case study outline emerged through iterative engagement with the data, RQs, and prior research. This is described below with the corresponding RQ in parentheses:

1. Participant background information,
2. Critical incidents in language learning (RQ1),
3. Critical incidents in becoming a teacher (RQ1),
4. How the participant became an English teacher (RQ1),
5. The research setting,
6. Conceptions of ELT (RQ3),
7. Stated influences of the four phases on cognitions and practices (RQ4),
8. Summary of observations (RQ2),
9. Critical incidents in the process of development and change in cognitions and practice (RQ5), and

GT (Corbin & Strauss, 2008; Charmaz, 2014) and CI analysis (Webster & Mertova, 2007) were applied to the case study analysis. This involved constant comparative methods (Glaser & Strauss, 1967) and qualitative data analysis procedures (Miles et al., 2014). The general process was as follows.

Data sets were printed, coded manually, and analytic field notes and memos were written. Data for each participant were uploaded into MAXQDA 11, where coding continued and code systems were refined. First cycle coding (Saldaña, 2013) included open and in-vivo coding of the entire data sets. This was done for each participant individually as data were collected, although some codes were used across cases. In the second and later cycles the codes were organized and reorganized under categories and emerging themes. This included refining the codes and code systems and looking within and across cases for patterns in the data. A sample code system for one participant appears in Appendix U. The process also included many handwritten memos, data matrices, tables, and diagrams (Miles et al., 2014).

Analysis included iterative ongoing engagement with the data (Miles et al., 2014; Yin, 2014), relating analysis to prior research and to findings from Study 1, consideration of alternative interpretations through member checking, and multiple case study drafts. In the final write up, codes and themes are indicated in the findings by
subheadings or *italics* and supported by data excerpts and thick descriptions (Geertz, 1973). Below, the analytical procedures are clarified for the sections addressing RQs.

### 5.6.4.1 Critical incident analysis.

Sections 2-4 address RQ1 and analysis included triangulating life-history interview and NF data. The analyses focused on expressions indicating significant events that occurred relating to participants learning English, becoming teachers, and (later) English teachers. To review, CIs refer to (1) clearly remembered events with (2) significance determined through interpretation and are (3) likely to influence cognition and behavior, and can be (4) positive or negative experiences that are (5) generally unanticipated (see 5.2).

Some incidents were imminently salient, for example, Sami indicating “the crucial moment” in her decision to recommit to learning English as an adult (Chapter 7). Others required more engagement in data to uncover, for example, the processes of socialization in Mia’s initial interest in learning English (Chapter 7).

Section 9 addressed RQ5 and sought to explain CIs identified during the study that lead to changing beliefs and practices. These were uncovered through the processes described in Section 5.6.4.

### 5.6.4.2 Conceptions of ELT.

This section addressed RQ3, looking for the stated cognitions occurring in the data sets, coding them, and looking for themes. The term *conceptions* was chosen here for two reasons. First, denotatively the term conveys senses of perception, understanding, and forming plans (Stevenson, 2010), all senses that can be interpreted as linking cognitions and teaching practices. Second, conceptions was able to encompass data relating to participants’ LTC with a single term. In adapting Tsui’s (2003) definition, conceptions considers “teachers’ metaphors, images, beliefs, assumptions, and values” (p. 61; see also D. Freeman, 1991). Earlier drafts included a more categorical analysis of LTC, but analysis at the level of themes in participants’ conceptions of ELT enabled the findings to encompass the earlier descriptive categories and in doing so improved readability and arguably strengthened the cases.
5.6.4.3 Stated influences on cognitions and practices.

Section 7 addressed RQ4. The analysis for this section was relatively straightforward. NF and interview data (where participants indicated an influence) were coded and patterns were sought. The themes are described in the findings.

5.6.4.4 Summary of observations.

This section addresses RQ2 and included qualitative and mixed-method analysis (Miles et al., 2014). Case study findings cover the following topics:

1. planning,
2. materials and sources,
3. pedagogic sequences,
4. procedures for introducing, managing, and closing activities,
5. classroom management strategies,
6. analysis of activity types (see CIL analysis above)
7. L1/L2 use and patterns of interaction, and
8. approaches to corrective feedback.

Data were triangulated for analysis and included video-recordings, transcripts, observation reports, and field notes. Also, the process included analytic memos (Corbin & Strauss, 2008) kept while transcribing, reading transcriptions, and re-watching videos.

To analyze pedagogic activities, observation report data was tabulated and coded according to activity type, source, skill focus, groupings, interactions, and other descriptors (see Appendix P). To estimate class time used for each activity type, observation reports were triangulated with video-recordings and transcripts. The estimated time in minutes was tabulated for each sequence and each pedagogic activity observed. This process addressed a weakness in research from Korea (Chapter 3). Rather than relying on self-reported data, this process provided a systematic means of analyzing classroom sequences, language use, and pedagogic activity types used by teachers.

5.6.4.5 CIL analysis.

Write ups of CIL findings were removed from the case studies because of space considerations. The descriptive analyses were not necessary for making the cases;
however, CIL findings were used for triangulating data so it is necessary to describe the analytical procedures here.

The logs for each participant were tabulated in separate spreadsheets and coded. Where an activity was clearly indicated by the data, it was coded by activity type (Appendix P). Similar procedures were used in the observation reports (see above). Other incidents were coded thematically. Participants’ rationale for their entries were elicited during interviews. CIL data were member-checked for accuracy and to confirm activity procedures prior to writing up findings. Analysis included within and across case comparisons. The logs revealed a clear record of teaching practices and classroom incidents relating to teachers’ judgments of student learning outcomes and what was and was not effective. Data from CIL analysis appear in Appendix Q.

5.6.5 Interpreting and Synthesizing Findings for Discussion

Findings are presented at the level of categories and themes, whereas the discussion chapter brings them together, synthesizing findings and constructing theory (Charmaz, 2014). This process is summarized below, but it may be helpful to review Figure 5.1 above. Data management is described in Appendix Y.

Once analysis approached data saturation, that is, when few new themes or concepts were emerging (Corbin & Strauss, 2008), the process continued by linking findings together to build conceptual frameworks to explain them. First, this entailed axial coding for organizing the emerging analytic categories (Corbin & Strauss). Some categories were integrated and others were refined/split. The process included within and across case analysis on MAXQDA 11 and on printed excerpts. Then, displays such as diagrams, charts, tables, and matrices were created (Miles et al., 2014) in notebooks and on Lucidchart. Following this, member-checks were conducted during the process of theoretical sampling where I sought confirmation of emerging themes with participants (see Charmaz, 2014). This process led to the development of theoretical models that are introduced in Chapter 9. This step corresponded with a survey of theoretical literature, looking for existing frameworks to support the discussion (Charmaz). The procedures occurred over many months.

Chapter 9 was written after the analysis approached theoretical saturation (Corbin & Strauss, 2008), that is, when reconceptualizing the findings seemed stabilized through the process of theory building and produced no new significant
insights (Charmaz, 2014). The discussion is organized by addressing the RQs successively, restating them as headings. The discussion was supported by member checks after the data collection period. For organizing the write up, I adapted and extended the interpretation outline tools described by Bloomberg and Volpe (2012). These tools aided in articulating conceptual frameworks for the discussion, linking them to the literature, and brainstorming for implications, limitations, and recommendations (see Appendix W). For addressing RQs 1, 3, and 4, GT methods facilitated comparative analysis and building conceptual frameworks. For RQs 2 and 5, the process culminated in theoretical models grounded in the findings, the hallmark of GT.

5.7 Language as Data

Pavlenko (2007) stressed important considerations in justifying the language of communication for narrative research in AL. In these studies, nearly all data were collected in English, the participants’ L2. As a researcher whose first language is English, who writes and publishes in English, this was a practical choice for me. However, English was used beyond reasons of mere convenience. Language use is clarified below.

In Study 1, all participants reported they had studied English from 4 to 44 years. All had in-service coursework taught in English so they were accustomed to writing and communicating in English to some degree. However, participants were given the option to write in Korean if they felt more comfortable doing so. A few participants chose to do so.

While the form, rhetoric, and length of responses would have been different had the instruments been designed in Korean, I made an assumption that the findings and themes would remain commensurate whether collected them in the L1 or L2. This limitation is addressed in the conclusion.

In Study 2 data were also collected in English; however, I encouraged participants to code-switch during interviews if they felt it helped express something or to clarify meanings of questions or terms. IELTS and TOEIC scores indicated that participants’ proficiency ranged from high-intermediate to advanced, and participants were able to express themselves clearly in English for the most part. Being a (low) intermediate speaker of Korean, I was able to understand and transcribe most classroom
interactions but sought confirmation if needed. Transcriptions and translations were checked by Korean linguists, but any errors are mine alone.

Pavlenko (2007) argued that the language of analysis should be the language that data were collected in, as was the case in these studies. The focus of Pavlenko’s critiques were directed towards research concerning language learner identity, whereas this study addresses LTC and ELT experience, and it was an assumption that having participants use L2 in this case was justifiable considering their profession.

5.8 Validation: Strategies for Establishing Trustworthiness

This section describes the strategies for establishing trustworthiness used in this thesis. Qualitative research requires an alternative stance to traditional categories of objectivity, validity, reliability, and generalizability (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Based on suggestions from Edge and Richards (1998), the concept of trustworthiness is addressed for validation of this project.

Lincoln and Guba (1985) describe four criteria for trustworthiness in qualitative studies: credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability. Table 5.7 below summarizes comparisons to corresponding concepts in (post)positivist research approaches. The following sections describe how Lincoln and Guba’s (1985) criteria were addressed in the thesis.

Table 5-7 Concepts in Rationalist versus Naturalistic Inquiry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Underlying Concept</th>
<th>Rationalist/ Quantitative Criteria</th>
<th>Naturalistic/ Qualitative Criteria</th>
<th>Examples for Naturalistic Inquiry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Truth value</td>
<td>Internal validity</td>
<td>Credibility</td>
<td>Triangulation, time in field, thick description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicability</td>
<td>External validity</td>
<td>Transferability</td>
<td>Cautious speculation, left to reader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistency</td>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td>Dependability</td>
<td>Audit trail, triangulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutrality</td>
<td>Objectivity</td>
<td>Confirmability</td>
<td>Documentation, extracts in text</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Lincoln and Guba, 1985, pp. 289-331)
5.8.1 Credibility

Credibility refers to authenticity regarding how the research represents the participants’ voice and experiences. In this thesis a number of strategies were included to establish credibility, the first being prolonged engagement. Having lived and worked in Korea for 10 years, I had familiarity with the context. Second, data collection was longitudinal (18 months) with persistent observation (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Third, analysis used constant comparative methods (Glaser & Strauss, 1967), looking within and across cases to support findings. Fourth, researcher positionality was clarified and recognition was given to reflexivity in interview and narrative data, the co-creation of knowledge, and the emic and etic influences in the study (see above). Fifth, triangulated data were used extensively, including all types addressed by Borg (2006). Sixth, findings were member checked extensively, particularly in Study 2.

5.8.2 Transferability

Transferability refers to how the findings may be generalizable to other cases within the context or in other settings. First, to strengthen transferability I sought to extend the representativeness of findings by design (Yin, 2014). Study 1 scaffolded analysis for Study 2. Further, both studies included multiple participants, with 27 in Study 1 and 4 in-depth cases in Study 2. Arguably, having multiple participants strengthened the representativeness of findings and the degree to which they may be interpreted as representing what others in the context might also experience (Miles et al., 2014). Second, thick descriptions (Geertz, 1973) were used. Although some have been condensed because of space considerations, I sought to explain context-specific or cultural phenomena that would help a reader unfamiliar with the context better understand the situation. Third, a chapter is devoted to the research context (Chapter 2), which might help a reader assess transferability to other contexts.

5.8.3 Dependability

Dependability refers to integrity of the research process. To address this, I described my role above and detailed the steps taken for collecting and analyzing data. Second, reflections on decision-making are included in the methodology, findings, and discussion where pertinent decisions were made on what to include in the study. Third, the research includes an audit trail (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). This methodology is
supported with evidence in the appendices. For practical reasons, a complete audit trail is unfeasible but readers should feel free to contact me to request clarifications or to provide further evidence of how findings were uncovered or conclusions were made.

5.8.4 Confirmability

Confirmability corresponds to objectivity and is concerned with questions of researcher bias in analysis and reporting findings. A number of strategies were followed to address this. First, there was triangulation of analysis, using inductive and deductive approaches. Some themes emerged through the process of analysis; others were adapted from prior research. Second, as indicated above, there was member checking of findings. Third, I sought alternative interpretations, in part through member checks, and considered the implications of contrary findings. These are discussed in the text where relevant (e.g., Chapter 9). Fourth, findings are supported with data excerpts in text. Further excerpts of classroom interactions in Study 2 appear in Appendix T. Fifth, the audit trail documented the analytical procedures and data collection instruments used. Further documentation may be provided on request. Lastly, member checking was sought for interpretations, not just findings. There were frequent discussions with participants in Study 2 after the data collection period regarding the analysis and conclusions. I sought confirmation for the interpretations and theoretical models introduced in the discussion chapter, and participant input contributed to interpretation.

In the end, the trustworthiness of this study is to be determined by the reader. Qualitative research has inherent limitations and the limitations of this thesis are discussed in the conclusion (Chapter 10).

5.9 Ethical considerations

The study was approved by the University of Otago Human Ethics Committee in July, 2012 (Ref. 12/195). No ethical issues arose. Participants gave informed consent (see Appendices C & J) and their contributions are to remain anonymous.
This chapter presents findings from the four narrative frames (NF) used in Study 1. The participant stories analyzed in this study look at their (1) reasons for entering the field of teaching, (2) prior language learning experiences in public schools, (3) pre-service teacher education, and (4) first year teaching public school English. Findings are presented in the order of the prompts as written on each NF and they are discussed further in Chapter 9.

6.1 Narrative Frame 1: Reasons for Becoming a Teacher

In order to understand commitments to ELT, the first NF asked participants to consider why they became teachers. The prompts for NF1 appear in the Table 6.1 below.

Table 6-1 Prompts for Narrative Frame 1: Why I Became a Teacher

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prompts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I remember the first time I thought about becoming a teacher. This was... (when)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The biggest reasons why I became a teacher include...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The people who influenced me most were...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. They influenced me by...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I started teaching English because...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Before I started teaching English, I thought that being an English teacher was...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Now I think that being an English teacher is...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. In the future, I hope to...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As covered in Chapter 2, the working conditions, social, and legal status of the teaching profession were described as the main reasons people enter the field in Korea (E.-G. Kim, 2009, 2011). These turned out to be prominent factors for these participants as well.

In total 22 teachers completed NF1, 17 female and 5 male respondents. Two were high school English teachers, the remainder primary school teachers. Most
participants considered becoming a teacher for the first time as students (N=14), although five people expressed deciding to become a teacher as adults, including three of the five male teachers. Pseudonyms were given for the four teachers also participating in Study 2. Other participants are cited by their initials (see Appendix M for data reference conventions).

The most frequently occurring themes were as follows: (1) the status and working conditions of the profession (N=24), (2) career and education prospects (N=10) and lastly, (3) interest in teaching (N=8). These themes are explained below.

The theme working conditions appeared 10 times, the legal status 9 times, and the social status 6 times in the 22 stories. Conditions such as salaries, standard of living, working hours, and vacations were common influences. For example, D.W. wanted job stability (NF1-7); E.A., like two others, valued vacations saying, “It is a way to relieve stress and take a rest” (NF1-24). For some older female participants, teaching was a means of improving living conditions. For example, J.S. wrote about the potential of teaching for overcoming “the poor condition of my childhood in the late 1970s” (NF1-5) and B.G. wrote that it was “actually the only way for a girl like me to break out of the poverty cycle and better the socio-economical status” (NF1-2).

Confucianism is a cultural legacy and Korea remains a patriarchal society, but teaching is one of the few professions that offer equal rights and strong job stability for women. The legal status was a leading factor for female participants (N=9), reflected in the following excerpts:

A public school teacher is practically the only job where women don’t have to worry about being discriminated because of gender. (B.G., NF1-2)

I wanted to get a job that can work after pregnancy. In Korea, many women worry about maintaining their job after marry. (E.K., NF1-23)

The social status of teaching was mentioned in six stories; however, some felt that this had been reduced from earlier times (see Lim, 2011). For example, B.G. wrote, “Even today the reputation of this job is very good, even though it’s not as good as in the past” (NF1-2).

The second most common theme was career and education prospects. Notably, these revealed gender differences regarding reasons to become teachers. For the five males, this was the dominant theme. For example, the oldest participant wrote that he
had few career opportunities when he was a student, noting, “At that time our country was poor, so we can’t think about future hope” (H.Y. NF1-29). Three younger males became teachers because other more desired career paths did not transpire, such as becoming a lawyer (NF1-30) or doctor (NF1-7; NF1-28). In contrast, two women chose teaching because it offered improvements over previous jobs. Four participants mentioned educational constraints, such as limited options after CSAT results (N=2), and the affordability of teacher’s colleges (N=2).

Of all participants, only eight explicitly expressed an interest in education as one of the primary reasons for becoming a teacher, including just one male participant. These participants tended to have positive educational experiences as students. For example, Sami and M.H. wrote,

I realized I was good at teaching while I was helping my younger sister learn math … my personal characteristics were suited to teaching. (NF1-4)

I like teaching and helping somebody. At studying for exam, I always helped my friends … and I felt happy about that. (NF1-25)

Interest in education was the least common theme and this finding corroborates prior discussions of the status and working conditions being primary factors for entering the field (E.-G. Kim, 2011).

6.1.1 The Most Influential People

The next prompts elicited information about the most influential people in participants’ decisions to become teachers. Family members and teachers were most frequently written about, mentioned by 15 and 11 participants respectively, seven of whom described both.

The influence of family members was most often described as positive encouragement (N=8), but two participants did express parental pressure. One teacher was dissuaded by her family, who told her that she was “too old to enter another college” and that she “should think about starting a family” (B.G., NF1-2). Three others mentioned influential family members who were also teachers. The following excerpts represent the breadth of parental influences occurring in the stories:
My father influenced me. He was very kind. He loved teaching me. I learned from him how to spread seed, how to plant, how to read and write Chinese letters, etc. He was happy when I knew what he teach. (Y.S., NF1-14)

My mother told me that it would be good for me to be a teacher because teaching job was respectable. (J.H., NF1-3)

My parents always supported me. I didn’t want them to disappoint because of me. (M.O., NF1-11)

Actually my parents pressure, especially my father who was a teacher for more than 40 years always told me since I was little kid that I should become a teacher and my mother pushed me to keep up my grading enough to go to the university of teachers. It was almost a threat … but I tried my best to make them happy. (Mia, NF1-1)

The last two quotes above reflect the cultural value hyodo, often translated as ‘filial piety’, that is, a duty to honor your parents’ wishes. Overall, parents seemed to be the strongest influence, often because of the status and working conditions mentioned above.

Teachers were the second most frequent people mentioned with 11 participants writing about positive experiences with teachers. For example, J.H. wrote about a Korean language teacher who

showed me what a teacher was. He was intellectual and knowledgeable. His class was entertaining and informative. He made me dream to be a good teacher. (NF1-3)

Three female teachers expressed images of teachers as role models for them as women, for example,

I was born and raised in a poor family in a rural area and there were not many role models for a young girl to pursue. To my eyes, they looked so great that I was eager to be like them. (B.G., NF1-2)
In my middle school I had met very young, smart and somewhat progressive women…They influenced me by giving good examples as a successful teacher and a woman as well. (J.S., NF1-5)

However, not all teachers left a good impression. Five participants emphasized negative influences from teachers. For example,

I didn’t have any good model for me in my life when I was in school, especially as a teacher. (M.O. NF1-11)

Unfortunately, I never seen before a good teacher. However, I would like to be a good, memorable teacher. (E.K, NF1-23)

In summary, only half of the teachers writing Story 1 described teachers as being positive influences on their career choice. Parents were the strongest influences, mostly because of the status and working conditions for public school teachers. Only one participant described making the decision independently. Discussion of these findings continue in Chapter 9 and the implications are discussed in Chapter 10.

6.1.2 Reasons for Teaching English

As noted in Chapter 2, secondary teachers are hired to teach specific subjects; therefore the secondary participants were permanent KETs. Primary school teachers, however, major in Elementary Education and end up teaching English for a number of reasons, although the final decision is made by school principals. This fact was reflected in the stories from the 20 PS teachers, where most participants described factors other than interest in English or ELT as their reasons for teaching it.

Nine participants reported teaching English because they were delegated by the principal or school, seven of whom were assigned against their wishes. For example, J.H. had taught in another city for 20 years but when she had to transfer to a new area she lost her seniority and was assigned to teach English against her request (NF1-15). Three others were assigned because they were younger than other colleagues. For example, D.W. wrote,

There were not many teachers who wanted to be in charge of it [English]. Then I was younger than other teachers so I had to take it. (NF1-7)
His last sentence reflects a sense of duty; teachers are expected to follow requests and suggestions of administrators. The administrative procedures also lead to uncertainty for some. Even if teachers desire to continue teaching English, there is no guarantee that they will be able to do so. For example, Eunjeong wrote, “I’m afraid that next year I will not being English teacher because it’s up to [the] school” (NF1-21). The teacher rotation and assignment system (Chapter 2) seemed to place many of these participants into positions that they did not want and were not prepared for, and the administrative turnover of English teachers indicated by participant stories presents an issue for efficacy (see Section 9.1).

Of 20 primary teachers, only 6 expressed an interest in English as a reason for teaching it. For example, Y.S. wrote,

I liked to study English and my English ability was pretty good during school days. So I wanted to teach English to my students. (NF1-12)

Two experienced teachers wanted to teach English as a change from homeroom teaching. For example Mia wrote,

First, I thought I could have more flexible schedule than homeroom teacher. Next, it’s a nice way to change myself as a teacher. (NF1-1)

However, her opinions changed once she began as she realized the challenges of building relationships with students and gaining respect as a subject teacher (see Chapter 7).

In summary, a few participants chose to become English teachers because of interest in the language but most were assigned for other reasons, the most salient being the decisions of principals (see also Jung & Norton, 2002).

6.1.3 Thoughts about Teaching English Before and After Starting

The next section prompted data about changes in their opinions about teaching English before and after teaching English. This is important for understanding how participants’ anticipation may have been different from the realities faced in practice (e.g., Johnson, 1996). The stories revealed that participants’ opinions of teaching were quite different before and after starting.
Responses generally fell under two categories: L2 related and teaching related. Interestingly, L2 related opinions occurred more frequently before than after beginning teaching English (N=8). Six teachers wrote about how they thought that one only needed English proficiency to teach English; however, all six changed their opinions after beginning ELT. For example, Y.S. and K.H. wrote,

Before … I thought if I have English ability or skill only then I can teach the students … Now I think that … compare to other subject it’s harder. (NF1-12)

Before I thought … teachers should speak English well … have a knowledge about grammar and culture. Now I think … English teacher should have lots of knowledge about children, know methods about English teaching, have a philosophy about English education. (NF1-25)

In K.H.’s story we can see the shift from language-related beliefs to those more oriented around teaching methodology. This excerpt foreshadows themes regarding the influence of ELT experience on LTC from Study 2 (see Section 9.5). Notably, no teachers wrote about ELT methods before teaching English, whereas four participants wrote about the necessity for improving ELT methods after starting.

Four participants wrote about how they thought teaching English would be easier than homeroom teaching, but three clearly changed their opinions after starting. In total, six teachers expressed how English teaching was actually harder than homeroom teaching, for example,

Before … I thought that being an English teacher … was easier than being a homeroom teacher… Now I think that being an English teacher is not easy at all but quite challenging. (Mia, NF1-1)  

Before … I thought that being an English teacher was easier … than to teach every subject as a homeroom teacher, but now I think that being an English teacher is getting harder because the students’ level is getting higher as well as parents and their expectation. (J.S., NF1-5)
6.1.4 Future Hopes for ELT

The final prompt elicited teachers’ hopes for ELT. Similar to above, future hopes generally fell into teaching related and L2 related categories. Eight of 22 teachers wrote about wanting to improve L2 proficiency (see also Hiver, 2013). However, teaching related ideas were mentioned 21 times, perhaps evidence of an increased appreciation for ELT pedagogy after starting (see 9.5).

Ten participants expressed a desire to improve as English teachers or learn more about ELT methods. For example M.O. wrote,

I hope to be a good teacher. A good teacher means that most of the kids likes my class. I want them to come to understand each other throughout my class … Now I know that liking English and teaching English differ. (NF1-11)

In contrast, two participants wrote about not wanting to teach again. For example, Y.S. wrote,

My class is very big. Student level gap is big, too … so I don’t want to be an English teacher anymore. (NF1-14)

These responses reflected the variability in the experiences of the teachers. While most expressed wishes to improve, for some the difficulties led to attrition (see 9.1).

6.1.5 Summary of Findings in NF1

Overall, the participants’ stories suggested that the primary reasons for becoming teachers were related to the status and working conditions of teaching more than an interest in education. Further, the most influential people on their decisions were parents and other family members, with participants frequently citing status and working conditions as reasons for family encouragement to enter the profession. Half the participants wrote about positive images of teachers, although a few mentioned the negative influence of prior teachers. This topic is explored further in Story 2.

Most primary teachers began teaching English due to administrative factors, the most common being assigned to teach English by the principal. Some teachers volunteered to teach English as a change from HRT. Less than a third of participants wrote that they began teaching English because they were interested in English or ELT.
Nearly everyone described changes in opinions about ELT before and after starting. In general these moved from L2 related opinions (e.g., need only English proficiency to teach), towards appreciating the importance of ELT methodology. Although some thought teaching English would be relatively easy, no one reported believing so after starting.

The teachers’ future hopes for ELT related mostly to improving as a teacher. Many also wrote about the desire to improve English proficiency. Two teachers explicitly stated that they did not want to teach English again.

The Korean context allows primary teachers some flexibility in committing to teach English; however, the selection of primary school English teachers seems problematic. The systemic issues for ELT commitments in primary schools are themes arising in the later chapters and the implications are discussed in the conclusion.

6.2 Narrative Frame 2: Prior Language Learning

The second NF was designed to elicit stories about learning English in public schools, the first phase of teacher experience. It prompted participants to contemplate how that experience may have influenced their approach to teaching English. In closing, it asked for participants to consider the factors that allowed them to be successful English learners. Notably, few participants credited public school experience with success as language learners. The sentence starters appear in Table 6.2 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prompt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. My English classes in school were…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. My English teachers usually…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. My best memories from English classes in school include...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. My worst memories from my English classes in school are...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I think my experience as a student in school influenced how I teach by...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. This is because...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. These days I think English classes in schools are…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. As an English teacher, I have had some success learning English. I think the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
biggest reasons that I was successful learning English are...

Eighteen participants completed NF2. Most participants began English classes in the first year of middle school (N=12) or the last year of elementary school (N=4). The two youngest participants began in Grade 3, after full implementation of the Seventh National Curriculum (SNC) (see Chapter 2).

Stories from the participants were predominantly negative; however, there were some differences between the two youngest participants compared to their seniors, particularly when describing their experience as primary students. Findings and excerpts from NF2 are described below, beginning with participants’ descriptions of their English classes.

6.2.1 Descriptions of English Classes and Methods

The first paragraph elicited general descriptions of English classes. Descriptions tended to be critical, with most participants referring to teacher-centeredness and all writing about grammatically-focused pedagogy at some point. Five people described audio-lingual methods and seven mentioned the focus on testing. Only the two youngest participants, who had started English in the third grade, described their experience positively, although both hedged when comparing primary and secondary education. The following reflections exemplify the range of experiences from Story 2. The first is from a teacher in her 40s, and the second from one in her mid-twenties:

My English classes in school were...

kind of a strange mixture of horror and excitement…No teaching methodology existed except for beating and threatening students…I'm pretty sure most of my English teachers didn't have many chances to talk in English and they weren't equipped with decent communication skills…We were supposed to listen to the teacher's explanations about grammar stuff, word meanings, and translation into Korean, sitting quietly…teachers didn't show or let us listen to any authentic conversations. English classes=choral/individual reading, grammar, vocabulary, translation, and corporal punishment and its accompanying terror. That was it. (B.G., NF2-2)
My English classroom was the best classroom that had good facilities. All desk, chairs, board, etc. was brand new because English was included in curriculum then, and classroom was made at that time…And English class, every day I felt fun! I enjoyed that. Many activities, chants, songs…similar with now. BUT ONLY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL WAS. When I was middle and high school student, it changed to boring. (Eunjeong, NF2-21)

Although B.G.’s story represented one extreme, particularly at the mention of “terror”, the teacher-centeredness and lack of teacher TL proficiency she described were common themes. Like B.G., a few teachers were very critical, noting corporal punishment and ineffective methods. In contrast, Eunjeong’s positive experience reflected the changes in primary school education (see Kwon, 2000). Nonetheless, her secondary school experience was less positive, as her emphatic capitalization suggested. Later, she described how English classes became teacher-centered and grammatically focused with the purpose of preparing for university entrance exams, other common complaints found in NF2.

The second prompt saw a continuation of these themes. Descriptions of teachers were largely unflattering. Here are a few examples:

*My English teachers usually…*

…did lectures. First, they always spoke in Korean…they read textbooks loudly. After reading, they translated and explained the meaning…They sometimes checked my answers and understanding the meaning of texts. (M.H., NF2-19)

…read the textbook and find uncommon words and explain grammar. (J.W., NF2-28)

…taught grammar…it’s important to pass the exams. (E.A., NF2-24)

These excerpts highlight teacher-centeredness and grammatically focused classes. The former arose 11 times and the later 22, including 14 descriptions of grammar-translation methods. It could be inferred from the pedagogies described that Korean was the dominant language of instruction, findings highlighted in the prior research (Chapter 3).
As anticipated, the model of teaching experienced as students contrasted with expectations outlined in the current primary school curriculum. The SNC emphasizes student-centeredness, communicative activities, and TL instruction (Chapter 2). However, only the youngest two teachers had any experience under these conditions. For most participants, their *apprenticeship of observation* (Lortie, 1975) provided examples of what not to do (see Chapter 9).

### 6.2.2 Best Memories of English Class

Considering the negativity expressed about English, it may not be surprising that 5 of 18 teachers responded to the next prompt by mentioning that they had few if any positive memories of their public school experience. For example, E.A wrote,

> Frankly, I don’t have good memories from English classes. (NF2-24)

Nevertheless, most participants did express something positive. The most frequent descriptions of best memories related to *pleasurable experiences* (N=8), *successful learning* (N=6), and *teachers* (N=7). These themes are expressed below.

Firstly, three participants wrote about their interest and excitement about being exposed to a new language and culture. Two others fondly remembered learning English songs. However, four of eight wrote about after school English programs. For example, W.J. wrote about the extra classes with a native speaker and performing in the school festival. K.H. enjoyed being part of a school play. J.H. and J.S. remembered winning awards for speech contests in middle school. These findings highlight the potential influence of extra-curricular activities on motivation (see also 7.1).

Next, for the six who described *successful learning*, five referred to *being a top student* as their best memories. For example, J.H. and J.W. wrote,

> …I got good point every exam... (J.H., NF2-17)

> …I got a high score at the test…my friends are envy me. (J.W., NF2-28)

It may be significant to note that these positive experiences differed from the experiences of peers, as can be inferred by J.W.’s comment of envious classmates. This is a particular issue for Korean English education, of which competition is a central
feature (Chapter 2). By definition not everyone can be successful in a system dependent on rankings determined by test scores.

Lastly, the remaining participants’ best memories related to teachers. One participant wrote of a kind and eager teacher; another was attracted to a good-looking teacher. Two described experiences with NESTs. For example, Eunjeong, wrote,

…it was the first time to see and talk with a foreigner for me…I enjoyed many games that he did. (NF2-21)

Three other participants remembered their teachers’ praise. For example, B.G., who wrote about the “horror and excitement” above, wrote that her best memories were,

[the] praise and recognition I was given by the teachers. … No matter how scary or harsh the teachers were, I was always the one adored by them and that kind of recognition and the sense of being loved naturally made me work even harder and like the subject. (NF2-2)

B.G.’s excerpt reflects her teachers’ influence despite the troubling conditions. However, we also get the sense that her classmates did not share her success, an outcome in which her teachers may have had some culpability. While teachers were rarely mentioned for best memories, they were frequently referred as responsible for participants’ worst memories of English classes.

6.2.3 Worst Memories of English Class

Twelve of 18 participants wrote about teachers or the teacher-centeredness of English classes as the worst things they remembered about public school English education. Three participants wrote about negative traits in their teachers, while five referred specifically to corporal punishment witnessed in class. Here are excerpts from three female KETs in their 30s and 40s:

…seeing my classmates get hit…because of bad grades or not doing their homework. (Mia, NF2-1)
…corporal punishment…after marking done the ‘massacre’ started. (B.G., NF2-2)

…corporal punishment…for not submitting my homework just once. He hit my top of head with iron stick which was used for stove. It was horrible and shameful. (J.S., NF2-5)

While these examples are dramatic, corporal punishment is no longer tolerated. The important factor for NF2 is how these negative images may influence ELT practices, which are addressed below.

Other participants wrote of more banal experiences due to teacher-centeredness. For example, J.S. explained her boredom with secondary education, writing,

if it was wrong, teacher explained that and the next student read and the next. Only teacher was speaking and explained about grammar. (NF2-21)

Similarly, M.H. wrote,

I had just listened and written what teacher said in Korean. I felt like I was a robot. (NF2-19)

Three others mentioned the volume of tests or homework and two mentioned a lack of success as their worst memories.

Teaching methods were frequently referred to. Interestingly, under best memories only one participant wrote about a method (i.e., dictations in M.H., NF2-10). However, methods were implicated by 12 of 18 teachers as their worst memories of public school English classes. Assuming that these stories represent their first images of language teaching, it is important to consider how participants make sense of it in the classroom as teachers. This topic is explored further in the case studies (Chapters 7 & 8) and discussion (Chapter 9).

6.2.4 Stated Influences of Educational Experiences on Teaching English

Considering the negative descriptions of public L2 learning experience, it is unsurprising that influences on teaching were described in terms of opposites. Two participants stated that their experience learning English had no influence on teaching
English, whereas 15 of 18 wrote about intentionally being different. Only one teacher wrote about transferring a positive experience into her current practice (Sami, NF2-4).

Below are two examples about the influence of prior learning:

*I think my experience as a student in school influenced how I teach by…*

…reminding me how uninteresting to learn English like that … the old teaching style made people hate English itself or gave bad memories which influence forever through their life. (J.S., NF2-5)

…making me decide on how my class atmosphere should be … I strongly believe that learning doesn’t happen in horror and negative emotions and state of mind will eventually make learners dislike the subject … I don’t want to waste my students’ time and efforts. (B.G., NF2-2)

Here both participants explained the significance of a negative learning environment, that it was demotivating and ineffective.

In summary, all participants described the influence of L2 learning on teaching as either having no impact or impelling them to intend to be different from their teachers. Nearly all the negative experiences described by the teachers occurred during secondary school English classes.

### 6.2.5 Changes in English Education

The next prompt asked participants to reflect on the changes of English education since the time they were students. The curriculum has undergone significant reform since most of the teachers were students and the following responses represent the most common themes written in the stories:

*These days I think English classes in schools are…*

…more fun, better in some ways such as facilities. We have more qualified teachers than before. (Mia, NF2-1)

…there are lots of materials for teaching and students’ level is higher. We can find good material easier than before. (Y.S., NF2-14)
…better than the past. Now, it’s important to communicate in English.
(E.A., NF2-24)

Notably, all 18 teachers described improvements. The most frequent improvements mentioned related to activities, materials, and facilities (N=14), better teachers and methods (N=8), and more interesting classes (N=7). Only the two youngest teachers, Eunjeong and K.H., thought their experiences were similar to their current teaching contexts.

The significance of these changes in English education as it relates to teaching beliefs and practices is that apart from K.H. and Eunjeong, none of the participants experienced similar conditions as students to the ones in which they are expected to teach (see also K. Ahn, 2009; Cheng et al., 2009; Urmston, 2003). Furthermore, there is little evidence of transferring positive teaching practices witnessed in this first phase of experience. Therefore, as teachers they were required to adapt to a changing education system without the benefit of experience as students of the reforms outlined in the new curriculum, namely, collaborative learning, student-centeredness, CLT, and TETE (see Chapter 9).

6.2.6 Reasons for Successful L2 Learning

There has been strong demand for English education for decades, yet Korea remains relatively monolingual (Song, 2012). However, to become English teachers all the participants must have experienced some degree of success. The final prompt of NF2 asked teachers to consider the reasons why they succeeded.

Responses were revealing for what was not written about: Only four participants noted experiences in public school English classes. Of these four, three were the youngest participants in the study, which suggests that improvements in public school English education are making a difference for some. Unsurprisingly, older teachers considered factors other than their public school education as reasons for success. Below are excerpts from the three youngest teachers:

I think the biggest reasons I was successful learning English are...

…I learned English from third grade in elementary school. The curriculum was changed in that period. It is earlier than other teachers. And I went many English academy. (Eunjeong, NF2-21)
…passion and effort plus good programs. (E.A., NF2-24)

…interest and confidence. I learned many things through school class and also I had interest and confidence at learning English. (K.H., NF2-25)

These excerpts suggest that public school education was an influence, but not the only one. For example, Eunjeong mentioned private education. E.A. and K.H. wrote about their “passion and effort” and “interest and confidence” respectively, factors relating to motivation. Referred to 13 times, this is the most frequent theme. For example, here are three excerpts from participants in their 30s and 40s:

…I had motivation to study and a teacher who gave me confidence. (Sami, NF2-4)

…my instrumental and intrinsic motivation plus my personality and working style. (B.G., NF2-2)

…it was amazing experience that I can understand foreign language. I studied hard and practiced every day. I read English books, I heard English lecture through radio. I tried to have free-talking with native speaker. (Y.S., NF2-12)

Other than Sami, no teachers over 30 years linked their success as English learners with experiences in public school classes. Overall, participant stories suggested that they became successful L2 learners in spite of their public school education, not because of it.

6.2.7 Summary of Findings in NF2

In summary, the impetus of NF2 was to elicit stories of participants’ experiences as language learners and consider its influence on ELT beliefs and practices. Nearly all described negative learning environments and were critical of their public school experience. For example, most participants implicated teachers and teaching methods in describing their worst memories. Incidentally, there was near consensus that L2 learning influenced participants’ teaching by motivating them to do something different than what they experienced as students.
Everyone described positive changes in English education since they were students; however, only the youngest participants experienced the new national curriculum as students. Other teachers lacked a model of the new reforms. Therefore, it is necessary for these teachers to draw knowledge from other sources for facilitating student-centered, communicative classrooms in which English is the medium of instruction. NF3 sought to investigate one obvious source, that is, pre-service teacher education, the second phase of teacher experience.

6.3 Narrative Frame 3: Pre-service Teacher Education

Prompts for NF3 were designed to elicit opinions about teacher’s college, specifically relating to the influence on ELT practices. Table 6.3 below outlines the prompts for NF3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prompts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. In university I had many professors. The things I remember most about my professors are…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I took many courses there. The things I remember about my education classes are…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. These days as an English teacher, the most helpful things from my university experience are…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The things I find least helpful are…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. When I look back to being a university student, I wish I had more opportunities to…</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Twenty-one participants completed NF3. They attended four different National Universities of Education (NUE) and one National University over the span of three decades. The experiences of the younger participants (under 30) tended to be less critical of their experience than teachers in their late 30s and over. Two secondary and 19 primary teachers completed NF3. Notably, none of the primary teachers specialized in English education but all ended up teaching it (see Chapters 9 & 10).
6.3.1 Memories of Professors and Courses

Participants offered slightly more negative comments about their professors than positive ones. Of the 15 negative memories, 6 teachers criticized traditional teaching styles. For example, J.S. mentioned that most of her professors were old style and very stubborn. They seemed to be fallen in mannerism with their status as a regular professor and had some prejudice about teachers. (NF3-3)

M.O. held similar opinions saying,

They were not familiar with us. In the lecture, they would be authority. Their lectures wasn’t interesting. (NF3-11)

Five other participants commented on lazy or indifferent professors, sentiments exemplified in the following excerpts:

[They were] lazy. They didn’t study about their class, textbooks, students. They never prepared materials or different methods. They only read the textbook. (Y.S., NF3-12)

My professor was indifferent to his students. He always looked like an animal chasing his success. (E.K., NF3-23)

My professors in university were worst. There is not much to tell about university. (J.H., 3-17)

Ten participants described positive memories about professors. For example, J.S. (quoted above) continued saying,

…But we had a few fresh minded young professors at that time even though I didn’t have enough chance to be influenced by them. (NF3-3)

Y.S. wrote about memorable professor saying,

He teached that we understand children’s heart. (NF3-13)

Regarding classes, the stories reflected the individual nature of educational experience and there were few trends across the cases. However, four participants
described the *practicum* or *demonstrations* and four others mentioned *collaborative learning*. For example, E.K. wrote,

…teaching practice! From 2nd grade [year] we have to do student teaching. It was difficult but fantastic experience for me. (NF3-23)

Y.M. remembered collaborative learning, saying,

…my education classes are worked by group sometimes. It’s very helpful. (NF3-27)

Three teachers wrote about impractical courses. For example, Mia recalled that her courses were

non-practical. They were supposed to be designed to be actual and related with teaching methods or skills but I found most them are quite far from it. (NF3-1)

However, two younger participants, who later attended the same university as Mia, described how practical their courses were. For example, Eunjeong wrote,

most of the courses are very helpful and useful. It is related with curriculum of elementary school, how to teach them, and methods, theory…all is related with education. (NF3-21)

Apart from the above themes, there was little in common among responses. Perhaps in part this is due to the fact, as J.H. wrote, “Every course had its own characteristic according to the professor’s major” (NF3-3).

### 6.3.2 Most and Least Helpful Experiences for Teaching English

Regarding helpful experiences, the most salient responses came from 6 of 19 primary teachers writing *nothing* or *not much*. For example, Mia wrote,

*These days as an English teacher, the most helpful things from my university experience are...*

…nothing. I don’t remember that any of my time in my university helped me as an English teacher. (NF3-1)
These six participants each had over 13 years teaching experience, attending university before English was included in the primary curriculum. Since they graduated, changes to SLTE had been phased in; for example, ELT methods courses are required for all primary teachers (see Chapter 3).

The eight youngest participants attended teacher’s college after implementation of SNC. Four of these teachers wrote about a new course focusing on Teaching English through English (TETE). For example, K.H., wrote that the most helpful things were,

learning classroom English and demonstration…we learned classroom English and practiced it and then we demonstrated actual English class using classroom English. (NF3-25)

Like K.H., two others emphasized the helpfulness of the demonstrations. M.H. also mentioned the feedback adding,

…and being helped by a professor. They did feedback my speaking in class and gave some advices. (NF3-19)

Two other participants wrote about the teaching practicum. This was a central topic in J.S.’s story. She described her practicum, and then wrote,

The practicum described above was really helpful because it put me in a real-life teaching environment. It wasn’t a theoretical exercise, and I was able to teach directly and learn many things from my students. (NF3-4)

Eight teachers described something practical that they were able to apply in the classroom as being helpful for teaching English. For example, both secondary teachers emphasized practical experiences such as theory being demonstrated in practice (B.G., NF3-2) and learning how to plan (J.H., NF3-3).

Relatedly, most participants implicated impractical coursework as the least helpful aspect of their pre-service education. Nine participants described impractical courses, four the traditional style of university education, and two bad professors.

Four teachers found the way they were taught educational theory and methods unhelpful. For example, a common practice was to have students translate English textbooks into Korean. M.H. and J.W. wrote about this practice:
…to translate some native books such that had written about theories. I could understand the meaning a little and I could not use them well in my class. (M.H., NF3-19)

…I just read text and transfer Korean. It’s necessary activities and improves my English levels but it is not very helpful. (J.W., NF3-28)

Related, K.H. wrote about how lectures were impractical. She wrote that it was unhelpful,

just learning theories. We saw the ppt slides about English teaching method, for example, [direct method] DM, CLT, TBLT, etc., so we just memorized that. So I think it’s the least helpful thing. (K.H., NF3-25)

B.G., critical of her required education theory courses, wrote,

The things I find least helpful are some of the required courses…to me, they (the professors) stuck to something unworthy and I felt like I was wasting my time just to get a degree. (NF3-2)

These issues for SLTE in Korea are discussed in Chapter 9.

6.3.3 Missed Opportunities

The final prompt allowed participants to express what they felt was missing in their pre-service education. Five teachers wished they had done more extracurricular activities and four wanted to travel abroad. However, most participants wrote about educational gaps related to teaching English. The most frequent responses related to improving English (N=7), learning more about ELT methods and theory (N=7), and longer practicums (N=4). For example, Eunjeong and Y.S. wrote,

I wish I had more opportunities to…

…study English. There is not much chance to learn and study. (NF3-21)

…study English more. And go abroad. I wish I meet many foreign friends. (NF3-1)
Seven participants wanted to learn more about ELT methodology or education philosophy in general. J.H. was generally positive about her experience but wrote that she wanted more opportunities to

…study English education methodology and practical English. It would be good to learn the way to teach English, deal with students, use technology in class, and help students study for themselves more. (NF3-3)

Four other teachers wanted more practicum experience, such as B.G. who wanted to

…do teaching practicums so that I could be more prepared for the field.
One month of teaching practicum is never enough. (NF3-2)

6.3.4 Summary of NF3

For these stories, teachers wrote about their experiences as university students and the influences of this on their English teaching practice. Most teachers were critical of their professors and coursework, with many commenting on the ineffectiveness of traditional lecture-based coursework or indifferent professors. However, nearly half the participants expressed positive memories of their professors and courses, for example, empathetic lecturers or memorable experiences with collaborative learning and group work.

Notably, about a third of participants did not find anything helpful from their university experience for teaching English. For some others, however, the most helpful experiences related to practical elements of coursework, for example, learning English for the classroom or the practicum itself.

In contrast, the least helpful experiences related to impractical coursework, such as translating theory from English to Korean and the ineffectiveness of lectures. Most participants expressed desires for more opportunities to either improve L2 proficiency or learn more about ELT methods. A few others wished they had done more extracurricular activities or traveled abroad.

Arguably the most significant finding was that so many participants did not find anything helpful from their university experience. Furthermore, all of the primary English teachers specialized in subjects other than English. This suggests that much of their knowledge about ELT comes from experience in the field. This third phase of
experience is the topic of NF4, specifically looking at memories from their first year teaching English.

### 6.4 Narrative Frame 4: The First Year Teaching English

This story focused on the participants’ first experience teaching English in public schools. The prompts began with asking teachers to consider how they felt and how they prepared for classes. The sentence starters for NF4 are in Table 6.4 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6-4 Prompts for Narrative Frame 4: My First Year Teaching English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prompts</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. When I first began teaching English, I felt …</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I felt this way because...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I prepared for my classes by...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Other teachers were...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The biggest challenges or problems I had my first year were...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I tried to overcome these challenges by ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. My best memories or experiences from my first year were...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Overall, I think my first year teaching English was...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6.4.1 Initial Feelings about Teaching English

Nineteen participants completed NF4 including 2 secondary teachers and 17 primary teachers. Most participants described having *mixed* or *negative feelings* (N=13) when they started; however, six participants expressed *positive feelings* about teaching English. The most common adjectives were nervous (N=5) and excited (N=4). The teachers who felt more positive generally looked forward to teaching because of interest in the language (e.g., Sami, NF4-4). On the other hand, many participants felt nervous because they lacked experience or felt unprepared by their prior education (e.g., B.G., NF4-1). The five youngest teachers were assigned to teach English sometime in their first two years and they all expressed negative or mixed feelings about it (see 9.1 for discussion).
Excerpts below provide evidence of the range of experiences among participants. First, B.G. described her negative feeling towards initial ELT:

When I first began teaching English I felt…

...unprepared and thus very nervous.

I felt this way because…

…I didn’t have any experience in teaching in a public school except for the very short (about three weeks) teaching practicum and partially because after the very first lesson I realized the reality was completely different from what I imagined and what I had learned in teacher’s college. (NF4-2)

M.O. felt indifferent, writing,

I taught [English] as homeroom teacher ... That time I didn’t care. I didn’t have any idea. Just followed teacher’s guide.

I felt this way because…

…I just taught [it] like Korean. I didn’t know how to teach in English. I thought that English didn’t differ [from] other subjects. (NF4-11)

Mia expressed mixed feelings, writing she felt,

…overwhelmed, nervous and excited at the same time.

I felt this way because…

…I found out that I had to teach two different grades, the number of students might be about 300 and had to deal with all administration bullshit with my native speaker teacher. So basically there were many things came along with nothing to do with teaching even though I volunteered to be English teacher that year. (NF4-1)

In contrast, Sami looked forward to ELT, writing that she was
…really excited.

*I felt this way because…*

…I felt this way because… before teaching English I’d studied the language for a long time. I enjoyed speaking English and finally I had the chance to teach others. I also liked the English topics and expressions for elementary school students. (NF4-4)

In NF3 above, B.G. was relatively positive regarding SLTE, but she found it insufficient for preparing her for the realities met in the field (Johnson, 1996). M.O. felt indifferent about teaching English and expressed uncertainty about how to do it. Mia volunteered to teach English but she felt overwhelmed when confronted with the extra duties she was expected to undertake as an English teacher. Sami, similar to a few others, was eager to begin. Responses for other participants fit somewhere between the themes expressed by these four teachers.

**6.4.1.1 Preparing for class.**

Most participants reported multiple strategies for planning in their first year. Many participants criticized their assigned textbooks and felt the need to find supplements. Preparing *supplementary materials* was the most frequent theme (N=13), followed by using the *teacher’s guidebook* (N=6), and *collaborating with other teachers* (N=6). Eunjeong’s response covered some common topics. She wrote,

*I prepared for my classes by…*

…making materials - pictures, worksheets - and searching for photos in the website and studying methods to teach. (NF4-21)

Other teachers expressed that they just followed the curriculum. For example, M.O. wrote,

I didn’t prepare any materials, just used textbook and CD. I tried to speak in English as [when] possible. (NF4-11)

Six teachers described collaborations with other teachers, four with NEST. For example, Y.S. explained that she prepared for classes by consulting her co-teacher,
writing, “When I need some games or songs or materials, she found them on the Internet and gave me them” (Y.S. NF4-12). The role of colleagues was explored further by the next prompt.

6.4.1.2 The influence of colleagues.

For this prompt, 12 of 19 participants wrote about the influence of others and only their responses were used for analysis. Of these 12, 9 wrote about the positive influence of other teachers and 3 about negative influences. The most common descriptors were that other teachers were encouraging, helpful, collaborative, and complimentary. However, responses suggested some indifference among colleagues. For example, B.G. described how other teachers “helped me to deal with students with bad manners and emotionally supporting me whenever I had an issue, but didn’t really help me with teaching” (NF4-2). She explained:

I think this is because of the unique relationship between colleagues in Korean schools. Teachers are considered to be professionals, and interfering or meddling around other teacher’s class or teaching styles is perceived as rude and very inappropriate…We do share ideas and materials concerning discipline matters or how to manage a homeroom class, but rarely do with subjects we are teaching. (NF4-2)

M.H. described a similar theme, writing that other teachers

…didn’t care about my way to teach but they helped and encouraged me to prepare and reflect my class (just talking and giving some advices). (NF4-19)

An important theme was from Eunjeong’s story, where she wrote,

…relating to English class, there is not much relationship with other teachers. Sometimes I tell to their homeroom teacher, “There is homework” and some students problem and bad behavior. (NF4-21)

Mia found that her colleagues were helpful with
sharing ideas, giving some tips each other. Particularly I had a native co-teacher who taught with me at the same time in the same classroom so we talked a lot, planned at the end of the week for the next week class. (NF4-1)

Mia, added that “homeroom teachers are not much helpful and some are almost careless dealing with some class management issues” (NF4-1). B.G and Eunjeong brought up an important factor relevant to the context of Korean education. Teachers are expected to take care of discipline their own classes, but subject teachers find that challenging (see 9.4).

### 6.4.2 The Biggest Challenges

The most common themes regarding challenges and problems faced during the first year related to teaching (N=13) and students (N=12). For teaching related issues, five participants commented on their lack of English proficiency and three on their lack of experience as the biggest challenges. For example, J.S. wrote,

*The biggest challenges or problems my first year were…*

…my pronunciation and accent was awful.

*I tried to overcome these challenges by…*

…attending teachers’ training program-the only chance that I could meet native speakers at that time. (NF4-5)

M.O. described her challenges being a new teacher by writing,

…I hadn’t got any English teaching method, skill, etc. I didn’t know how to teach English in English…I participated many English train programs. I tried to improve my English ability. (NF4-11)

Regarding challenges with students, six participants mentioned *level gaps* or *low-level students* as their biggest issues. For example, Y.S. wrote,
…students’ level gap was so big. Some students understood and speak English very well but many other students didn’t understand what I taught.

(NF4-12)

M.H. wrote that “even though I repeated what they had learned several times, they were not interested in that and couldn’t do successfully” (NF4-19). K.H. also described difficulties maintaining interest in class but sought advice from other teachers (NF4-25).

6.4.3 Best Memories of the First Year

Of the 19 participants, 2 reported not having any memorable experiences from their first year; for example, M.O. wrote, “Actually, I didn’t have any [good memories]” (NF4-11). Most participants, however, described some kind of successful experience (N=11) as their best memories.

A few primary teachers began their career teaching English. For example, J.Y. started as a substitute teacher in a rural school. She wrote that she was scared and nervous, sometimes wanting to stay home because of challenges with a problem student. She persevered, writing that “although [it was a] short period, I’m very satisfied at the end. I stop to cry last day” (NF4-18).

Unlike J.Y., H.Y. had over 30 years’ experience homeroom teaching when he began teaching English full-time. He wrote that his best memory was feeling “confident about teaching English” (NF4-29). Y.S., also an experienced teacher, wrote that her best experience was that

…students absorbed like sponge that I taught. Almost every English class was excit[ing]. They really enjoyed English class. I miss them. (NF4-12)

Other teachers mentioned keeping a journal (M.H., NF4-19), making friends and gaining respect as a teacher (B.G., NF4-1), doing fun activities in class (Y.S., NF4-13; M.S., NF4-16), and working hard with the students (J.H., NF4-17) as their best memories.
6.4.4 Overall Impression of the First Year

As the closing paragraph, teachers were prompted to summarize their first-year ELT experience. Two answers were unclear so they are excluded. Of the remaining 17 participants, 10 wrote about positive outcomes, for example, K.H wrote that it was a “very hard time, but was a very valuable thing for my teacher’s life” (NF4-25). Y.S. described her first experience as an “unforgettable time” (NF4-14). One participant was neutral, but six wrote about negative outcomes, including both secondary teachers.

In Section 6.4.1, four teachers were quoted who exemplified the range of experiences in the cohort. Their conclusions to NF4 also reflect the range of participant experiences:

*Overall, I think my first year teaching English was…*

…terrible. I didn’t have any idea about teaching English and I didn’t speak English well. I taught English in Korean so sometimes I was confused whether [it was] Korean class or English class. (M.O., NF4-11)

…chaos and not very successful, but I’m sure it was worth it for the rest of my teaching career. I believe I had a pretty good start. (B.G., NF4-2)

…not like what I expected but I would say it was a wonderful chance to have a different perspective seeing the students, teachers and the school. (Mia, NF4-1)

When I look back, I was really enthusiastic and passionate about teaching at that time even though sometimes I had unrealistic expectations. From that experience I learned that students are influenced a lot by their teachers’ attitudes. (Sami, NF4-4)

The case studies (Chapters 7 & 8) explore the themes in these stories in more detail. After collecting data for the case studies, it seems likely that the coda to these stories were artifacts of the data collection instrument in that the realities of teaching English in Korean public schools do not lend well to summary statements about a year’s work.
6.4.5 Summary of Findings in NF4

The participants’ expressions of initial ELT experience varied considerably; however, most teachers described mixed or negative feelings about teaching English, including the five youngest primary teachers who started teaching English early in their careers. Interestingly, the five primary teachers who were most positive about ELT all had over 10 years HRT experience when they began teaching English.

Most participants prepared for classes by making or finding supplementary materials for their classes. A few participants described just following the teacher’s guide or assigned textbook and about a third of the PS participants described collaborating with other teachers. In contrast to other studies from Korea (e.g., S.-K. Shin, 2012), most participants described positive working relationships with colleagues, but three participants described other teachers as having little to no influence on their teaching.

The biggest problems faced in their first year were that some felt impeded by a lack of L2 proficiency or ELT experience, a common theme in research from Korea (Chapter 3). Other common problems related to the students, particularly the challenges of dealing with level gaps and accommodating low-level students (see also Moodie & Nam, forthcoming).

Most teachers described their best memories as some kind of successful experience, for example, student engagement in their classes or successful teaching outcomes. Overall, most participants described their first-year experience teaching English positively, but a few participants commented on the difficulties and negative outcomes in their classes.

Findings from Study 1 are further synthesized in the discussion chapter. First, the themes raised above are explored through the following four in-depth case studies with two experienced and two novice primary school teachers, three of whom were participants above as well (Sami, Mia, and Eunjeong).
CHAPTER 7: CASE STUDIES WITH EXPERIENCED TEACHERS (STUDY 2, PART I)

Study 2 consists of four case studies written in two chapters. The two case studies below investigate the ELT experiences of two mid-career primary school teachers, Mia and Sami, each with over 15 years’ experience teaching in primary schools in Korea. They begin with the background information of the participants, their language learning experiences, and the factors that drew them to education and language teaching. (Data reference conventions appear in Appendix M.)

7.1 Mia (Experienced Primary Teacher, Novice English Teacher)

Mia grew up in a small city in North Gyeongsang Province and began elementary school in the early 1980s. After finishing teacher’s college in 1996, she taught primary school in her hometown for four years before transferring to the current city where she has since lived. 2013-2014 was her 16th year teaching and her 2nd year teaching English.

7.1.1 Critical Incidents in Language Learning

7.1.1.1 Becoming the “English expert in the neighborhood”.

Mia began learning English in Grade 6 during an after-school English club, a government initiative for the 1986 Asian Games (see Chapter 2). She was proud to represent her school at a district competition, saying, “That was really awesome!” (MI2: 227). She won an award and became motivated to learn on her own, which her parents supported: “They were very proud of me so it was a really nice feeling” (MI2: 251). Mia felt “their external push was very genuine - because I was into it.” (M2: 447).

Mia described socialization processes that led her to become known as an English user in a monolingual community. Her siblings were impressed that she could read English and “they really looked up to me. I really enjoyed that. So I just learned by myself” (MI2: 484). Recognition extended to her community, where “it just felt like I got attention from everybody, got recognized at school, and by many people - my neighbors - so, you know, I was twelve years old” (M2: 251). These experiences influenced her identity. She said:
Somehow I just became an English expert in the neighborhood so whenever my father’s friends and my relatives came it was like, ‘Oh, Mia, what’s this in English?’ ((laughs)) ‘What’s this in English?’ ((laughs)) ‘What’s this in English?’ I had no idea what some things were, but I felt like I had to know. (MI2: 257)

By chance, the competition administrator would be her homeroom teacher the following year. She described her experience at the time, saying,

There’s an interesting episode. … I went to the same middle school…my homeroom teacher remembered me because she was the teacher - like, ‘Oh, I remember you’… She really cared about me and so … she really influenced me a lot, actually … I really wanted to impress her with my English score. (MI2: 174-179)

English became her strongest subject. However, she raised an important point, saying, “She’s really good at English means she is really good at taking tests” (MI2: 310).

Although successful, Mia was critical of her experience (see 7.1.6) and did not become a proficient English user until her mid-twenties.

7.1.1.2 Interacting with native speakers: “It opened my eyes.”

Mia enjoyed learning English in school, but its biggest function was to meet test criteria and she had never used English communicatively until she became an adult. She described a transformation in how she approached learning English. During an in-service conversation class for teachers, she became friends with the instructor (a female NEST) and met other native speakers. Mia described the influence from interacting with them, saying, “That’s how my ability English ability rocketed up. I noticed how people communicate … It opened my eyes” (MFN6). Although she would not begin teaching English until years later (see 7.1.3), these experiences influenced her approach to ELT (see 7.1.6).

7.1.2 Critical Incidents and Influences in Becoming a Teacher

7.1.2.1 “My parents’ pressure”.

Mia’s father was a teacher and her parents wanted her to become one, too. She wrote that the primary reason she became a teacher was “actually my parents’ pressure” (MNF1). Like in Study 1, the working conditions and status of teaching were factors.
As Mia said, “I think they assumed [teaching was] the best job they could really recommend for me, because they knew what teaching is like … especially for a woman - it would be better” (MI1: 44).

Her parents’ desires were reinforced in the community by teachers, family, and neighbors. She said, “Everybody assumed, like, ‘Mia will be a teacher,’ or ‘Mia will be a professor.’ All relatives. All neighbors. My sisters. My brother, too” (MI1: 27). This socialization influenced her career, saying, people “assumed that I wanted to be a teacher so I became one” (MI1: 60).

### 7.1.2.2 Limitations of CSAT results.

Although Mia had wished for other careers before choosing teaching, it became a pragmatic choice for her as a high school senior. In Korea university entrance requires a combination of good grades, strategic planning, and serendipity. In the 1990s, students could only apply to one university program, creating pressure to choose programs they would likely be accepted into in the first round of applications. If someone applied and did not get in, they would have to settle for a less competitive program in a second round just before the school year began or wait a full year to reapply. Feedback from practice tests indicated that getting into her desired program was unlikely. Mia said,

> I wanted to be a writer - because I was interested in English a lot - so I thought I’d like to go major in English - but in reality, I couldn’t make it to the school I wanted to go to … my [CSAT] score wasn’t high enough … I think I kind of gave up because I was like, ‘Why take the risk to apply?’ (MI1: 74)

Her family could only afford a subsidized national university and she conformed to her parents’ wishes: “So I said, ‘Okay, teachers’ college,’ then I can focus on studying to be a teacher” (MI1: 19). Although her experience there was “a nightmare” (MI1: 127), she is appreciative of her career.

### 7.1.3 How Mia Became a Full-time English Teacher

After more than a decade as a homeroom teacher, Mia was ready for a change:

> At first, I wanted to be recharged. I had been a homeroom teacher for 12 years or so. I felt like I had to take a break and get a different perspective.

> I heard that subject teachers are quite flexible; they don’t have as many
duties as homeroom teachers, so I thought it might be a good chance to relax and try different things. (MI3: 170)

However, Mia soon realized it “was not like what I expected” (MNF4). She found a week before starting that she would teach two grades and roughly 300 students. Her biggest challenges became “the discipline, class management…finding their motivation…and the gap of individual levels” (MNF4). Although she faced difficulties, “it was a wonderful chance to have a different perspective seeing the students, teachers and the school” (MNF4). The next year she went back to HRT and did so until she had to transfer.

Transferred teachers lose points accrued internally at their school and therefore are less likely to get the more popular grades to teach, such as third and fourth grade (see Chapter 2). Mia wanted to avoid teaching Grade 6 because “sixth grade itself makes people [students] crazy” (MI6.1: 30), so she volunteered to teach English. Ironically, she was assigned all six sections of sixth grade English. She was notified of her position four days before the semester began.

7.1.4 Mia’s Teaching Setting

Mia’s school was established in the 1930s by Japanese administrators (see Chapter 2). The school is in a busy working class neighborhood bordering an industrial zone. There are some small shops and a few hagwon across from the front gate. The back fence abuts an ROK Marine Corps base. There are approximately 700 students in the school, roughly 60% male and 40% female.

Mia’s third floor classroom was abandoned by the previous homeroom teacher who left a mess for her to clean up. Through the year it became more colorful as posters with English phrases and student projects were hung on the walls. There were 26 desks arranged in rows of two. She had a chalkboard and a flat-screen TV for presentations. She supplied hand-held whiteboards, colored markers, crayons, and scissors for projects. She posted her reward system (see 7.1.7) on the board and charts on the back wall for students to keep track of reading assignments.

Each class met three times a week for 40 minutes. There were 70 female and 85 male students in Grade 6, with an average of 25.8 per class. Pre-tests showed that while some students could write coherent paragraphs, others could not write the alphabet. The disparity in student proficiency levels presented challenges throughout the year, as did
their behavior (see 7.1.7; see also 9.4).

Mia was assigned *Elementary School English 6*, published by Cheonjae Education (Ham et al., 2011). It came with a teacher’s guide and multimedia files. Teachers are free to supplement materials and most of hers came from indischool.com, self-made presentations, and *500 Activities for the Primary School Classroom* (Read, 2007), a book recommended on indischool.com.

Mia taught each class once a week with Cathy, an EPIK co-teacher (Chapter 2). She delegated some lesson planning to her although they rarely met outside of class because they were in different buildings. Her classroom doubled as the sixth grade teachers’ break room so she saw the HRTs often, but she rarely met with the other KETs at her school.

During the year, Mia was in charge of the English programs and English-related paperwork at her school. Programs included a summer camp and a city-wide English competition.

### 7.1.5 Themes in Mia’s Conceptions of ELT

Mia was a dedicated teacher who seemed to have a reputation among peers as being a passionate teacher. Early in the study she described what she enjoyed about teaching, saying,

> I learn from them [students] - a lot … and they are always encouraging me to do something new and drive me to learn something new. And it’s such a real honor to see their improvement - through my improvement. (MI1: 353-357)

She associated her interest with her growth as a teacher and the success of her students, but she added,

> And then - teachers get lots of perks in Korea - I get lots of vacations, and a pension - without those two things, hmm - maybe not ((laughs)) - to have a job with my salary and vacations, to be honest with you. (MI1: 358)

This suggested that her development was also linked to the working conditions (see E.-G. Kim, 2009). She continued without prompting, saying,

> That’s such a huge commitment, because always those two things make me appreciate my job more - and I should try more - and harder - because I shouldn’t be wasting their money - I shouldn’t waste people’s tax - to be honest with you - and I get a lot of respect from them too - I feel, like, social big time
Her commitments to teaching English are explored further towards the end of her case. Mia’s experience with English influenced the way she wanted her students to approach learning it. She said,

It’s a big tool. If you learn English—if you can speak English, there are so many things you can do. So I want them to realize that—what a blessing it is learning foreign languages. (MI2: 504)

She wanted to inspire students telling them about her “English success story” (MI2: 507), emphasizing that she learned English without private education. She described her expectations, saying,

I expect them to have an opinion about English, the same opinion I have… How do you approach English? It’s not just for studying or for a job, you know. It’s for life. English for me is such a window to see the world, to see outside of here. (MI6.1, 42)

Like the other participants, Mia emphasized the importance of fun, saying, “I want my students to realize how fun it is [to learn English]” (MI2: 503). Her stated beliefs reflected collaborative learning, a curricular theme (Chapter 2), saying, “I want to make them to feel they are learning something in the class … with my teacher, with my friends” (MFN3).

Like Sami below, Mia’s described the primacy of rapport, a theme suggesting that a relationship between students and teacher is necessary for effective teaching. Her first objective was “to make a rapport with them, you know, build a relationship with them … and to show passion and [that] I’ll be there the whole year for you guys” (MI6.1: 23). Rapport related to her approach to classroom management, saying,

It’s based on the relationship. First, they have to respect me and then they’ll listen to what I’ve said. If I don’t get respect from them, they’ll never listen. (MI6.1: 37)

But for Mia, rapport was conditional, saying,

Certainly after a few weeks I will have my favorite and least favorite [class]. That always happens. And I can tell…there’s a kind of chemistry between the teachers and the students, too. (MI6.2: 4)

More so than other participants, Mia emphasized the importance of good behavior. From the beginning, she set the tone, saying, “I’d like to let them know that this is my territory ((laughter))” (MI6.1: 21). She referred to a subject-homeroom.
teacher dichotomy in Korea, feeling that subject teachers were not respected as much as homeroom teachers, both by students and other faculty (MI9.1). This feeling influenced her emphasis on behavior. She explained, saying,

So what is the limit? What are the boundaries? I can't really deal with them, you know, … but I decided it's important to show them that I'm not only an English teacher, I was a [homeroom] teacher before … I'm not here for only teaching English. I'm a teacher. So I let them know what's right and what's wrong … and keep the boundaries. (MI6.2: 69)

Further, she saw sixth grade as a special case, saying,

That’s really important for that kind of class, like, I'm the boss. That's sixth grade. It makes it easy for me and for them too and for other students too. (MI6.3: 8)

Mia’s practical knowledge from HRT seemed the strongest influence in her conceptions of ELT. Reference to the disciplinary terminology of AL/TESOL was noticeably absent during discussions, but that is not to say concepts from the field were absent in her teaching. For example, Mia provided lots of comprehensible input through teacher talk and sometimes facilitated pushed output through insisting students use accurate and appropriate English. Further, she used collaborative learning and planned many communicative, student-centered activities, but terms such as these were rarely used. Given Mia’s educational experience described below, this gap between explicit and tacit knowledge about language teaching is understandable.

7.1.6 Stated Influences from the Four Phases of Teacher Experience on Mia’s Cognitions and Practices

7.1.6.1 Phase 1: “Doing the opposite”.

Mia’s experience as a student seemed to be an anti-apprenticeship of observation (cf. Lortie, 1975). Typical of English education at the time, Mia had large, teacher-centered classes with many grammar and translation exercises, audio-lingual drills, and tests, with order maintained through corporal punishment. She wrote, “I think my experience as a student in school influenced how I teach by doing the opposite way that I had studied in public schools” (MNF2: 6).

Although Mia enjoyed English, she felt bad for classmates, saying, “It was so boring for them and they were not motivated to study English” (MNF2: 4).
She explained the influence, saying,

Because I remember my classmates, they hated English like I hated math

… Many students … had no idea what the teachers were talking about …

I’m trying to be the opposite of the teachers from whom I learned!

((laughter)) No punishment, no penalties … I like to enhance the positive
reinforcement, not encourage negativity. (MI2: 351-379)

She added, “The basic thing is to make friends with English, not enemies” (MI2: 362) and her experiences were the source of her beliefs that language learning should be fun and include meaningful communication, elements lacking in public school classes.

For teaching English, Mia’s other life experience was more influential. As she explained,

I have some experiences studying and living abroad - so even - I studied
my whole life in a boring and inefficient way. I am trying to help them
realize this is not how it works. (MI9.1: 33)

7.1.6.2 Phase 2: “Nothing…it was a waste of time”

Mia began teachers’ college in the early 1990s and did not find it useful for ELT. In NF2, she wrote,

*As an English teacher, the things I found most helpful from my time as a
university student were nothing. I don’t remember that any of my time in
my university helped me as an English teacher.* (MNF3)

Mia hated teachers’ college, calling it “a nightmare” (MI1: 131). She described a rigid schedule of impractical classes and described her professors, writing, “most of them were old-fashioned, conservative and had nothing to do with any elementary school education, in my opinion” (MNF3). Regarding the practicum, she said, “I don’t remember anything because it wasn’t really that impressive at all. It was totally uninteresting. I tried not to remember! ((laughter))” (M3: 93). Although expressed strongly, Mia’s criticisms were not uncommon at that time (see Kwon 2000), but her experience contrasted with the two younger participants who found their teacher training to be very helpful (Chapter 8).

Nonetheless, Mia appreciated her career, saying,

Even though I had a shitty time at my university, … I’d want to be a
teacher again! I’d want to be an elementary school teacher again. (MI1: 350)
This sentiment, however, would take some time to develop. Her first years were challenging, but with self-determination she learned how to teach on the job.

7.1.6.3 Phase 3: Learning how to teach.

In Mia’s first year teaching she was assigned her homeroom and grade the first morning of the school year. She said, “I had no idea what to do” (MI3: 50). She said she learned “by myself, I guess. Self taught. ((laughs)) I was just thrown in the classroom” (MI3: 99-101). She was committed to developing and prepared in her spare time, saying, “I always carried six or seven textbooks home and I would read, I remember, and try to figure it out” (MI3: 117).

Over time Mia became a confident and knowledgeable teacher. As above, her ELT practice was influenced by principles developed over 14 years as a HRT, particularly her approach to classroom management. In member-checks, she confirmed the following themes were drawn from this experience: the importance of rapport, encouraging good behavior and polite manners, classroom management including reward systems, and seeing sixth grade as a special case. The influence of HRT on ELT is further discussed in Chapter 9 in defining the professional knowledge base for primary English teachers in Korea.

7.1.6.4 Phase 4: “It’s such a wasting of money and time”

Mia has taken 27 in-service training courses, 10 for English alone, adding up to over 400 hours of training; however, she reported their influence as minimal, if not a waste of resources. For example, she did not recall anything useful from the many online courses that she reported just clicking through. She criticized a TEE course (see Chapter 2) held at an English Village. Most instructors had never taught in Korea and none had experience in Korean public schools. She said,

It was a disaster. The first week people [the trainees] argued a lot. The second week people settled down and - [then it was] finished. I learned nothing. It was embarrassing as part of education because they paid for food, accommodation, and transportation and there’s about 40 teachers. It’s such a wasting of money and time - most people agree with me (MI12: 6-12).

Moodie and Nam (forthcoming) critique the research on in-service education in Korea and the issue of its ineffectiveness that Mia raised is also discussed in Chapter 9.
7.1.7 Summary of Observations

In the following sections, the case study shifts from reflections and stated cognitions about language teaching to describing the ELT practices observed during the study. In total I observed 12 of Mia’s classes, including two on the first day used as a warming period. Procedures from three classes are described in detail in Table 7.1 below. These were from the second, fourth, and sixth day of observations; however, all observation data were considered for the discussion of her practices.

Table 7-1. Mia’s Observation Report Summary

7.1.7.1 Planning and materials.

There were nine pedagogic activities in these three classes including four communicative activities from her supplementary book (Read, 2007). Only four activities came from the textbook. Unlike other participants, Mia included no songs because she did not like singing and believed they were ineffective (MI9.1).

For most classes, Mia prepared a presentation file with instructions for activities and wrote the target vocabulary and utterances on the blackboard before class. Every unit Mia assigned self-reported reading assignments, the only homework for students.

7.1.7.2 Lesson sequences.

Mia made students line up outside of class and ask one-by-one to enter. She
greeted students (in the L2) as they entered, usually waiting for them to quiet down before starting but sometimes using a chant (see below). Apart from opening sequences, Mia’s procedures were flexible, even when teaching the same lesson plan (e.g., MO1). Some classes began by continuing activities from the last class (MO4), schema building (MO6), corrective feedback (MO7), or review (MO3). There were usually clear introductory sequences to activities, usually with demonstrations and confirmation checks, although activities (and classes) ended abruptly at times (e.g., MO4). Progressively, her sequences seemed more organized later in the year as she developed routines for setting up and managing activities (MO6). Time permitting, she reviewed activities by using examples of student work and encouraged students to share their work with classmates. To close, Mia assessed behavior and TL use holistically (see below), often pointing out positive examples of both, and if earned, complimented classes on their hard work. In a few classes, sequences were interrupted to address behavioral issues.

**7.1.7.3 Analysis of pedagogic activities.**

Compared to other classrooms, the most salient aspect of Mia’s classes was the degree of student-centeredness observed. In Table 7.1 above, collaborative group work occurred for 79 minutes, or roughly two-thirds of available class time. Other notable points included (1) adapting a language exercise into group work (MO6), (2) the only problem-solving activity observed among participants (MO6), and (3) including extra activities for fast finishers (MO2), also the only example of this activity-type observed. Mia used the CD-ROM and textbook less than other participants, preferring to use activities from a supplementary book.

Supplementary activities from this book (Read, 2007) tended to stimulate much more TL use than ones from indischool.com or her assigned textbook. For example, the envelope race activities (M02 & MO4) were by far the most effective activities for promoting TL output observed in this study. These activities kept students engaged and communicating with each other for more than half of available class time and during these activities, every student communicated in English with Mia multiple times (see also 7.1.8 below).

**7.1.7.4 Classroom management.**

As described above, Mia emphasized the importance of student-teacher rapport
and for students to be respectful to her and each other. More so than other participants, Mia highlighted the importance of good behavior, imploring students to have good manners (e.g., MO8), although that is not to say behavioral issues were less evident in her classes.

Mia used a few strategies for classroom management. First, she made students line up before class, signaling that it was her territory. She said, “Just before I start I make sure everything is good and quiet because they are just so excited and they shake the desks around. So sometimes I never talk and I just wait at the front” (MI9.1: 30).

Second, she made simple rules for class and expected them to be followed. These were:
1. Bring your textbook, notebook, pencil, and eraser. That’s it.
2. Respect the teacher and other students.
3. Help each other.
4. No cell phones. (MO1)

Third, she made a class reward system for regulating behavior and motivating students. Mia kept a chart for all six classes on the front board. At the end of the lesson, she assessed the class, giving a blue circle for good manners and a red circle for using English. When a class earned 20 circles, they earned a class party and watched a movie. Students seemed interested in seeing how other classes were doing and Mia found it to be effective for promoting TL use (MI8.2).

Fourth, like the others, she frequently used chanting to draw attention if students were misbehaving or she wanted to make a point. For example, in the following excerpt she wanted to have students use their own ideas rather than copy the example written on the blackboard:

**Excerpt 1: Chanting**

T:  *yook hangnyeon!* ‘Grade 6!’
SS:  *o ban!* ‘Class 5!’
T:  *o ban!* ‘Class 5’
SS:  *yook hangnyeon!* ‘Grade 6’
T:  This is my poem. So - *yeogigeot* ‘from here’- do not cheat from here. ((She points at her example on the blackboard))

(MO8: 276-289)
Fifth, she often used a portable whiteboard allowing her to face the class or move around while giving notes. Finally, Mia stopped class if there were incidents occurring beyond her level of tolerance, such as a student yelling out a racial epithet about an African character in the textbook (MO1). Behavioral issues are discussed further below.

### 7.1.7.5 Language use and interaction.

Mia was composed, empathetic, and encouraging during class. Teacher-talk was generally in English, but she often code-switched to explain language and instructions. Mia also used L1 to address behavior problems and to save time (see also Kang, 2008).

Notably, many students frequently communicated with her in English. She taught classroom English expressions, posting them on the walls, and expected them to be used when possible, which created extra opportunities for meaningful TL use in class. The following excerpts exemplify how this often occurred:

**Excerpt 2: Envelope race instructions**

T: Do you see this? An envelope.
S2: Envelope?
T: ((points to classroom English poster))
Some SS: What does that mean?
T: *bongtu*
‘envelope’
SS: ahhh.
((a student is taking a pencil from her group mate))
T: Na-young, Na-young?
S5: Can I ‘b’-
T: What do you say?
S5: Can I borrow a pencil?
((T motions for the third group member of each group to come forward. Six students gather around the table, but one is slower.))
S6: *sambeon balli gara!* ((A student yells to a group mate))
‘Number 3, go fast!’
T: ((S7 comes up and grabs an envelope)) No, no, no. You must ask.
S7: Can I have number 3?
T: Yes.
((The student takes the envelope back to the group. They open it, unscramble the sentence together, and then write it in their notebooks. All groups do the same.))
(MO4: 4-45)

Excerpt 3: Students using classroom English
T: So - I'll give you - four minutes. You answer your picture in your notebook. Do you understand?
SS: Yes.
T: Ready? Go.
((Starts timer on the screen, walks around the class and helps students write the answers. A student raises his hand))
S2: Teacher, can I speak Korean?
T: Yes.
S2: yogi mwoyaeyo?
   ‘What’s this?’
T: This? This is a jacket.
((She continues walking around helping and monitoring))
S3: Teacher, how do you spell classroom?
T: ((to class)) How do you spell classroom?
SS: cl-as-r-o-o-m
T: Could you say that again everybody?
SS: cl-as-r-o-o-m
T: Okay. Group 2, any questions?
((She goes from group to group checking answers. The online timer rings.))
S4: Please, one minute.
T: Okay. I’ll give you - three minutes more. Ready? Go. - Yes.
S5: How do you spell jacket?
T: ((to class)) How do you spell jacket?
SS: j-a-c-k-e-t
S6: How do you spell t-shirt?
(MO7: 127-151)
In the beginning students almost never used English with each other, but by the fourth month there was more evidence of student-student TL interaction during activities (MO6). For example, three girls often visited after class, all low-level English users from lower socio-economic backgrounds whose families could not afford private education (MI9). They were observed multiple times studying after school, asking to borrow materials, practicing writing, and asking Mia about the meanings and spellings of words, all in English. Appendix T includes further examples to support the findings above.

7.1.8 Critical Incidents in the Process of Development and Change in Cognitions and Practice

Mia first taught English in 2010, but language teaching was more challenging than she expected (see above). Nevertheless, she was committed to self-directed development that was evident during the study. The two most salient aspects of her development in her second year were her changing beliefs that occurred through discovering the effectiveness of (1) student TL use in class and (2) incorporating student-centered activities, both elements highlighted in the curriculum but ones she avoided in her first year. Incidents leading to these changes in her practices are described below.

7.1.8.1 Discovering the effectiveness of classroom English.

This year Mia decided that she would emphasize classroom English use, for herself and students. She taught classroom English phrases, used them extensively, and encouraged students to do the same, often slowing down, allowing students to use them if appropriate situations arose. Compared to her first year, she said,

In my other school it would never ever happen. I didn’t even want to try because I had no idea what was going on there … Even I didn’t really speak English to them at all. (M9.1: 82-85)

She made posters with common phrases, adding to these throughout the year. These phrases served basic communicative functions such as asking for permission, confirming information, and using English as metalanguage (see Table 7.2 below).

Table 7-2 Common Functions and Examples of Classroom English Use Observed in Mia’s Classes
**Asking for permission**
May I come in, please?
Can I speak Korean?
Can I borrow a/an _____?
May I go to the bathroom?

**Confirming information**
Pardon me?
Can you repeat that, please?
Is this right?
What about _____? / How about _____?

**Using English as metalanguage**
How do you spell ____?
What does ____ mean?
How do you say _____ in Korean?
How do you say _____ in English?

Like Sami below, Mia’s continual use of classroom English provided comprehensible input; however, unlike the other participants, Mia also taught and encouraged students to use classroom English. Progressively, students became accustomed to using English for many functions (e.g., Table 7.2), even if results were modest (see also Appendix T).

Mia wrote, “It’s been amazing … to see some kids try to communicate with others … in English in the classroom” (MNF6). She described its effectiveness, saying, They have to set it up. It’s a real situation. They know when to use that sentence exactly. They understand that circumstance. It’s communicative. It’s communication. (M11: 40)

When asked why she avoided it before, she responded,
I didn’t know how important classroom English was. I thought it was like, ‘Open your book - Attention,’ like that. I really didn’t give a shit to how important it is, like, ‘Open your book. Close the window. Is anyone absent
today?’ I know who is absent. What’s the point? … but that’s really communicative, I think. (MI11: 41-42)

Over time Mia observed improvements, saying, “I didn’t realize how much they could, the possibilities of using classroom English” (MI11: 55). She gave an example of a low-level student asking her, “Teacher, what does that mean, how about?” after hearing another student use the phrase “How about it?” (MI11: 39). Mia said, “To me that’s unbelievable to see” (MI11: 39).

Teaching and reinforcing classroom English provided more opportunities for TL communication than observed in other classrooms, and was particularly evident during collaborative group work activities, an activity-type Mia discovered while dealing with a throat infection.

7.1.8.2 Discovering the effectiveness of student-centered, collaborative activities while sick.

Early in the year Mia had difficulties with group work, particularly regarding student behavior and the level gaps. After a noisy class, for example, she said, “It’s a nice game but Jenga is too - the point is reading but sometimes they’re more into playing … some groups were okay but some groups were just garbage today” (MI8.2: 5). Students were throwing wooden blocks around and there was hardly any English being used. In her CIL, she wrote, “No more Jenga!” (CIL5). Mia searched for new ideas.

The next week Mia was suffering from laryngitis. In Korea, employees are expected to work through illness so she came up with a plan to cope. She found the most collaborative activity she could, wrote instructions on presentation slides, and planned an extra activity for fast-finishers, a worksheet based on the lesson, which ensured that everyone had something to work on until the end of class. She said, I got this idea from the book I bought last week … because writing - I always have trouble. They just hate it. But the board games you only get the good English speakers, the good writers, to do the activity … I’ll try to make sure that each student has a chance to write something down or that they can write it together. (MI8.2: 16)

The activity is described below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Envelope Race Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
A collaborative writing activity. Mia added an exercise for fast finishers.

**Materials:** 10 envelopes containing scrambled sentences, notebooks, & worksheets

**Source:** Read (2007)

**Activity description:** Collaborative group work for writing practice with some speaking practice.

**Activity objective:** Unscramble and write 10 sentences.

**Procedures:** Students are arranged in groups of four. Group members take turns asking the teacher for an envelope. They return to their groups, unscramble the sentence together, then all students write the sentence in their notebooks. During the activity they are encouraged to help each other and confirm answers with the teacher. When finished, students check their answers then begin on a worksheet individually.

When asked why she planned it this way, she replied, “Because I can’t talk … It was the only way” (MI8.2: 30). She urged students to cooperate, saying,

I made sure that this is not about racing it’s not about speed I want to see how much you cooperate and help each other and make sure things go well. (MI9.1: 25)

Positive outcomes from this activity led to her recycling it. After the second time she said,

[It] works fantastic for each class. I did it for review again this time too because I could save a lot of time because each class they knew what was going on. Even they finished two pages in their notebooks by themselves together and then wrote 10 sentences. It made me so happy. I felt like a homeroom teacher actually … They just worked so hard and they just studied by themselves. (MI9: 70)

Three important observations of the envelope race were that collaboration (1) facilitated the most TL output during the study as the higher-level students helped lower-level peers, (2) behavioral problems were reduced, and (3) it freed up her attention to focus on student language use. Noticing the benefits of student-centered activities, she said,
That was the best thing about this sentence game. I could really observe them and they don’t even notice. I can make notes about the English that they said to each other and I heard, ‘Hurry,’ ‘What number?’ things like that and I like to mention that to them and give them a lot of compliments…and they were really happy to hear that. (M9: 81)

It is worth noting that she did not seem to see these student utterances as indications of language development or as examples to use for corrective feedback (see 9.2 and 9.5 for discussion of these points).

When asked about the envelope race’s effectiveness, she replied, “Because they don’t realize it. That’s part of the game, I guess. They write but they don’t realize they have to write” (MI11, 22). Her planning and classroom management during the activity enabled meaningful communication and motivated students to practice a skill that they usually resisted (i.e., writing).

Furthermore, including extra activities for fast finishers allowed more proficient users to continue studying rather than becoming a distraction. During subsequent observations, Mia included instructions on the screen, usually with ideas for fast-finishers. She clarified how she came upon this practice, saying, “Because I couldn’t talk before … I lost my voice … That’s why I put it up” (MI11: 33).

Ceding control over activities while being sick enabled her to discover the effectiveness of collaborative, cooperative language learning. Subsequently, she adapted textbook activities, making them more collaborative, for example, changing an individual language exercise into group work (MCIL8) and making a new communicative activity, a survey (MCIL9). She often incorporated student ideas and elicited examples from their own experience (MI11). Mia discovered student-centered, collaborative language teaching by chance, noticed its effectiveness and adapted it into her teaching practice.

However, Mia emphasized the importance of rapport for being able to carry out these activities. In the third month, I wrote, “[Mia] has clear control of class and respect of students. They are willing participants for the most part” (MOR6). Afterward she agreed, saying, “Yes, because we have rapport now” (MOR6). Over time her focus on good behavior and respect for classmates enabled student-centeredness to be possible, as she confirmed while member-checking.
7.1.8.3 Hindrances to development.

Although Mia experienced success as a language teacher this year, not every class went as well as she hoped. As a novice language teacher using new materials she was uncertain about outcomes, for example, saying,

I’m just so overwhelmed right now … because this [lesson] is new … So today I didn’t know how they would respond to the materials and things like that. (MI7.1: 66-68)

Planning and time management were challenging, especially ending activities on time. Eight of the nine future changes mentioned in CILs related to planning, for example, making better use of time and allowing for more student centeredness.

Uncertainty was a common theme; for example, she said,

Sometimes I bring too many activities. I have to rush through them so I have to stop in the middle and wrap it up and move to the next activity because there are other activities I want to finish up. Sometimes I bring too many things. I don’t know what is better. (MI8.2: 61)

Although cooperative learning like the envelope race activities were helpful, level gaps were challenging because “some are very interested in English…but some have no idea. That’s my dilemma” (MO1: 69).

Further, behavior was an issue. She wanted class to be fun, but this led to contradictions among her objectives, saying,

It is really hard to be entertaining and educational at the same time, that’s my goal, but it’s very hard to satisfy both sides. Yeah, we can play a game, like a stupid, dumb PowerPoint game. It’s exciting for some, two or three kids, they love it and the other kids they just follow them. They don’t know what’s going on. They do it and then after they argue and fight a lot. (MI9.1: 25)

The most frequent problems noted in CILs related to student behavior, mentioned nine times. These included incidents such as arguments carried over from other classes, excessive noise during activities, and fighting. Although behavior was a point of emphasis, she tolerated disruptive incidents at times, saying,

I don’t have a choice - With another class we did the same thing that they got crazy. I almost called the homeroom teacher to come here. I almost, I wanted to - It was so hard to calm them down. Some kids were moving around and they kicked each other. (MI8.2: 51)
Notably, these issues threatened her commitment to ELT and she wanted to return to HRT the following year. Therefore, her development as an English teacher described above would have been lost to the Korean primary school system had she done so (see below; see also 9.1).

7.1.9 Commitment to Teaching English: “Right Now I Want to be a Homeroom Teacher”

In the end, Mia wished to return to HRT, mostly because of extra duties she was responsible for outside of class. She said,

As long as I teach English I have to be the head of English education department at this school … I can’t get away from that. Everything the school asks me I have to do.

… right now I want to be a homeroom teacher. (MI11: 4-6)

She explained, saying it was,

All the camp things, the competition things … nothing to do with classes, it was all extra things. … I have to be involved with everything in the bureaucracy - talk to the principal, vice principal, call to the education board, call to city hall. I have to do it by myself. It’s unfair.

(MI11: 4-8)

If she had a choice she would have taught third or fourth grade. However, assuming she would be assigned as a sixth grade homeroom teacher, she volunteered to teach English again the following year.

7.1.10 Case Summary: Mia

Mia experienced success as a young learner, becoming the English expert in her neighborhood, although as she realized at that time being good at English meant doing well on tests. Her “ability rocketed up” (MFN6) after meeting native speakers following an in-service conversation course in her city.

Her parents pressured her into teaching, believing it was the best career choice for her and she accepted their advice after feedback from a practice CSAT indicated other desired options were unlikely. Although Mia hated teachers’ college and felt it insufficiently prepared her for the profession, she became a dedicated teacher who developed as she learned on the job in her spare time, was motivated by seeing students
develop as she improved as a teacher, and was committed through the normative obligation she felt due to the status and working conditions she gained as a teacher in Korea.

After HRT for 12 years, Mia wanted to “be recharged” (MNF1) and volunteered for English thinking it would be easy. It was different than she expected and she faced challenges with discipline, class management, student motivation, and level gaps. She returned to HRT the following year and continued to do so until she had to transfer schools.

Wanting to avoid sixth grade, she volunteered to teach English again but ended up with all six sections of sixth grade English. Trying to do the “opposite” of her English teachers, her experience as a learner served as an *anti-apprenticeship of observation* (cf. Lortie, 1975). She stated that her teacher education did “nothing” (MNF3) to influence her as a language teacher and despite taking over 400 hours of in-service ELT, she called it a waste of time and money.

Her approach to language teaching was built on her HRT experience. Seeing sixth grade as a special case, Mia focused on good behavior and building rapport first, letting them know “what’s right and what’s wrong” (MI6.2) and wanting to “build a relationship with them” (MI6.1).

In her first year teaching English, she did not realize “how important classroom English was” (MI11) and rarely used it. However, this year she decided to use English more and get students to use it as much as possible. She was the only participant who taught students classroom English and expected students to communicate with her and each other in English. Throughout the year, as students used more and more English, Mia expressed amazement at how effective this practice was.

Mia’s commitment to improving as a language teacher was reflected in her self-directed development from studying a supplementary materials book in her spare time (Read, 2007). With the help of this book, Mia serendipitously discovered the effectiveness of student-centered pedagogic activities. Early in the year she came down with laryngitis and had to cede some control of class. She asked for volunteers to help give instructions and planned a cooperative writing activity. In this class, every student communicated with Mia multiple times, and with the help of group mates, nearly every student unscrambled and wrote 10 sentences in their notebook. This was by far the most student target language use observed in all classes during the study. Mia recycled this activity often and subsequently included more learner-centered cooperative activities.
Nevertheless, Mia faced ongoing challenges with time management, student behavior, and uncertainties over effective teaching practices, saying it was “really hard to be entertaining and educational at the same time” (MI9.1). Moreover, because of extra duties, Mia wanted to return to teaching third or fourth grade. However, expecting to be assigned to sixth grade, Mia volunteered to teach English again the following year.
7.2 Sami (Experienced Primary Teacher, Experienced English Teacher)

Sami was from a large city in the middle of North Gyeongsang Province. She was born in the early 1970s and graduated high school in the late 1980s. She went to the same university that Mia (above) would later attend, majoring in Elementary Education with a specialty in science education. She began teaching in her hometown for two years, then transferred to the current city where she has taught since. In total she has taught for 20 years, and this was her sixth year teaching English.

7.2.1 Critical Incidents in Language Learning

Sami’s first exposure to English came as a child watching cartoons on the American Forces Korea Network (AFKN). She described it, saying,

I felt it was really fun and I started getting accustomed to the English environment … So after that I thought that English was not so hard and it was a really interesting language, a new language. (SI5: 18-19)

She studied at home but unlike other participants, her parents had little influence “because they were really busy earning money and they weren’t so interested in their kids or their daughters’ education” (SI5: 54). However, a neighbor encouraged her:

He was really interested when I spoke English even though it was really short, like ‘A-B-C, thank you,’ but he praised me a lot and he encouraged me, ‘Oh you speak English? Amazing!’ And then I was really encouraged, so I think from back then. (SI7.1: 4-5)

Because of this early start, she was ahead of classmates when her first English classes began in middle school.

She did well in middle school, but vowed to be the best in high school. She decided, “Whomever will be my English teacher, I will fall in love with him … just to like the English subject” (SI5: 13). To clarify, she said, “I think not actually a crush on him, just a crush on English, the English in him” (SI5: 63) and observed, “Actually, the first intention was not so good, but the results were really good” (SI5: 62).

With over 500 students in her grade, Sami earned the highest English marks. The curriculum changed (see Chapter 2) leaving her classmates struggling “because they were not so interested in English and they didn’t have a broad vocabulary range, … So I got the best scores every time” (SI5: 58). Recognition coincided with results.
and became a source of motivation during a difficult time.

Her parents experienced financial troubles and left her at home to take care of her younger sister. She said,

The only thing that encouraged me was the score, the outcome. Whenever we had our monthly test, that teacher announced, ‘The person with the top score is Sami’. (SI5: 75)

As she explained:

I was in a really terrible situation because of my father’s bankruptcy and also I had to take care of my sister. My mom was not here … The only thing I wanted [was] to get recognition. That encouraged me a lot. (SI5: 75)

However, like Mia, she stopped studying English in university to focus on coursework and did not begin again until years later.

Early in her career, Sami experienced a personal crisis and looked for ways to overcome it, saying,

I tried to forget everything that happened in my life, every really bad thing that happened. It wasn’t so easy. And then I thought about myself. What is my favorite thing? (SI5: 81-82)

She remembered her interest in English as a student, saying,

The crucial moment - after I [had that issue] I searched and thought and thought about what is my favorite thing, to relieve my stress and my [troubles] and I realized English is the thing that can soothe myself. (SI5: 132)

She enrolled in a hagwon, and studied at home, joining local video-chat groups.

Learning English provided a means of self-actualization and this related to her identity. Sami described how, “when Korean women talk about something the topic is usually via gossiping … and talking about their in-laws, especially for married women, right?” (SI8: 6).

She continued, saying,

They don’t talk about social issues, or topics related to political things and topics related to controversial things … They avoid that talk. They’d like to talk about their in-laws or fashion or make-up or stylish things and how can they manage, what, their middle-age beauty. But those things are not something my type. (SI8: 8)

And then she added,
I think about why do I like English so much? Because I can share the ideas over the topics with people of various status, job status, not only teachers...like doctors, students, soldiers, even professors - I think that is the biggest one why I am really obsessed about studying. (SI8: 8) Through using English she found interlocutors who “have common things with me, that is, English and social issues and sharing ideas” (SI8: 10). Using English provided opportunities for discourse differing from the norms in her L1. Importantly, her renewed interest in English and how it contributed to her identity as a Korean woman led her eventually to teaching it, but not until she felt ready.

7.2.2 Critical Incidents in Becoming a Teacher

In high school, Sami had wanted to be a scientist, but her family’s financial situation limited her opportunities for higher education, and, like Mia, she chose teaching. As she explained,

My homeroom teacher, he knew about my family condition, that we lacked the finances, so he recommended me to go to teachers’ college because the tuition fee is really cheap compared to the other national universities. (SI7.1: 49)

Sami recognized his influence, saying “a crucial moment, right? To choose which way for my life. I didn’t think about being a teacher before” (SI5: 40). She mentioned, “I didn’t know that my aptitude was right for teaching before but … I found out that teaching is really rewarding and also teaching is my calling” (SI7.1: 49). She appreciates his influence and still keeps in touch.

7.2.3 How Sami Became an English Teacher

Sami first taught English in 2008, then, like Mia, alternated between HRT and ELT. After teaching for 13 years, Sami volunteered for English after taking a TESOL course. She enjoyed that first year but with over 150 students she missed the relationships “and sharing everything with my own students,” saying, “I really wanted to be a homeroom teacher again” (MI5: 100). Two teachers returning from in-service ELT training were supposed to teach English, but they lobbied the principal to be assigned homerooms and Sami lamented, “There was nobody except me” (SI5: 110). Sami taught English for two more years, then returned to HRT, saying, “It was a really happy time” (SI5: 116).
However, in 2012 Sami had to transfer and volunteered to teach English again. First, “I missed English. I missed teaching English.” (SI5: 116). Second, because transferred teachers “usually have to be in charge of sixth graders” she felt that “teaching English is better than being a sixth grade teacher” (SI5: 116). She said that “the school welcomed it because no one else wanted to be an English teacher” (SI5: 116). Since 2012, Sami has taught Grade 5 English at that school.

7.2.4 Sami’s Teaching Setting

Sami’s school is located in a middle-class area and was built in the 2000s as the city expanded northward. It is surrounded by a park, office buildings, and apartments. A new high-rise complex across the road pushed class sizes above the national average.

Sami taught in one of the colorful English Zone classrooms, an area renovated with an MOE grant. There was a large touchscreen TV between two white boards and 36 desks were arranged in groups of 4.

Her textbook was YBM’s *Elementary School English 5*, chosen by a school committee two years before. The book had 16 lessons (i.e., units), each with 21 activities planned for six classes. She provided supplementary materials nearly every class, for example, self-made presentations, worksheets, songs, and activities from indischool.com.

There were five fifth grade classes averaging just over 30 students per class. They had English three times a week in forty-minute classes. Student proficiency varied from beginner to near-native like, and these level gaps presented concerns (see 7.2.5 below).

Sami taught each class once a week with a NEST co-teacher, Anna. There was one other KET and one Korean English instructor at the school who shared an office next to Sami’s classroom. Sami rarely met with the fifth grade HRTs because their classrooms were in a different wing of the building.

Sami was in charge of English paperwork and supervising the instructor. Sami’s main tasks were teaching an English camp on Saturdays during the first semester and preparing students for the local English competition where they performed a skit. She also taught an after-school class for parents and organized an English discussion group for staff.
7.2.5 Themes in Sami’s Conceptions of Teaching English

Sami thought of herself as a “mom at school,” saying she wanted “to hug them [students] like they are my sons and daughters, you know?” (SI1.2: 121). Her commitments to teaching and concerns for students were linked to this image. As she said,

Keeping all of them in my arms is sometimes really important but difficult. It is needed. I can’t neglect even one of them. So I feel guilty when I see a person who doesn’t feel, like, interest in my English class. (SI7.3: 5)

Her empathy was particularly evident with low-proficiency students and she felt responsible for reducing the language gap, saying “it’s the most important thing” (SI1.2: 13). She explained,

I can’t just abandon them. Others are really good at English but one person or two people if they are really poor English they feel that English is not their style then I have to make a desirable standard for them. That’s my duty. (S3.2: 102)

This was an ongoing challenge and her strategies for adapting assessments for low-level students are discussed below in describing her changes in practice during the study (see 7.2.8).

Like Mia, Sami’s approach to language teaching was based on her experience homeroom teaching. Further, the primacy of rapport was evident in Sami memorizing 180 student names by the third week because “rapport is the most important thing I have to set first” (SI1.2: 72). Her emphasis on rapport was demonstrated in the patience she showed towards troublemakers, saying,

You know, the playful - the naughtiest students - those people. I need to make them on my side and then I can do everything ((Laughter)). If I have a bad relationship with them, I can’t do anything. (SI7.1: 60)

Sami empathized with “the naughtiest students” because they reminded her of herself (SI7.1) and she was more tolerant of disruptive behavior than Mia.

Sami encouraged students to use her nickname and this facilitated communication outside of class. She said,
Whenever I go … in the hallway or in the playground, they just run up to me and yell ‘Sami!’ - So I feel like I am still doing good ((Laughter)).

(SI11: 44)

In Korea, the cultural norm would be for students to bow and address teachers by job title (i.e., seonsangnim ‘teacher’). Using her nickname facilitated a closer relationship by lowering the social distance between herself and students.

Sami had more ELT training than the others and recognized the importance of this knowledge, but she emphasized that “teachers’ attitude and teachers’ enthusiasm and how much do we try to make the class successful” (SI3.2: 102) was more important. An emerging measure of success for Sami came from the degree to which activities were fun (e.g., SI2; SI3.2; SI4). As she told students, learning “English is not studying. Enjoy English!” (SI2: 48). She routinely used games and singing, saying, “They need to practice the target language but with fun activities. It’s the most helpful for them” (SI3.2: 95). Entertainment was a theme in Sami’s classes and the emphasis on fun seemed to have precedence over TL use (see 7.2.7 below).

She believed fun activities were motivating:

I mean interesting activities are not all they can do but if it is really serious they feel like it is really difficult or not interesting. Sometimes I think interest is important to encourage them. (SI6: 33)

Motivating students was a central theme in Sami’s conceptions of ELT. For example, one week students “were not in the mood to jump into class” (SI3.2: 100). She countered their lack of energy by being especially enthusiastic and complimentary. Her efforts paid off the following week when she found that class had demonstrated the most willingness to participate among fifth grade classes. She described the results of her efforts, saying “it was really worth it. Because of me, they got interested in English class” (SI3.2: 100).

The emphasis Sami put on encouraging students related to her understanding of the role of motivation in language learning. She said,

I think that motivation is really important, right? So if they are really willing to join or willing to study English, that moment is most effective and the most important part in a situation. (SI1.2: 29)

She described her role as a catalyst, saying,

I think everything comes out of the teacher’s plan, how can I organize the class for today. It depends on the student’s will. They will make that decision, the
result, is this successful or not. … I’m doing only really the role of the trigger, the catalyst, right? And then they can make the result and they can make themselves kind of a winner or an owner [of their success]. (SI3.2: 102)

Although her words suggested the importance of student-centeredness, in practice she tended to maintain control over communication in the classroom (see Section 7.2.7).

7.2.6 Stated Influences from the Four Phases of Teacher Experience on Sami’s Cognitions and Practices

7.2.6.1 Phase 1: “No relation”.
Sami said her public school experience had “no relation” (SI7.1: 17) to her teaching. Although she was a successful learner, her classes were demotivating, saying that her teachers,

concentrated on grammar points. That dissuaded me, discouraged me to learn English. There was no conversation time … No games. Just re-read the textbook. And we translated it and had grammar quizzes … It was really boring. (SI5: 72-73)

Like Mia, her experience suggested an anti-apprenticeship of observation. Her negative experience “showed me how important it is for students and teachers to have a good rapport” (SNF2).

Her experiences outside of class were more influential. She said,

Ah, when I talk to you about English, I think I remember the most valuable moment was my childhood experience—not in middle school or high school. Those memories influenced my teaching style. (SI5: 78)

For example, explaining that she was a curious, playful, and occasionally naughty child, she empathized with disruptive students, saying,

because I can understand the troublemaker’s … mindset and I can approach them. So it is the base - it is kind of the background of my skill and my teaching style. (SI5: 78)

7.2.6.2 Phase 2: “We had to face reality”.
Sami was less critical than Mia about her education but she also found it impractical, saying it “should be changed” (SI5: 151) because they “spent a lot of time learning things in theory rather than in practice” (SNF3). She criticized her professors
for teaching “everything from textbooks” (SI5: 151).

Unlike Mia, Sami found her practicum to be effective, saying,
because we had to face reality, and we jumped into the classroom and we met
the real students, not students in a textbook … we had to solve the problems by
ourselves. So that was really helpful, to have the real experience, like teaching -
and struggling with students and struggling with problems happening in the
classroom. (SI7.1: 29)

Sami was a student before curricular reforms so she did not have pre-service ELT
training, but other experiences were influential, as described below.

7.2.6.3 Phase 3: “Simplified” homeroom teaching.
Sami described teaching English as a kind of simplified homeroom teaching. As
she explained,

When I teach a subject in Korean it can be much more complicated or difficult
when I compare an English class to a normal subject class. - So I think that
English class is simplified … I just show them the target language and I make
proper activities related to the target language like songs or fun activities.
(SI7.1: 26)

Like Mia, Sami volunteered for English as an experienced homeroom teacher
and drew on this experience for ELT. The following themes seemed linked to her
homeroom teaching experience and were confirmed in member-checks: the primacy of
rapport, strategies for motivating students, and approaches to classroom management.

7.2.6.4 Phase 4: “The turning point”.
Sami was much more positive than Mia regarding in-service training. She had
taken four major courses, including the six-month INSET program (see Chapter 3).

Before teaching English the first time, Sami enrolled in a 150 hour TESOL
certificate course offered by a Canadian university. Classes were on weekends two
hours away and she had to pay tuition herself, reflecting her commitment to
professional development. This course challenged Sami to reflect on her teaching. She
received praise from her peers for her demonstrations, but the most influential feedback
came from the constructive criticism of instructors. For example, one trainer “was
really straightforward” so it was a good opportunity “to see myself objectively” (SI7.1:
34).
During her first year teaching English, Sami believed she needed to improve her proficiency and teaching methods so she applied for the six-month INSET program, saying it “was the turning point” (SI7.1: 36). Having instructors familiar with Korean education was important because “they knew what was wrong in Korea … and what are the teachers doing very well” (SI7.1: 38). Further, she thought it was helpful sharing ideas with peers.

7.2.7 Summary of Observations

When I first entered Sami’s classroom I knew I was in the presence of an experienced language teacher (SFN1). Her desk was tidy, with materials for lessons within easy access. Lesson plans were written on one board with practice conversations on the other, and this was the case in every class.

Prior to the year, she wrote,

I think that being an English teacher is having the passion to teach and encouraging students to learn with enthusiasm. In the future I hope to teach English based on open-minded rapport with my students. I will help build the students’ interest in my classroom with well organized and interesting activities. (SNF1)

This excerpt foreshadowed Sami’s practice: She was enthusiastic and energetic, building relationships with the problem students and exemplified patience with their misbehavior, and she was entertaining, keeping a fast pace.

In total I observed ten classes between March and September, 2014. All observation data were used for the case study, but the analysis in Table 7.3 below focuses on three classes: one at the beginning, one at the middle, and one at the end of a unit.
These classes had 14 pedagogic activities, including 5 songs. She provided supplementary materials every class, for example, self-made presentations, worksheets, activities from indischool.com, and many games.

### 7.2.7.1 Lesson sequences.

Before class students entered freely, with most playing around loudly with classmates. Sami signaled the start of class with songs, which tended to settle down classes quite quickly (e.g., SO2). After singing, she usually greeted the students and asked about the weather before describing her lesson plan. Her classes generally followed present-practice-produce (PPP) procedures. The beginning and middle phases included lots of TL teacher-talk, often supported by entertaining images in self-made presentations (e.g., SO7). Songs were often used for signaling the end of activities and classes (e.g., SO3 & SO5). Sami generally followed her plans, anticipating when activities would come to a close and made efforts to review activities using student examples (e.g., SO7), practices that reflected her experience.

### 7.2.7.2 Analysis of pedagogic activities.

Games and competitions were frequent, occurring in every observation, for example, the 20 minute Quiz Bomb Game in SO2. Sami often turned activities into...
competitions, awarding points for language use and good manners (see below). Form-focused language exercises (e.g., pattern drills) took up nearly 50% of class time compared to 40% for communicative activities in Table 7.3. Most remaining class time included singing and Sami usually provided lyrics and worksheets for students, turning songs into language exercises.

In the beginning of the year classes were quite teacher-centered. For example, she limited student interaction during a survey, having Anna ask the class together rather than having students interact with each other as designed (SO2). Like Mia, Sami included more student-centered materials as the year went on (e.g., SO3; SO7), but she usually retained control over procedures, for example, by having only higher-proficiency students do the writing (e.g., wall dictations in SO3), or choosing activities with limited interaction (e.g., Sleeping Elephants in SO7). Speaking activities generally occurred as controlled practice and there were few opportunities for authentic language use.

7.2.7.3 Classroom management.

Like Mia, Sami adapted strategies from prior experience for managing classes. These included her coupon reward system, portfolio evaluations, group rewards, and routines for drawing attention.

Sami developed a coupon reward system for motivating students and regulating behavior, saying, “sometimes [it] is a really good method, a way to control them, and also coupons let the students get engaged in the class” (SI7.3: 9). She prepared coupons, handing them out at her discretion for demonstrating positive actions in the classroom such as using English or good behavior. When a student earned 10 coupons, Sami prepared an award ceremony, for example, in the excerpt below:

**Excerpt 1: An Award Ceremony**

T: You know, we have a ceremony for the super students.

((applause from class))

Yeah, it is the first time. First time, so, listen. - Yeah, we have two super students. The first, Yoon-jae, come here please.

((applause))

And please bring your textbook.

And Kyung-min, please bring your textbook. Come.
It’s okay.
((two students approach the front))

How many coupons?

SS: Ten.
T: He has 10 coupons. Wow. Congratulations.

SS: ((applause))
T: Kyung-min, it’s okay. Come. - I believe in you.
    Yoon-jae has 10 coupons. - Here. - Do you see the sticker here?

SS: ooooh
T: May I?

((Sami puts a sticker in his textbook and reads))
Super student award awarded to Yoon-jae, today’s date, awarded
by teacher Sami. Yeah!

SS: ((applause))
T: You can choose. ((She presents a selection of stationary
    materials.))

SS: wa!
    ‘Wow!’

T: Choose anything you want.

((applause))

T: Wow, good job, Yoon-jae!

(SO3: 22-42)

Students seemed proud receiving awards and most classmates appeared
supportive, but some seemed envious. Most students kept track of coupons keenly,
suggesting the effectiveness of her system.

Sami also made a group point system to manage class. She did most activities as
a full-class, but students sat in groups. During class, she gave points at her discretion
for correct answers or helping others, awarding candy or coupons to the group with the
most points at the end of class, as in Excerpt 2 below:

**Excerpt 2: Group Reward**

T: Today [class] 5-4 you were really good …
    Han-seo, good job. Good manners, two points.
Jeongmin, you were a gentleman, so two points.
So today’s winner - Group 1
((applause))
I promise. I will give you a caramel, each one. (SO3: 324-330)

Group rewards seemed to interest students, but they appeared more interested in the coupons and candy than recognition for using English. Moreover, it seemed points were often awarded arbitrarily. At times the intergroup competition created conflicts among classmates that hindered the opportunities for others to practice the TL, for example, during the Quiz Bomb Game (SO2, SO5).

Like Mia, Sami used chanting routines for getting students attention. In her routine, Sami called out a series of numbers (e.g., 1-3-2-3-1) and the numbers had corresponding gestures. For ‘one’ students put both hands at their side; for ‘two’ they put their hands on their lower backs; and for ‘three’ they put their hands on their heads. She usually mixed gestures and numbers so that students had to listen carefully, a similar concept used in Simon Says.

A second chanting routine used in similar situations went as follows:
T: Look, look, look at me.
SS: Look, look, Sami!
((Students point both hands at Sami as they chant))
(SO1: 313-315)

She also used a bell, sometimes using all three in succession.

Although Sami had many strategies for management, she was quite tolerant of noise and misbehavior. For example, two boys intentionally tipped over a desk during a song. Sami looked at them, shook a finger, but did not follow up on the incident (SO6). There was a lot of yelling before, during, and after class. Once while we were talking, a student said “Shut the fuck up!” to a classmate in front of us. She said, “Hey, watch your manners. That is very rude what you said,” and we continued our discussion (SFN4).

7.2.7.4 Language use and interaction.
Sami used English extensively, but not exclusively. Instructions were given in English, repeated if necessary, and frequently translated to the L1 after monitoring student uptake. She regularly complemented students in English and was almost always
positive. She liked to entertain students, saying, “Sometimes we need, we need to have showmanship” (SI1.2: 94). For example, in Excerpt 3 Sami was standing on a chair wearing an apron with flashcards attached to the front. She joked around with students for a minute, then began. Students were to memorize the words, close their eyes, then she removed a word and students had to figure out which one was missing:

**Excerpt 3: Apron Flashcards**

T: Close your eyes. Good. Beautiful students. Let me see.

((removes a card))

Okay open your eyes.

What is missing?

Some SS: Swimming

T: Shhhh. It is top secret. Raise your hand. - Jaemin?

S1: Swimming.

T: Swimming. Do you think so? Please make a sentence, 1-2-3 -

Most SS: Are you interested in swimming?


((removes another card))

(SO3: 180-190)

Sami transformed this preparatory exercise into something more engaging for the class. During this phase, Sami was surprised when a student spontaneously asked, “Why?” (SI6: 30). This was one of few instances of unplanned, meaningful student TL use occurring during the ten observations. Students generally only used English in controlled speaking practice, for example, in Excerpt 4:

**Excerpt 4: Interaction During Quiz Bomb Game**

T: Everybody. 1-2-3 -

SS: What’s your favorite class?

T: Try again.

SS: What’s his favorite class?

S1: His favorite class is PE.

T: Everybody, together, one, two, three.

SS: His favorite class is PE.
Apart from this kind of exercise, students almost always used the L1, especially with each other (e.g., SO2, SO6).

7.2.8 Critical Incidents in the Process of Development and Change in Cognitions and Practice

Like Mia, Sami found teaching rewarding and was committed to self-directed development. As an experienced language teacher, she reflected on this process, saying, “My teaching style … is different from past years … I’m getting that kind of know-how [and] changing little by little” (SI7.3: 6-7). Further, her commitment to improve seemed normative, as she added,

Also I think I need to change myself, because of the feedback, or from my experience, I need to give effort to change my style to a better way.

(SI7.3: 7)

An example of change came from her approach to using TL in class.

During her first two years, Sami used English exclusively, pretending not to understand Korean. Following the curriculum guidelines and advice from teacher trainers, she believed “that students should be exposed to an English environment” (SI5: 118). In some ways it was successful, she recalled, such as getting students to use English with her outside of class, but it “was really tough” and she “felt totally exhausted” (SI5: 120).

Moreover, she realized that exclusive TL use did not benefit the “low achievers” (SI5: 118). She saw that “teaching English in English, only TEE, is not a good idea” (SI5: 120). This experience changed her beliefs about ELT and she realized the exclusive use of English did not seem to help students who were already behind.

It seems important to emphasize Sami’s process for coming to this conclusion. Her beliefs changed through tensions with a curricular recommendation (D. Freeman, 1993), but this change was not mediated by coursework or in-service training, rather it was though her personal experiences with the practice of TETE. Her discovery concurs with research on TETE (Kang, 2008), and with the knowledge of the younger participants who were taught effective times for code-switching in pre-service coursework (Chapter 8). These findings are revisited in Chapters 9 and 10.
It should be noted, however, that her changing beliefs about language use was retrospective. As the most experienced English teacher, Sami had less dramatic incidents influencing cognitions and practices than other participants, but there was one change that seemed important because of her success motivating students to practice English at home.

7.2.8.1 “Yeah, I saw that. I need to lure them to the English sea”.

In the past Sami did not give out homework because she thought that students were (1) too young and (2) already getting too much from hagwon (SI6). This year she gave a small assignment most weeks because she wanted to give extra TL practice, especially for the lower-level students. Students had a 16 unit workbook and they self-evaluated their progress, choosing a “fantastic” or “needs improvement” stamp. They also kept portfolios for activities and worksheets. After each unit they had to memorize a conversation and perform it for Sami before class. If successful, they received a coupon and a stamp next to the lesson number. These methods led to the most student TL use occurring outside the classroom during the study.

Sami described narrowing “the level gaps” as “the biggest problem that I have” (SI4: 89), and a critical incident in addressing this problem came from adapting her coupon reward system for checking writing and speaking assignments. After assigning the workbook on a Thursday, she said,

And you know what happened? … On Monday some of the students brought me their writing book. They had done it [all]! … They said … just I only thought about coupons. (SI9: 10-11)

During level checks students were “really enthusiastic to have a conversation in front of me,” and she said, “so they are really motivated … I think I’m really clever. (laughter)” (SI1.1: 74).

Those students were already more advanced learners, but the system seemed to be having an influence with other classmates watching peers earn rewards.

Sami described modest success with two low-level students, saying, usually “they opted to stay in their seats. They don’t want to come up here … but yesterday … they came up voluntarily and they tried to do something” (SI7.3: 2).

Sami helped them, instructing them to repeat as they read the dialogue together. She continued, saying,

And when they finished … I gave them a sticker, but nobody complained about
it … so I thought it was really successful. I saw the delighted or joyful face when they got the sticker. Maybe it encouraged them, ‘I can do it. I can speak English,’ even though it was really short. Yeah, I saw that. I need to encourage them, lure them to the English sea. (SI7.3: 2)

Sami said, “That was the most important thing to me for solving kind of a problem with the slow learners” (SI4: 92). Her success might have implications for pedagogy in Korean primary schools since the other participants struggled with getting students to practice English at home.

7.2.8.2 This research is “encouraging me to be a better teacher”.

In closing Sami’s case, there is an important influence to discuss, that is, how she viewed the research process and the influence of it on her practices. Sami was known as an expert language teacher in the area. She was on hiring committees for teachers in the province, assessing applicants’ English ability and teaching demonstrations. During the year, she opened her classes to local teachers who wanted to learn from her. However, despite her relative experience compared to these peers, it became apparent how much Sami also desired to improve as an English teacher, and she saw participating in research as a means to do so.

Early on it was evident that the research process was influencing her approach. For example, after answering questions about an observation, she said,

The most difficult question was, ‘What would I change in the same class for the future, for next time?’ As I told you, there was no relation between the first activity and the second activity. So if I have the same situation – hmmm, so you know [with that textbook activity] they listened and then circled the right answer but I have to study about it - how can I make them more active during these activities. (SI1.2: 128)

I clarified my role as an observer (see Chapter 5), but Sami frequently asked for advice, for example, regarding the scenario above, asking, “Can you give me any ideas about that?” (SI1.2: 129).

My influence was more obvious with Sami than the others; in fact, she was explicit about it at times, for example, saying,

I need to think about what is an efficient way to teach this. What is today’s topic? What is today’s target language? What is a really good activity? You know, Ian, after meeting [with] you [last week], I tried to make students really
active and I decided to give them a chance at least once or more than one activity that they can be really verbally active. I decided to make that a segment in my class. (SI2: 44)

By being there asking questions I was causing Sami to reconsider her practices.

Sami expressed how this facilitated change, saying, it is “encouraging me to be a better teacher” (SI4: 111). She explained:

You know, the first time I felt it was kind of a burden because I had to open my class to you, even to a native speaker … but these days I feel like I’m showing my class to you I got kind of something from it. I’m trying to improve my class and I’m trying to make my class better. (SI4: 108)

For example, in the first month, she said, “I think it is really important to reduce teacher talk … I need to maximize the students’ talk” (SI2: 46).

Sami expressed openness to change, but she simultaneously resisted teaching more communicatively (see also E.-J. Kim, 2010). As she explained,

I’d like to give them a chance for an authentic situation, like use real English.
But I have an excuse because of the lack of time and also the number of students. (SI6: 53)

Despite her experience, Sami seemed to be getting by week-by-week, as the other participants did, having ongoing challenges with time-management, large classes, level gaps, and behavior.

7.2.9 Commitment to English Teaching

Sami continued teaching English in 2014-2015. As she requested, we had a debriefing after the data collection period where I discussed my observations in terms of what I saw regarding activity types and interactions that occurred and gave my opinions about what I felt were her strengths and weaknesses. One specific suggestion regarded the use of classroom English, and the amount of interaction it could stimulate, an observation based on Mia’s case. After member checking something else, Sami mentioned that she began teaching classroom English and strove for more student-centeredness in her classes (email 5/6/2014). After her yearly evaluation, she contacted me, writing, “I received positive reviews. Thanks to your observation, feedback and good tips” (email 31/3/2014). She forwarded me evaluations from parents with comments such as, “It was better than a hagwon, useful and interactive, students used
only English, every student had a chance to participate, and finally good evidence that public English education can work” (email 31/3/14).

I mention these examples not as evidence of the effectiveness of research participation for professional development, rather as evidence of Sami’s commitment to her profession. The relevance of this exposition lies in the fact that the following school year (2015-2016) Sami applied to return to homeroom teaching. Her principal assigned to teach English again in 2015-2016, but Sami was adamant that she would return to HRT the following year. Her decision highlights a systemic issue for the selection and rotation of primary school English teachers in Korea (see Chapters 9 & 10). As in Mia’s case above, ELT expertise will be lost in her region when an experienced English teacher returns to homeroom teaching.

7.2.10 Case Summary: Sami

Sami started learning English as a child, found encouragement from a neighbor, and was ahead of most classmates when English classes began in middle school. Unsatisfied with results, Sami wanted to improve, committing to have the best scores in high school. She became the top English student, motivated by the recognition. However, she described her English classes as boring and ineffective, having no relation to her teaching (cf. Lortie, 1975).

As an adult, Sami recommitted to studying English. Determined to overcome a personal crisis, she recalled her interest in English as a child. Learning English became a form of self-actualization, providing means of expression generally avoided in her L1 as she was able to discuss social issues and share ideas with people of different status. Moreover, knowing English provided an opportunity in the workplace to develop as an English learner and teacher.

Sami became a teacher on advice of her homeroom teacher, recognizing this as the “crucial moment.” After teaching for 14 years, she decided to teach English, a choice coinciding with her renewed language learning. During her first year, she wanted to improve and was accepted to the INSET course (see Chapter 2) saying it was the “turning point”. Sami alternated between HRT and ELT: First missing the relationships with students, she returned to HRT, and then missing English, she returned to ELT (see Chapter 9 for discussion of this issue).

Like Mia, Sami’s approach to language teaching was based on her prior HRT
experience. She saw herself as a “mom at school”, emphasizing the importance of rapport and building relationships, especially with troublemakers. She was enthusiastic and energetic in class. Believing language learning needed to be fun, she entertained students and often moved quickly from one activity to the next.

Based on earlier experience exclusively using only English in class, she realized this was not ideal and changed her practice, code-switching to Korean in order to keep low-level students engaged. Through a coupon reward system, Sami promoted more TL practice outside class than other teachers, and she realized its effectiveness for motivating students.

Although she incorporated more learner-centered activities in later observations, she generally controlled the procedures through teacher-talk. Her language use provided comprehensible input, but few students used English with her and there were limited opportunities for authentic communication, especially between students.

Sami was known as an expert English teacher and other KETs sought her advice during the study. However, it was clear that Sami herself was eager to improve, seeing participating in research as a means of development.

In the debriefing period, Sami was eager to hear my opinions of her practices and I discussed my observations with her. The next year, Sami reported incorporating changes, such as teaching classroom English and planning more cooperative activities, and evaluators commented positively on these features of her classes. Sami’s experience as a participant has implications for the direction in-service training in Korea; however, a more urgent implication involves the selection of primary schools and the systemic loss of language teaching expertise as Sami would later chose to return to homeroom teaching (see 9.1).
CHAPTER 8: CASE STUDIES OF TWO NOVICE KOREAN ENGLISH TEACHERS (STUDY 2, PART II)

This is the second and final part of Study 2. This chapter includes two case studies, one with a second-year primary teacher who was teaching English for the first time (Eunjeong), and one with a first-year primary teacher also teaching English for the first time (Yuna). The format follows the sequences of the previous chapter, first with a look at the second-year teacher, Eunjeong.

8.1 Eunjeong (Second Year Teacher, First Year English Teacher)

Eunjeong was from a middle-class family in a large metropolitan city. Born in the late 1980s, her generation was the first to have English in Grade 3. She entered the profession following her mother’s advice, starting as a substitute in 2011, then taught sixth grade during the 2012-2013 school year, her first full year. 2013-2014 was her first year teaching English. She majored in Elementary Education with a specialty in ethics education.

8.1.1 Critical Incidents in Language Learning

Eunjeong began learning English as a child, enrolled in private classes by her parents. Growing up in an affluent neighborhood, she said, there were “so many hagwons [sic] and parents think studying is important [so] my daughter has to go, that’s why” (EI2: 49). Eunjeong enjoyed studying at the hagwon. One reason was her NEST; she said, “It was the first time to see a foreigner. I thought shingihada ‘amazing’” (EI2: 29). Like Yuna below, Eunjeong’s parents hired a home tutor. Eunjeong described the differences between her hagwon and her tutor, saying,

One is a real academy, there is a native speaker teacher and there’s conversation and talking, and the other is a private teacher doing worksheets and books … I have to record what I learned and every morning she called me at 7:00 or 7:30 … I hated it very much. (EI9.1: 51-52)

Nevertheless, Eunjeong became one of the top English students in her public school classes. In high school she quit hagwon classes to prepare for the CSAT, opting
for Megastudy lectures online, saying, “The teacher is the best in Korea but the hagwon teacher is [only] the best in my neighborhood ((laughter))” (JE2: 68). In teachers’ college she took a few classes but wished that she had more opportunities to learn English.

### 8.1.2 Critical Incidents in Becoming a Teacher

Eunjeong’s mother urged her to become a teacher, saying, “When I was young, my mother always said to me, ‘You are being teacher’ because it was her dream [for herself]” (ENF1). Eunjeong explained her mother’s reasoning, saying, “because she thinks teacher is a good job for women because you can be happy and … stable” (EI1: 28).

However, Eunjeong never seriously considered teaching until having to choose a university, saying, “When I was a high school student I didn’t want to be a teacher” (EI1: 16). She wanted to work in the airline industry, but her CSAT score indicated that it was unlikely she would be accepted to a good program. Instead, Eunjeong decided that she wanted to attend a national university. When she got her CSAT results, she noticed that her CSAT “score was similar with National University of Education and I choose that” (ENF1). Her decision reflected the lack of options that high school students face. The stringent university application process determines the programs that students may apply to (see Chapter 2; see also Mia in 7.1.2).

### 8.1.3 How Eunjeong Became an English Teacher

Eunjeong started her career by replacing a male fifth grade teacher reporting for mandatory military service (EI1). The next year she was assigned to sixth grade. In 2013-2014, her principal asked her if she was interested in teaching English. She then volunteered, saying, “because I think I had to do that because I’m the youngest teacher in our school” (EI1: 130). This decision was reinforced by the many behavioral issues the year before: “Sixth grade students are famous for trouble so I don’t want to do it again” (EI1: 136). Eunjeong felt “nervous but excited” (EI1: 154) about teaching English.
8.1.4 Eunjeong’s Teaching Setting

Eunjeong taught at an inner-city school smaller than the others in the study. There were about 400 students, with class sizes averaging 24 students per class. Like Sami’s classroom, her classroom was a remodeled space, part of the school’s English Zone. She taught two sections of Grade 3 and 4 English who came twice a week for 40 minutes.

Students were mixed level although they tended towards being lower-proficiency. Many students in both grades could not read or write the alphabet and students in this area generally received much less private education than in middle class areas (cf. Sami in 7.2).

In addition to teaching English, Eunjeong was assigned many duties. She taught art for Grades 3-6. She was responsible for all English paperwork, textbook selection, and oversaw speaking and singing competitions and a student art exhibition. In addition, she did the computer paperwork and supervised a computer class on Saturdays. These duties came into her decision-making process for continuing ELT and are discussed at the end of her case study.

Unlike the others, Eunjeong taught all classes with her NEST co-teacher, Mike. Eunjeong was responsible for planning but delegated portions to him if needed (EI3). Mike had a TESOL certificate and three years’ experience in Korea.

Most materials for class came from the assigned textbooks, YBM’s Elementary School English 3 and 4, supplemented with teacher’s guides and multi-media CDs. She often prepared worksheets and presentations herself, used activities from indischool.com, and got ideas from Mike and the Korean English instructor at the school.

8.1.5 Themes in Stated Cognitions about ELT

Eunjeong was a concerned and empathetic teacher, who considered the future outcomes of her students, saying,

I’m worried about some students. … There are some students who can’t write the alphabet, who can’t read. If they getting be high school and middle school students they have to quit. That’s my biggest worry. (EI2: 91)

Teaching in a lower socioeconomic area, she felt extra responsibility for teaching effectively, saying,
I think they don’t study and they don’t practice writing because our school students - they don’t go to any hagwons and they don’t study at home so I think they have to practice at school. In this class I have to give them the opportunity.

(EI7: 6)

One example of this responsibility in action came from tutoring low-level students after school (EI3).

Like the others, Eunjeong’s words suggested the primacy of rapport, saying, “I think relationship with students … is the most important as a teacher” (EI3: 92). She found affirmation from the “energy of students”, saying “if they like that, I like it, … and the results of class - [if] they do well in class, I feel good” (EI5: 79).

Like Sami, she believed that fun activities were motivating, saying, “because they have to think, ‘I want to learn this.’ The mind is the most important” (EI2: 97).

She added,

They think doing games is not studying … so they like that. They want to participate … It is the most important students want to participate in the class.

(EI9.2: 7-11)

This suggested beliefs in the importance of intrinsic motivation and the role of games in stimulating that. Like Mia, however, Eunjeong downplayed the importance of competition, saying, “Every time before class I said that winning is not important, review[ing] is more important … several times I have to say [that]” (EI10: 29).

Eunjeong was uncertain about writing instruction. She was frustrated that students were not able to learn vocabulary. She developed strategies for direct instruction, saying,

So I think why don’t they write well … I think the reason is they can’t read. The reason they can’t read is they don’t know the phonics so I think at the start of the lesson [unit] I will do a phonics song and I have to explain about the words, how to read, how to write. (EI7: 5)

Through experience she seemed to be developing beliefs about an order of acquisition in language learning, even though her timeframe for it was ambitious.

Like Sami, Eunjeong followed PPP methods. As with phonics and reading, CIL interviews revealed implicit beliefs about the effectiveness of explicit instruction. For example, the most helpful incidents tended to come from presentation and practice phases, that is, the exercises bridging to CAs (Appendix Q). She explained:
They have to know the target language and key expressions. So I have to teach
that and practice with them … before activities, before conversation they have
to know … what that means and where the conversation used. (EI9.2: 13)

Her adaptation of PPP methods seemed to be influenced by concern for students,
knowing that most students only had her English class to study (EI7).

Eunjeong believed authentic practice was also important. For example, she
appropriately described the effectiveness of an information gap, saying, “They can
speak each other. It was like real, not practice” (EI4: 47). However, adapting CAs
remained challenging, particularly because of the low-level students, who she doubted
would be able to participate.

Uncertainty was a theme for all the teachers. For Eunjeong it was particularly
evident in her assessment of student vocabulary uptake. The first semester students had
trouble remembering the words. She said,

It was too difficult for me. It took so much time … It worked for a moment but
the next day they forgot. - I don’t know why they don’t remember. Because I
[could] remember very well, why couldn’t they? Why? (EI3: 82)

Her strategies for teaching vocabulary are expanded on below and this theme is
discussed further in Chapter 9.

8.1.6 Stated Influences from the Four Phases of Teacher Experience on
Eunjeong’s Cognitions and Practices

As a young teacher starting school after curricular revisions, Eunjeong
experienced the changing education system; however, she still had opinions about
secondary ELT that were similar to those of the older teachers. Notably, Eunjeong’s
experience in teacher’s college was described much more positively than the older
teachers.

8.1.6.1 Phase 1: English needs to be fun not boring.

In Chapter 6, Eunjeong was one of the few teachers to have positive experiences
learning English in public schools. She wrote, “Every day I felt fun! I enjoyed that.
Many activities, chants, songs - similar with now”; however, she emphasized, “BUT
ONLY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL WAS” (ENF2). She felt bad for classmates who
gave up studying English in secondary school. She wanted to be different, saying,
I think English class always has to [be] fun and students think [it’s] exciting and they have to think ‘I like to learn English.’ That’s because in middle school and high school class English was always boring but I want to [make sure] my class isn’t like that. (E2:78)

Furthermore, she was influenced by thinking “speaking is the most important,” adding, Because I have learned English for 20 years … but I don’t think, I don’t speak very well. 20 years I studied but the result is not very good. … That’s why education has to change, I think. (EI2: 81)

8.1.6.2 Phase 2: “Most courses are very helpful and useful.”

Compared to Mia and Sami, Eunjeong’s pre-service experience reflected improvements to National University of Education curricula (see Moodie & Nam, forthcoming). She wrote,

Most courses are very helpful and useful. It is related with curriculum of elementary school, how to teach them, and methods, theory … all is related with education. (ENF3)

For ELT in particular she found “the most helpful things are practice classroom English and demonstrations and professor feedback about it” (ENF3).

Her practicum became a source of practical knowledge, particularly the tutelage from her mentor teacher. Describing what was helpful, she said,

Everything, because … I went to his class … and he explained how to do things, when you meet parents of students, when you have trouble in school, when you teach, when the students fight and … everything about the class (EI1: 124)

Interestingly, she contrasted this practical knowledge with her coursework, saying,

Professors didn’t say like that, but he was a real teacher in the classroom. It was really helpful. I thought when I will be a teacher I will do that. … I learned very much. (EI1:124)

Some acquired practices included signaling (to start class and activities), managing lesson procedures, and classroom management strategies like a reward system (EI3).

Although Eunjeong did not think about teaching before enrolling, in university she discovered her interest in the profession, saying, teaching “is the job which I can feel happiness! I realized that when I was university student” (ENF1).
8.1.6.3 Phase 3: Adapting practical knowledge.
Eunjeong explained how her prior HRT experience prepared her for language teaching, saying,
If I teach English the first time, it will be confusing, because I don’t know how to treat students or how to do many activities. So I did last year and the year before [as a substitute] so I know it. I can use my experience now. (EI3:19)
This practical knowledge from HRT gave her ideas for managing classrooms, designing tests, adapting materials, and deeper knowledge about the needs of PS students (EI3).

8.1.6.4 Phase 4: In-service ELT training.
Eunjeong had taken an online TEE course the year before and could not recall anything influential about it (EI8). In 2013-2014 she attended two 60-hour TEE courses. One was during the summer. I should mention that as noted in Chapter 5, I had taught a portion of this TEE course. This included about 10 hours with Eunjeong in a class that focused on how to sequence communicative activities. The principles that were discussed, demonstrated, and reinforced through peer-teaching sessions were evident in her observations, and she did mention that the course reinforced the importance of opening sequences for introducing activities. I believe Eunjeong was genuine; however, I cannot be sure if she was saying this knowing I was a stakeholder in the course. She did not have many positive things to say about other portions of this TEE course, but she was reluctant to criticize it. She took a second TEE course during the winter at the English Village (see also Mia 7.1.6.4). Eunjeong criticized this course during a member check, saying that she did not learn anything useful there. 180 hours of formal in-service training seemed to have minimal impact on her cognitions and practices (see 9.3 for discussion of these findings).

8.1.7 Summary of Observations
There were four observations with two Grade 4 classes. In this summary, I describe the three observations from Class 4-2 occurring at the middle and end of Unit 9 and the beginning of Unit 10. The instructional sequences are summarized in Table 8.1 below. This bounded case study focuses on Eunjeong (see Chapter 3 for rationale), but all classes were co-taught with Mike.
Eunjeong and Mike had good rapport and seemed to enjoy teaching together. They were relaxed, confident, and casual during class (EOR1). Classes were generally
teacher-centered, and although they included a fair amount of teacher-student interaction, this was almost always done as a full class and there were few opportunities for student interaction or spontaneous TL use. They were enthusiastic and encouraging during class and they included many pictures and animations that seemed to interest students.

Table 8-1 Eunjeong’s Observation Report Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lesson Title</th>
<th>How Much Is?</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eunjeong's Observation Report Summary</td>
<td>TT</td>
<td>SS ends at end of day</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class Sequence</th>
<th>Focus</th>
<th>Minutes</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Skill Focus</th>
<th>Grouping</th>
<th>Interaction (Language)</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Class plan</td>
<td>TT (K)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Greetings, weather, date</td>
<td>TT (K)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. PPP vocab. Vocabulary</td>
<td>LS, E</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Greetings, weather, date</td>
<td>TT (K)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I Can Do It, p. 102</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Present and practice for Role Play</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Demonstration</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Note: Coding abbreviations appear in Appendix P. Full-page displays of these tables are reproduced in Appendix R)

8.1.7.1 Class sequences.

Each class began a little differently but generally followed PPP methods with a series of exercises leading to longer activities. In EO2, students sang along to a catchy alphabet song as they entered class. She greeted the students, mentioned the lesson plan, and reviewed key expressions from Unit 9. In EO3, Eunjeong described the class plan, drawing students’ attention to desks set up at the back of class for a shopping role play. After this, she greeted the class, elicited the weather and the date, and began the lesson. EO4 began with greetings followed by a schema-building exercise where students described a friend in the L1.

Eunjeong and Mike took turns leading activities. Mike modeled the TL and led most of the speaking and listening activities, whereas Eunjeong led the reading and writing activities. Time management seemed to be an occasional issue. Some activities ended abruptly and two classes did not have clear middle and ending phases. However,
it seemed that the students were familiar with the routines and activity types and Eunjeong mentioned that she was making efforts to improve her instructional routines after observing another teacher (EI5).

8.1.7.2 Classroom management.

Eunjeong adapted HRT practices for managing class. For example, her reward system included giving stamps for correct answers or winning games. After seven stamps students received candy. She adapted the look-look-look chant (see Sami in 7.2) from her mentor teacher, using it often to draw attention if classes were noisy or to make a teaching point. Like Mia, she made simple rules for class: “Don’t be late. Don’t make noise. Don’t fight. Bring your English textbook and notebook. Bring your pencil” (EI1: 160).

Notably, behavioral issues were less evident in Class 4-2 than in Class 4-1 or in other schools. Eunjeong attributed this to the “homeroom teacher’s effect,” saying their HRT “is a little bit strict” (EI5: 59-61). There also seemed to be other factors, for example, students were younger and in smaller classes than in other schools, there were always two teachers monitoring, and most activities were teacher-centered, as described below.

8.1.7.3 Analysis of classroom activities.

Over these three classes, there were 11 form-focused language exercises, two meaning-focused communicative activities, one song, and a spelling quiz. Just under half of the activities came from the textbook and the others were adapted from indischool.com or made by the teachers. The language exercises took roughly half of total class time (58 of 120 minutes). Most exercises included listening and repeating or pattern drills and nearly all were done as a full class. The two communicative activities, done at the end of the second and third class took roughly 12 and 18 minutes, respectively. The first was a role play where students took turns as shopkeepers and shoppers. First, the teachers presented TL for the role play and practiced with students for ten minutes, then they did a short demonstration before the students began. The role play was well organized. All students had equal opportunities to practice as both sellers and shoppers; however, not many students used only English and it got a little noisy. Half way through Eunjeong stopped the activity and had them return to their seats to change roles and urged them to be quieter; the students seemed eager to continue. She
ended with a review of the target conversation and vocabulary and encouraged students, saying that they would now be able to shop in English (EOR2).

However, this activity was the only activity including student-student interaction observed. Although students had many opportunities to practice speaking through choral response, there was no pair or group work and no collaborative activities or tasks in these lessons.

8.1.7.4 Language use and interaction.

Eunjeong used L1 mostly, generally only code-switching to include key expressions or vocabulary from the textbook. Korean was used as metalanguage, giving instructions, eliciting TL, translating, and for classroom management. However, time was usually allotted for Mike to explain and demonstrate in English, which he did effectively. During activities, Mike and Eunjeong often walked up and down the aisles complementing, encouraging, and helping students.

TL interaction in class generally occurred only between the teachers and the full class. During observations only the shopping role play (see above) allowed for student-student interaction. Other than this, there were no instances of students speaking English to each other. There were many controlled speaking activities such as pattern drills and close-ended teacher questioning. Occasionally some students asked Mike questions in English, but they almost always spoke in Korean to Eunjeong.

Mike used classroom English expressions frequently but Eunjeong rarely did. Part of the reason for her nearly exclusive L1 use was that she shared her classes with Mike whom she felt could model the expressions and communicate with students in the TL (EI5). However, her beliefs about language evolved during the year, particularly after observing other teachers. She started using more classroom English halfway through the second semester; this important development is described in the next section.

8.1.8 Critical Incidents in the Process of Change on Cognitions and Practices

Eunjeong enjoyed teaching English and was committed to improving, often planning late into the night. As a first-year KET she was cognizant of her inexperience and sometimes questioned the effectiveness of her practices. When asked about how she changed, she said,
I don’t realize change because it is my first time to teach English. That’s why every lesson, every time I change a little because I don’t know what is the best method teaching English, so always I think I have to change, change, change to find out the best way. However, I can’t tell you it was changed. It’s very difficult. I don’t know. (EI10: 35)

A salient example of her uncertainty of ELT methods and changing “a little” came from her frustrations over student uptake of vocabulary. She adapted many strategies and describing the process, she began saying,

I thought lots of writing is useful for them. First semester I did a lot but it’s not useful. Even though they write it 20 times, 30 times, they don’t remember. I wanted to change the method. I quit that. (EI3: 63)

She tried giving homework and have students come to practice after school, “but it was too difficult to me. It took so much time … It worked for a moment. But the next day they forgot” (EI3: 82). She tried to motivate them through testing but the “result was not good ((laughs)) - [it was] terrible,” she said (EI3: 48).

Eventually she adapted the Telepathy Game to practice writing vocabulary. This game from indischool.com included a presentation file and each slide had a picture of two target words. Students had to guess the one Eunjeong was thinking about. When she clicked the mouse, her selection was revealed and students received a point if they were correct. During the Telepathy Game, she instructed students to write their selections three times for each slide. After the game they did a follow-up writing exercise where the class copied out the words seven more times and students willingly did so, with most completing the 100 words in the allotted time (EO2). The following class included a spelling quiz and Eunjeong found the results were “better than before” (EI7: 11).

This adaptation was a practical solution to an ongoing concern. However, this process illuminated Eunjeong’s uncertainties regarding the disciplinary knowledge of SLA, namely, the complexities of vocabulary acquisition in this example. Despite having 120 hours of in-service SLTE during the year, she did not have opportunities to find mentorship on this issue that could have given her a better understanding of why her students were struggling with vocabulary and different instructional methods that she could have used (see Chapter 9).

Although Eunjeong did not feel she changed a lot, there was an important development occurring that aligned her practices with a major curricular policy,
namely, using English as the medium of instruction. Critical incidents in this process are described below.

8.1.8.1 Emerging beliefs about TL instruction: Seeing is believing.

Eunjeong believed she should be using English and she thought she was able to do so, saying, “I think I can do [it]. … not perfectly, but a little bit I can do, but now I don’t” (EI5: 97). In the first semester Eunjeong taught exclusively in L1, in fact bringing it up as a concern before agreeing to participate.

Her avoidance of TL instruction seemed driven by three primary reasons. First, because she taught with Mike, she believed it was his role, saying, “That’s why the native speakers are in English class” (EI5: 99). Second, she had concerns about her own L2 proficiency, particularly about pronunciation (ECIL2). Third, she did not believe it was suitable for her teaching context, saying, in “our school 100% teaching English in English is impossible” (EI5: 93). She thought it would be demotivating “because they can’t understand. They will forget. They will drop English. They will quit, lose interest, think English is too difficult” (EI5: 95).

During the second semester her beliefs began to change. Eunjeong explained what happened, writing, “I saw another teacher’s English class this Tuesday. It was the first time to saw that. … I want to speak classroom English more” (ECIL5).

After observing this teacher, she saw that teaching English through English could be done. However, she resisted change, writing, “But I didn’t. I will try next time” (EJCIL5). It was difficult to change her “habit” (EI5: 101), but her changing beliefs eventually led to changes in practice, as evidenced in the following excerpt from the fourth observation:

**Excerpt 1: Eunjeong Teaching English through English**

Activity: Hooray 1, a listen and draw activity from the textbook.

Procedures: Students listen to instructions and draw the monsters on the page.

((Mike (NS) begins the activity by describing the first monster while Eunjeong (T) helps out. They switch roles for the second monster))

T: first. It has -. It has - two - blue eyes. two - blue - eyes.
two - blue
eyes
eyes - ((confirmation check)) two - blue eyes . ((she draws on the board as she speaks))
It has four green arms. four - green - arms
four green arms
nuga halkaeyo –
‘Who will do it?’ –
((five students raise their hands and she selects S1)).
it has eight legs.
color?
it has eight red legs.
eight - eight
okay. Mike teacher?
noses. It - has - four - purple - noses.
it has four - purple bora saek ‘purple’ noses ((points to nose))
((one student raises hand with 4 fingers to confirm))
four - purple - noses
octopus
((laughter))

Close your English books and close your notebooks. Stand up.
insa ‘salutations’
bye bye
((students exit))
EO3: 44-109
In this class, she used clear signaling to end the activity and exemplified clearer sequencing than other lessons, showing her development of instructional routines and conformance to TL instruction (EO3, EO4).

A few weeks later she observed a second teacher in a rural area, where like her own school, students “can’t go to any hagwon” (EI9.1: 18). She explained what happened, saying, “there was no native speaker teacher only a Korean teacher … and the best surprised thing is all students in that class used English” (EI9.1: 6). She continued, saying,

I was shocked. I thought that before watching that it is impossible, because in my class students only use, mwolago ‘what do you say’, target language - key expressions and target language, but in that school, really, every student … used only English. (EI9.1: 6)

This observation stimulated reflection on her teaching. She said,

I regret. ((laughter)) I think it’s a chance of thinking of my class now. I thought that it is impossible before seeing that, it is impossible, how can they speak English, only English, I thought that is impossible but, ah, I see that. (EI9.1: 10)

Although she did not teach students classroom English during the study, she said, “If I am an English teacher next year it is possible for me” (EI9.1: 24). After watching teachers in similar contexts, her beliefs and practices changed, aligning more with the curricular guidelines for TETE.

8.1.9 Commitment to Teaching English: The Burden of Extra Duties

Eunjeong decided to continue teaching English, but she strongly considered returning to HRT. Her decision-making centered on the burden of extra duties, a frequently occurring theme for all participants. For example in her CIL, she wrote that the biggest problem was “not enough time to prepare. I always say that. But it is real” (EJCIL5). Two weeks later she had to organize a student art exhibition and she wrote, “This week I really have no time to prepare” (ECIL7).

At the end of the year, teachers can request grades and subjects on an application form. As in Eunjeong’s school, often teacher committees in the school use these forms to recommend grade assignments for the following year to the principal. Eunjeong described her decision, saying,
It is very complex problem because not think about English or homeroom teacher I have to think about my [extra] work. … Duties is the biggest problem. … I have to think about that more. (EJ9.1: 49-51).

In the end, Eunjeong agreed to teach English again, but with no art classes.

8.1.10 Case Summary: Eunjeong

Eunjeong started learning English in the third grade and received private education in the many hagwon opening in her neighborhood at the time. She enjoyed learning English, particularly interacting with NESTs. In high school she focused on CSAT preparation, giving up communicative private education in favor of online lectures. Her mother wanted her to be a teacher but Eunjeong resisted this until receiving feedback from exams showing she was a suitable applicant for teacher’s college. It was in university that Eunjeong realized teaching was a profession where she could feel happiness.

She began her career substituting for a fifth grade HRT on military duty in 2011, then the following year was assigned to sixth grade. Wanting to avoid sixth grade again, Eunjeong agreed to teach English and art.

Like the older teachers, Eunjeong wanted to teach differently from how she learned English in secondary school, believing that language learning needed to be fun. Unlike Sami and Mia, however, she found her pre-service training prepared her well for ELT, particularly receiving feedback about activity sequencing after peer-teaching demonstrations. In her practicum, she learned signaling to start class and activities, how to organize procedures, and a reward system. This practical knowledge was reinforced in her HRT experience, where she further developed strategies for managing classrooms, adapting materials, and testing.

Although she had taken two TEE courses, she used L1 exclusively at first, but gradually included more TL instruction after seeing a “famous” local teacher’s class where all interaction was in English. Despite 120 hours of in-service ELT training the past year, the biggest influence on her cognitions and practices came from observing two experienced teachers for 40 minutes each.
8.2 Yuna (First Year Teacher, First Year English Teacher)

Yuna grew up in a coastal city in South Gyeongsang Province. She had a private English tutor from a young age and began public school English in Grade 3. Like Eunjeong and Sami, Yuna did not seriously consider teaching until having to choose a university in high school. She began teacher’s college shortly after and graduated in 2012 with a degree in Elementary Education specializing in mathematics. The 2013-2014 school year was Yuna’s first as a full-time teacher but she had some experience as a substitute HRT the year before.

8.2.1 Critical Incidents in Language Learning

Yuna started learning English when she was six years old, much earlier than the other participants. Wanting her to succeed under the Early English Policy, Yuna’s parents hired a tutor and enrolled her in many hagwon during elementary school (YI1). Initially, she did not want to study, but she enjoyed learning English, saying, “I told my mom I want to go more … I wanted to go” (YI1:30).

Yuna remembered her tutor fondly saying, “I loved that teacher. She was really kind, but strict” (YI1: 9). She studied with the same tutor for about seven years and because of this she remembered that she could “understand the whole thing” (YI1: 20), meaning the English curriculum, adding, she “really helped me study English well” (YI1: 23). Yuna enjoyed English, saying, “I felt that English was so fun because I studied English by stories. … And I think I enjoyed learning something new” (YI1: 13). Her interest also grew from interacting with NESTs at her hagwon, saying it was “so sensational for me at that time” (YI1: 30).

Because of early success, like Sami, she was determined to remain a top English student throughout her schooling. She remembered feeling “proud of my English at that time because when I start, I start English faster than them [classmates]” (YI1: 19). In middle school, she had private classes with friends and was motivated by the competition (YI1: 51). However, like Eunjeong, Yuna stopped private English tutoring in high school to prepare for the CSAT (YI1).

8.2.2 Critical Incidents and Influences in Becoming a Teacher

As a child Yuna wanted an English related career, saying, “I loved English when I was young so I wanted to be something related to English” like a “translator
who works for the country beside the president” (YI1: 6). She described a critical incident. Yuna studied really hard in middle school and earned a TOEIC score over 800. It was high, but not high enough for her aims. As she explained:

I had some dreams but when … I had to do the TOEIC test … I realized I’m not *that* good in English. ((laughter)) There are so many people who can speak English more fluently than me. At that time I really hoped my TOEIC score was more higher than before but … it takes too long. … I changed my dream. (YI6: 6)

Further, she added, there was “too much pressure about English” (YI6: 7), and she became uncertain about her future, mentioning, “I didn’t know what I want to do” (YI6: 9).

Like other participants a critical moment came during high school when she had to choose a university. Influenced by parents and teachers, she decided to apply to teacher’s college. In high school Yuna wanted to be a secondary teacher. Her father was supportive of this decision, but her mother convinced her otherwise. Yuna said,

High school teachers have to spend more time in school and middle school students are tricky. ((laughter)) Do you know what I mean? ((laughter)) So my mother told me elementary school teacher will be better to me. (YI6: 23)

On reflection Yuna said, “My mother was absolutely right!” (YI6: 25).

One strategy Yuna had to consider, however, was which university to apply to. Her first choice was Seoul National University of Education but she was not certain that she would be accepted. After considering her chances, she chose to apply to a less competitive university of education closer to home. Her prospects of finding work were also better in this area, which is why she ended up teaching in North Gyeongsang Province rather than her home province (YII).

Yuna specialized in mathematics, remembering that it was “because of my math teacher in high school … I liked that teacher and my math score was increased at that time … so I chose math” (YI1: 60). She earned 96% on her CSAT math exam, remembering that friends often asked her for help in the subject (YI6).

**8.2.3 How Yuna Became an English Teacher**

Yuna was assigned as a full-time English teacher in April. Like Eunjeong, she began her career replacing a male teacher reporting for mandatory two-year military
service. As one of 70 teachers passing the provincial exam, she knew she would get a placement somewhere and waited for notice from the education office. Yuna wanted and expected to be a homeroom teacher. She was surprised to be assigned to English, saying, “I didn’t expect that” (YI2.1: 42). She said that she “was confused” because the school told “me the fact that I’m an English teacher only 4-5 days before I go to work. I always dream[t] about my first homeroom” (email 14/4/2014). She only had a few days to move to a new city and prepare; however, she was excited to begin her career (YFN1).

The following sections were generated from data collected during her second semester as a full-time teacher.

8.2.4 Yuna’s Teaching Setting

Yuna taught fifth grade English at the same school as Mia. Like Mia, she had a normal classroom, not the special English Zone rooms that Sami and Eunjeong had.

Her classroom was similar to Mia’s, but notably lacked the English posters and signs. There was a TV above her desk and a chalkboard at the front. Desks were arranged in groups of four, with two extras at the front for troublemakers. Students had assigned seating based on homeroom classes. There were colored magnets on the board used for her group point system and felt boards on the side wall, one where groups tallied their scores after class and one for her class reward system (see 8.2.7 below). Student projects were displayed on the back shelves.

Yuna taught all five sections of Grade 5 English, each section meeting three times a week for 40 minutes each time. There were 60 female and 65 male students, averaging 25 per class. Students were of mixed ability, but there were no high-proficiency students. One special needs student came with a teacher’s aide.

Her assigned textbook was Elementary School English 5 from Cheonjae Education (Ham et al., 2011) and she used blended-learning materials from the course CD-ROM most lessons. Supplementary activities came from computer files left from the previous teacher, activities from indischool.com, i-scream.co.kr, self-made handouts, presentations, and ideas from the NEST, Cathy.

Her class was down the hall from the fifth grade homeroom teachers and she was in contact with them regularly. She taught each section once per week with the
NEST Cathy and delegated some planning to her if needed. Because they were in different buildings, Yuna rarely saw Mia or the Korean English instructor, Sunny.

Yuna had fewer duties than the other participants but was in charge of after school programs for first and second grade.

8.2.5 Themes in Yuna’s Conceptions of Teaching English

As a novice teacher, Yuna expressed awareness of her inexperience and earnestness for professional development. For example, when asked about her teaching philosophy, she replied, “I’m making it now” (YI2.1: 32). Later, she said, “I don’t have a model yet but I think I have to make it” (YI3.1: 3-5). However, her personality came through in her lessons and she was confident, enthusiastic, and playful during class, saying, “I can’t hide it in front of students … that’s my personality” (YI3.1: 3).

Like the others, Yuna emphasized the importance of fun. She did not want to pressure students and she described her approach by saying, “I think my role is just they have fun with English and they have a lot of chance to be familiar with English” (YI2.1: 9). She described her rationale: “First, I think that my English class has to be active and I like to teach when students like to learn. I always try to make my class more active and fun” (YI5: 10). She continued, saying, “So in that way I mean a lot of games - and we often play games or songs and I can see all students are enjoying my class when we do games or songs, chants, so I often do that” (YI5: 10). Notably, Yuna also felt activities should be fun for herself, not just students (YI2.1; YI5).

A related theme was Yuna’s rejection of textbook activities, even communicative ones, for supplementary activities that were more entertaining. She said, “I found the textbook is not that fun for them and for me also” (YI2.1: 34). This topic, an important aspect of her development, is discussed towards the end of the chapter. Although she did not like the book, she felt it was important to follow the general syllabus it provided (YI7).

Similar to Eunjeong, Yuna described beliefs in a linear order to L2 development (YI2.1; YI5). She explained:

This one is my thought - I think listening and speaking skills should be first activities, not writing or reading. If they can hear, then they can speak what they heard and then reading and writing is the next one, I think. (YI5: 21)
She described how she thought “listening and talking is more important,” saying, “if they can talk English they can study writing or reading English themselves” (YI2.1: 23).

Yuna described her thoughts about teaching grammar: “I think they don’t have ideas about grammar yet … They don’t want to know that rules, I think. That makes students more confused” (YI5: 21). She continued, saying that “there is more important things than grammar,” for example, “speaking English in appropriate situations, conversational skills” (YI5: 22).

Although she expressed the importance of providing opportunities for meaningful communication (YI5), observation and CIL data suggested that there were very limited opportunities for meaningful TL practice in her classes, an issue expanded on below.

On a number of occasions, Yuna described the challenges of managing mixed-level students in class. One strategy she adapted involved focusing “on the middle part; not high, not low” (YI5: 16). Yuna said, “There are over 20 students in my class and I am not expecting all students are focusing on my class in all activities” (YI5: 14). She described how she praised the higher-level students and included them in activities; however, lower-proficiency students were a source of concern. She said, “I feel bad. I feel sorry for them … I want to be a help for them but I have no time to take care of them” (YI2.1: 60). Although she tutored lower-level students twice a week, she lamented that it was not enough (YI2.1). Her perceived lack of success with low-level students was a source of tensions described in closing her case (see 8.2.9).

8.2.6 Stated Influences from the Four Phases of Teacher Experience on Cognitions and Practices

Like Eunjeong, Yuna expressed uncertainty about the influence of prior experience. Nevertheless, she identified many links during interviews, beginning with her L2 learning experience.

8.2.6.1 Phase 1: “I can’t teach students like I learned English.”

After describing her language learning history, Yuna reflected on how it influenced her teaching, saying,

Ah, I’ve never thought about that but, yeah, but I can’t teach them - I can’t teach students like I learned English before because I don’t know how to teach like
my previous teachers taught to me. I know what I have to do but I cannot do it like that, I think. (YI2.1: 7)

Her saying “like that” referred to personalized education with private tutors (see above), and the feeling she could not emulate their instruction in the public school context. On a related point she believed that, like her, students required private education to attain fluency. Compared to her teaching she said,

One thing that I think, private tutoring is more influence for them, for students, because in this class there are too many students so there’s limits to be – to be fluent in English. There is a limited time. (YII: 110).

Yuna, aware of how much time and effort it took to attain her level of fluency, believed she did not have enough time to make a noticeable difference on student proficiency (YI7), and this influenced her feeling about her experience during the year (see below).

Like the other participants, she expressed the anti-apprenticeship of observation (cf. Lortie, 1975) and wanted to be different than the model of her public education. First, she described her experience saying, “English class was not that fun. We just learned grammar. We studied English for only tests” (YI1: 25). Later she reflected on her experience saying, “[the influence] would be ‘studying English has to be fun,’ I think” (YI2.1: 11). Although not stated, her language learning clearly influenced how she could teach. Wanting to be an example for students (YI2.1), she used the L2 extensively in class (see 8.2.7 below).

8.2.6.2 Phase 2: “It was very helpful.”

Similar to Eunjeong, Yuna found her pre-service education prepared her well for the classroom. She stated a number of SLTE influences including learning about policy, classroom English, and routines. Although she disliked memorizing policy, she said it was very helpful. As she explained:

I have no idea about teaching English before that class but they taught me, why do I have to give many chances to students to speak English, and why I have to teach English to them. That kind of thing very influenced me. (YII: 106)

Learning policy was complemented by practical coursework, in particular practicing TL instruction for class. In a classroom English course, students used official textbooks and teacher’s guides during peer-teaching sessions. Yuna thought that was helpful even though it was “hard for me [at] that time” (YII: 107). This class gave her ideas on how
to give instructions in English and compliment students, things frequently observed during lessons (see 8.2.7 below).

Like Eunjeong, Yuna found these demonstrations useful for learning routines, particularly because of the feedback. She explained:

My university experience is helpful for my class pattern, my class pace. I told you before … I had to do my class in front of all my friends … repeatedly … And the professor taught me, ‘This one is good for this,’ ‘This one will be better if you do this,’ like that, I think that was helpful for me to make my own class.

(YI3.1: 27)

Further, the practicum was influential. Yuna identified a number of things she learned from her mentor teacher including a reward system where student groups receive points collectively for participation and good behavior, signaling to start and end activities and getting attention from students, and beginning classes with singing (YI3.1). These ideas were evident during all four observations (see below).

8.2.6.3 Phase 3: Developing routines.

While pre-service education made the foundation, her prior experience helped further develop classroom routines. One point of emphasis in this phase was learning the importance of bringing attention to lesson objectives. Yuna said, “I think it’s important in every class they have to know … what is our object in today’s class” (YI3.1: 19). Appendix T includes an excerpt of how Yuna brought students’ attention to the unit objectives and content.

8.2.6.4 Phase 4: Not Applicable

Yuna had no in-service ELT training during her first year.

8.2.7 Summary of Observations

In total I watched four of Yuna’s classes, one at the beginning of Lesson (i.e., unit) 11, one in the middle, and two at the end. Her observation reports from Class 5-5 appear in Table 8.2 below. The final observation was co-taught with Cathy, who led the singing and a past tense drill (Sequences 2 & 4).
8.2.7.1 Class sequences.

All classes began with similar sequences and students seemed accustomed to the routine, even providing answers before questions were asked (YFN3). Similar to Sami’s classes, most students arrived early and many played around loudly with friends. When the bell rang, students found their seats and generally calmed down quickly. Yuna began class with English greetings, elicited the date and weather, and had students write it in their notebooks. In each class they sang before continuing activities, with most students eagerly participating (e.g., The Hokey Pokey during YO1). In all classes, she brought students attention to the class plan or unit objectives, for example, eliciting objectives and key expressions before beginning activities (YO1). Two classes ended with a review, for example, doing oral corrective feedback at the end of the Zombie Game in YO2. She ended classes with salutations and directed attention to plans for the next class. While there were clear beginning, middle, and ending phases, some sequences seemed overly repetitive (see below).

8.2.7.2 Analysis of classroom activities.

In total 13 activities were observed including nine language exercises, three songs, and one form-focused communicative activity. Seven activities came from the
textbook, two from the NEST, two were self-made, and two songs came from Youtube. Form-focused activities (N=8) accounted for roughly 38% of class time, whereas the two meaning-focused activities took up 10%, occurring only in the first observation. Singing accounted for 16 minutes, more than 13% of class time. Nearly all activities were done as a full-class, with only two done individually. No group work was observed and only the Zombie Game included student-student interaction, but its TL use was inauthentic and very repetitive.

Three additional sequences are worth noting. In YO1 preparing for a card game took about 10 minutes, as did the instructions for a game in YO2. In YO4, there was a 13-minute sequence where a song was repeated seven times. These sequences were about 28% of observed class time in Table 8.2, evidence of Yuna’s relative lack of experience.

8.2.7.3 Classroom management.

Yuna employed two main reward systems, a group point system and a class ‘cookie’ reward system. Other strategies for managing class included ‘Seats of Love,’ ringing a bell, and chanting, all described below:

(1) Group point system. Students sit in groups receiving points collectively for actions like bringing all materials, being ready to start, exemplary behavior or participation, and using English. Individuals earn points for the group; conversely, poor behavior could reduce points. Yuna kept track of points with magnets on the blackboard during class. At the end, groups were responsible for adding points on a scoreboard on the side wall. Students’ attention seemed attuned to this system, as in the following excerpt.

Excerpt 1: Yuna’s Group Point System in Action

T: Okay. Open your notebook. Did you bring your notebook textbook and file?

((She gestures towards the magnets on the board that are keeping scores for group points))

SS: Ye! ((in unison))

‘Yes’

T: - Okay. - Open your notebook’s, please
S1: joyonghi haera! ((a girl yells at her group mate, aware they may lose a point))

‘Be quiet!’
(YO2: 25-28)

During observations Yuna added points for positive actions, although there were no instances of subtracting points, despite several behavioral issues occurring (e.g., swearing in YO1).

(2) Class ‘cookie’ reward system. There was a bulletin board with five pieces of yarn, five elderly ladies—one for each class—and a tiger. The previous teacher had left this on the wall and Yuna adapted it for her class. If the class earned a ‘cookie’, they moved their lady up, away from the tiger. Collectively the class earned cookies for singing well, good behavior, and using English. If she felt a class (or particular sequence) went well, the class received a cookie. When they get to the top, they get a class reward such as a snack party. The following excerpt demonstrates how Yuna used these artifacts:

Excerpt 2: A ‘Cookie’ Reward

((After singing ‘Hokey Pokey’ in Sequence 2 of YO1))

T: Okay. That’s enough for today. I’ll give you one more cookie. You sang very good. You have 28 cookies [now].

And open your book. Page 160. - If you have two more cookies you can move up the board. - Listen to the chant first. - Look. -

Listen carefully.

((Yuna mimes and mouths the words for the chant on page 160. Students watch the animation and sing along.))

(YO2: 44-46)

((Later, towards the end of class))
T: Okay. - That’s it for today. You did a very good job today. ((She gives two thumbs up and claps)) We are - next week I think you can go up the board. ollasuisseo-yo ‘You can go up’
Have a nice weekend!
(YO2: 139-140)

In this sequence, Yuna rewarded the class for singing together and provided motivation for giving effort during the remaining activities. Cookies were positive reinforcement; Yuna did not deduct any cookies. It seemed the students expected to earn at least one every class.

(3) Seats of Love: After some incidents with student behavior in the first semester, Yuna moved two desks to the front of class, perpendicular to the others, so that she could more easily monitor the troublemakers from previous classes. She said, “The reason I use the word love, I don’t want students to think they are troublemakers, so I told them you need my love, so come [sit] here” (YI3.1: 71).

(4) Ringing a bell: She rang a bell three times to signal the end of activities. It was also used to quiet down the class.

(5) Look-look-look chant: Like Sami and Eunjeong, she used this to draw attention when things were noisy or to make a teaching point during activities.

In addition, Yuna followed some general procedures that facilitated classroom management. For example, having students put items down before starting activities, drawing attention to instructions and reviewing procedures before starting, and knowing all students by name.

Although her management systems seemed effective, there were quite a few incidents where student behavior negatively influenced their peers. Examples from each class are described below:

1. It became quite noisy during the Zombie Game in YO2 and she rang the bell three times bringing the activity to a close.

2. Before YO3, students were running in class and some students were fighting and yelling. When the bell rang students found their seats and quieted down fairly quickly, urging group members to do the same.

3. A boy yelled, “You fucking (inaudible)!” during student-student greetings in YO1. Other students repeated what they heard to Yuna. She told the student she would speak with him after class, then continued with the lesson.
4. The same student hit a classmate and another student kicked a classmate in YO4. The first two incidents exemplify the effectiveness of her management systems, while the last two exemplified ongoing challenges with misbehaving students (see below).

8.2.7.4 Language use and interaction.

While there were few opportunities for students to interact with each other, Yuna’s classes were punctuated with TL teacher talk. During activities she was encouraging and animated, moving around the class and helping where needed. Although Yuna’s classes tended to be teacher-centered, she provided lots of TL input throughout the lessons in the form of instructions, simple questions, compliments, and encouragement.

Instructions for activities were usually in the TL, but like others she code-switched to the L1 to reinforce meaning or used Korean for more complicated instructions or vocabulary. She frequently used gestures to reinforce meaning as in Excerpt 3 below.

Excerpt 3: Instructions for the Zombie Game

T: Do you remember the Zombie Game?
SS: Yes!
T: We’ve already played this game before. - I will explain the rules one more time.
((She makes eye contact with the students and draws attention to instructions on the screen.))
I’ll explain the rules. -
Everyone - first - put your heads on your desk. - Close your eyes. -
((gestures the actions))
Then, I will choose - I will choose one zombie ((gestures with a feather and holds up one finger)) - -
And five doctors. ((holds up the opposite hand with fingers open))
S1: uisadueli - dasot ‘five - doctors’
T: Yes. One zombie ((holds up one finger on the left hand)) and five doctors ((raises her right hand with all fingers open))
S2: geundae, geundae… ‘but, but…’
T: ((raises hand to lips)) shhh. - if you have any questions then -
S3: *geunago!* ‘after (she finishes instructions)’!

T: yes - after I finish. - One zombie and five doctors. And the rest of you,
nameoji-neun ‘as for the rest of you’, you will be human. ingandeul ‘humans’ -
So, zombie, doctors, humans. ((counts with fingers at the same time))

(YO2: 76-80)

((Instructions continue for nearly 10 minutes. Some students are getting noisy.))

T: Okay. Look at the TV now. –
nomo sigeurowo-yo. ‘it’s too noisy’ - you have to whisper. -
Ready go!

(YO2: 111)

This excerpt exemplified student-teacher interactions and her TL language use and code-switching. Further it demonstrates some students’ awareness of routines and how she maintained control. Although she used English, students rarely used English with her and almost never with each other. This was an issue that Yuna realized herself and is discussed below.

8.2.8 Critical Incidents in the Process of Change in Cognitions and Practices

As Yuna gained experience, she became more familiar with her students, discovering what worked for her and what did not during lessons. Seven months after starting, Yuna reflected on her development, saying,

I’m not sure I changed a lot but I think that now I have … kind of [a] foundation. I have routines of every class. In the first period of every [unit] I have to do this and second period I have to do this. So I made my own [routine]

(YI5: 64)

Explaining the process, she added, “As time goes by when students and me have interaction - The more I taught them the more I can make my own class” (YI5: 65). In the following sections, emphasis is placed on how she made class her own, looking at her development with a particular focus on her materials selection in developing routines.
8.2.8.1 Decision-making in adapting and recycling pedagogic activities:
“Oh, I can use this game every lesson”.

For each unit of the textbook, Yuna made decisions about what to include and what to supplement, replacing textbook materials that she believed were ineffective. Critical incidents in this process are discussed below, beginning with her choice of two supplementary activities, the Kimchi and Zombie Games.

The Kimchi Game and Zombie Game were the most frequently appearing activities in her CILs, cited four times each under positive incidents (see Appendix Q). Yuna used both every unit, roughly once every seven class periods (YI5).

The Kimchi Game
This game was recommended for reading practice. It had quite elaborate procedures requiring more attention on those than on the TL, however.

Materials: Presentation with target sentences written on slides. Other slides include pictures of (a) kimchi and (b) babies.

Source: indischool.com

Activity description: Non-interactive, form-focused language exercise.

Game objective: Be the last student standing up.

Procedures: All students begin standing with the front-left person reading the first word. Students take turns reading sentences word-by-word, row-by-row. When the last word is read, the next student must say, “kimchi,” and the following student must sit down. The next slide contains a random picture of a baby or kimchi. If a baby appears, the next person in line must sit down; if it is kimchi, the next person sitting down may stand up. Then the next sentence begins. Play continues until all students are sitting or until time runs out.

Yuna came across the Kimchi Game on indischool.com and used it to replace reading and group project activities from the textbook (e.g., Sequence 5 in YOR4). Yuna described a critical moment after trying the activity:

In first semester when students played the Kimchi Game … [they] really liked that game [more] than I expected before and I realized, oh, I can use this game every lesson. (YI5: 61)

Over time student interest waned so Yuna altered the “rules to make [it] more fun” (YCIL2). First, she added a picture of cheese. If this appeared on a slide, the second
person in line had to sit down. Second, she added a bell. When tapped all students had to read the sentence together. Instead of trying something else, Yuna made the Kimchi Game more elaborate.

Importantly, her planning was focused on retaining student engagement and keeping class fun, not on stimulating TL practice or other AL/SLA related considerations. Further evidence of this point came from the adaptation of the Zombie Game described below.

The Zombie Game
This is an iteration of the Virus Game (cf. Sami), a common activity for Korean primary school English teachers.

Materials: None, but students should be familiar with the conversation being practiced.

Source: NEST

Activity description: Form-focused, full-class activity that encourages language practice similar to a structure drill except that it involves student-student interaction.

Game objective: The ‘zombie’ student infects the rest of class until all students are zombies.

Procedures: First, students close their eyes and the teacher selects a zombie. Then students walk around and find a partner to practice a short conversation. When they meet, partners play rock-scissors-paper and the winner starts the conversation. For example, in YO2 the focus was on the irregular past tense and students practiced this basic conversation:

Student 1: What did you do yesterday?
Student 2: I _a kite. What did you do yesterday?

Students filled in the blank as they wished except for the zombie who was given special instructions to say, “I ate a human!” If someone meets a zombie, they become a zombie after the conversation. The game ends when all students are zombies or time runs out.

Yuna was introduced to this activity by her co-teacher, found it effective, and like the Kimchi game, she continued to recycle it to replace activities from the textbook (e.g., YO2). Students enjoyed the Zombie Game; however, over time they lost interest.
As with the Kimchi Game, Yuna added new procedures, for example, assigning five doctors who can heal zombies (see Excerpt 3 above). This change necessitated a ten-minute instructional sequence (YOR4). Although this included lots of TL teacher-talk, it came at the expense of student interaction.

Discovering that these games interested her students, she recycled them often. Similar to other participants, Yuna tended to assess effectiveness in terms of how engaging activities were for students, rather than how much interaction or TL was used, for example. Students were engaged during the Kimchi Game; however, its design limited rather than promoted TL output (YO3). Only one student could participate at a time and their attention seemed much more focused on the game procedures than on language. During the Zombie Game, students were observed skipping conversations and sharing information in the L1. Moreover, recycling these activities limited opportunities for more authentic communication that may have been possible through other activities, such as the project described below.

| **Project:** “Make and present the house you want to live in” (Ham et al. 2011, p. 137) |
| Projects were included at the end of every unit, but activity-types varied. This one is from Unit 9. |
| **Materials:** Paper, colored markers, scissors, and glue. |
| **Source:** Textbook |
| **Activity description:** Collaborative TBA to practice writing about and describing items in a home. |
| **Objective:** In groups students make and present a model home that they would like to live in. |
| **Procedures:** First, students draw items in four rooms of a house on A4 paper together. Next, they write sentences to match their pictures (e.g., This is the living room. There is a sofa). Then they cut out the rooms, glue them together, and make a simple model home. Last, they present their house to other groups. |

During the first eight units, Yuna omitted all ‘Project’ activities from her textbook. She tried the one above and was surprised that student projects “were more wonderful than I expected” (YCIL5). She wrote, “They have to use their complex skills to complete this activity. I will do this activity in every lesson” (YCIL5).
She did the project again for Unit 10, but not in Unit 11 because of problems with behavior and time management (YCIL5). Moreover, she did not like the projects’ design. Not all were as carefully planned and many were less dynamic than in Unit 9 (e.g., the project in Unit 2 was a fill-in-the-blanks exercise).

In her data, the project in Unit 9 was the only TBA occurring; however, Yuna modified it into a language exercise by providing the language input and skipping the presentations. TBLT presented a clear gap in knowledge for Yuna, as it did for the others.

Her decision with this project (and rejection of others) covered two themes important for understanding her decision-making: (1) criticisms of the textbook and (2) behavior issues during class, both discussed below.

8.2.8.2 Rejecting learner-centered materials: “I cannot understand this textbook’s aim.”

Regarding Yuna’s materials selection, two key influences became salient during analysis. First, being critical of the assigned textbook, Yuna found the materials ineffective for her teaching aims (i.e., making it fun and communicative). Second, challenges managing students led to selecting materials allowing her to maintain more control of the class.

While discussing the textbook, Yuna said,

I cannot understand the names of each activity. They are very similar to each other and they could be boring … I want this textbook may focus on speaking or have more chance to communicate with others … I cannot understand this textbook’s aim. (YI5: 48)

Yuna usually skipped the activities that she thought were “not that fun” (YI7: 25). In interviews she emphasized that she wanted more meaningful, communicative activities (YI5; YI7). However, looking at omissions, the communicative activities were the ones she often did not use. For example, of the 18 activities in Unit 8, she omitted the following five:

- Listen & Play (group work, role play)
- Speak & Play (group work, role play)
- Act & Play (group work, role play)
- Read & Play (group work, TPR)
- Project (group work, role play)
All were communicative activities designed to promote speaking practice, a point of emphasis in her belief system; however, she choose not to use them, replacing some with more familiar but less interactive activities such as the Zombie Game and Kimchi Game.

In the data, the project above was Yuna’s only group work activity. During the study, she came to a realization of her practice, noticing why she tended to avoid it, saying,

I just realized that I rarely do group work because I cannot control all groups. … They have more chance to talk in Korean. … I cannot control all groups altogether. (YI5: 17).

Asked if group work was important, she replied,

Of course. Because I have to give them chances to speak in English with other students, not me. And that is the authentic situation using English. So I know that’s important but it’s hard to do in my class. (YI5: 19)

This issue created tensions for Yuna: Although she “knew what she had to do” (YI1), behavioral issues, level gaps, and time management problems created difficulties during class. Therefore, she tended towards teacher-centeredness (i.e., 10 of 12 exercises were full-class activities in observations) because she was able to exercise more control. Yuna believed she should create more opportunities for student-student interaction, but she was unable to align her practices with that belief, a phenomena explored in the discussion chapter.

8.2.9 Commitment to Teaching English: “Maybe 10 Years Later, When I’m Ready”

Although Yuna was an enthusiastic teacher developing through the year, she did not want to continue teaching English, describing her experience as “just for practice” (YI7).

Yuna found the negative affect to be the most challenging aspect to deal with, as she explained below:

For example, if I teach math to students … at first, the students cannot solve the problem, but after I explained about this question, then students can solve the problem, right? Students can change. Also I can see the students are changed. But [with] English I don’t know I changed one student … I’m not sure that I am
doing well. That makes me feel depressed, yeah, I can’t see one student have progress from me. (YI2.1: 49-51)

Self-doubt regarding student progress contributed to her decision, but it is important to note that she never wanted to teach English in the first place. The following school year Yuna lobbied the principal for her own homeroom and was very happy to be assigned to fifth grade (email 3/24/2014). She did mention this, however:

But I want to try to be an English teacher maybe 10 years later, when I’m ready for English teaching skills or when I have more experience to manage students, then I want to try -- because I like English and I will not stop studying English. - So maybe later ((laughter)). (YI7: 95)

Interestingly, the career trajectories of Sami and Mia were reflected in these comments.

8.2.10 Case Summary: Yuna

Although Yuna wanted to be an English translator as a child, she “changed her dream” and decided to become a teacher in high school. After university she hoped for a homeroom class but was assigned to teach English, replacing a teacher on military leave.

As a first year language teacher, Yuna exuded confidence. She was playful and animated with students, which they seemed to enjoy, and she was concerned for their development as language learners. Because she was a high-proficiency user, she had little trouble using English during classes and provided extensive TL input through teacher talk. Her SLTE provided ideas for how to sequence and manage classes and she further developed routines that built on this experience.

Believing that English education should be fun and active, Yuna planned accordingly, replacing textbook activities with ones she found more engaging for students. She recycled these often and refined procedures as students lost interest. During class, student interaction was limited, often by design as Yuna struggled with student behavior, level-gaps, and time management. Aware of these difficulties, she realized that she avoided group work, favoring full-class activities where she could maintain some control.

Drawing from her experience as a language learner, she believed that public English education was insufficient for attaining fluency. She empathized with low-level students, but she did not expect them to participate while she focused “on the middle.”
The fact that students did not seem to be improving troubled Yuna and uncertainty over their progress was a source of discomfort. Yuna thought of this year as “just for practice” and was pleased to become a HRT the following year. However, an important point was that Yuna never wanted to be an English teacher in the first place.

The in-depth case studies in Chapters 7 and 8 above explored the experiences of four Korean English teachers at different stages of their careers. Chapter 7 included two experienced teachers, Mia and Sami, and Chapter 8 included two novice teachers, Eunjeong and Yuna. In the following chapter, the cases are synthesized and the findings are corroborated with those of Study 1.
CHAPTER 9: DISCUSSION

This thesis was designed to explore LTC and development in Korea, with the intention of developing a richer understanding of ELT practices in the public school context. The previous three chapters presented findings from two studies. Study 1 (Chapter 6) investigated narratives about prior language learning, education, and ELT experiences of 27 participants, and Study 2 (Chapters 7 & 8) included four in-depth case studies of Korean primary school English teachers during the 2013-2014 school year. The present chapter synthesizes, interprets, and discusses the previously presented findings; presents a mixed-method cross-case analysis of observation data with discussion; and positions the studies within prior research and theory. In order to organize the discussion, this chapter addresses the RQs successively, restating them as headings.

As described in Chapter 5, the studies used procedures for qualitative data analysis (Miles et al., 2014) using grounded theory methods (Corbin & Strauss, 2008; Charmaz, 2014). To summarize, the general process went as follows. Through constant comparative methods (Glaser & Strauss, 1967), data were coded and organized into categories and themes as they were collected. Discussion-oriented field notes were kept throughout the process as data were analyzed and prior chapters were drafted (Corbin & Strauss). Interpretation outline tools (Bloomberg & Volpe, 2012) were adapted for addressing the research questions, thereby aiding the organization of the discussion below (e.g., see Appendix W). Axial coding (Corbin & Strauss) and comparative analysis (Miles et al.; Charmaz) were used for developing theoretical models to encompass findings, looking within and across data sets for support.

9.1 RQ1: Why do People Become English Language Teachers in Korea?

How language teachers think and act in classrooms is inextricably connected to their prior experiences as language learners, teacher trainees, and classroom practitioners (Borg, 2003, 2006), and an important but often overlooked aspect of this experience is why people commit to language teaching in the first place (Chapter 3; see also Moodie & Feryok, 2015). In addressing RQ1, my intention is to extend prior
discussions of what draws people to education (E.-G. Kim, 2009) and why they end up teaching English in Korea (Jung & Norton, 2002; Lim, 2011).

Case study findings in Chapters 7 and 8 contributed to a study which demonstrated the importance of commitments in understanding language teacher development *over a career* (Moodie & Feryok, 2015; see Chapter 1 for clarification of author contributions). As Moodie and Feryok (2015) argued, industrial and organizational psychology research offers insights into understanding why people enter the field of language teaching and interpreting their development. The discussion of RQ1 continues below based on the work of Meyer and Herscovitch’s (2001; 2004) model of commitment, an authoritative framework in the field of organizational behavior, but focuses on the *initial* decisions to commit to teaching and ELT in Korea.

Meyer and Herscovitch (2001) describe commitment as multidimensional, consisting of *affective*, *continuance*, and *normative* components, each distinguished by mindsets. Moodie and Feryok (2015) summarized these components as follows:

1. Affective commitment has the mindset of desire, and involves identification (e.g., one decides to teach because one likes it or wants to do it).
2. Continuance commitment has the mindset of perceived costs and involves calculation of the loss of investment or the lack of alternatives (e.g., one decides to teach because it is the first or best or only job available).
3. Normative commitment has the mindset of obligation, and involves socialized norms for reciprocity (e.g., one decides to teach because ‘everyone’ has ‘always’ thought one would teach).

Interpretation for this section of the discussion involved recoding data for these commitment components and considering the significance of the different mindsets evident in the data. First, findings from Study 1 are interpreted, looking at the categories *reasons for becoming teachers* and *reasons for teaching English* from the narrative frame data (Chapter 6). Then discussion turns to findings from Study 2 where critical incident analysis contributed to understanding how commitment to ELT is disincentivized in primary schools, a finding with potentially negative consequences for language pedagogy in Korea.
9.1.1 Reasons for Becoming Teachers in Study 1

Cross-case analysis in Study 1 revealed that legal status and working conditions were more influential for participants than interest in teaching (see 6.1.1). In terms of commitment theory, continuance mindsets were more dominant than affective mindsets, implying that teaching was selected because of the job it provided more so than desire to teach (see also E.-G. Kim, 2009). Moreover, the most influential people for committing to education were parents (16 of 22 in NF1), and the stories suggested their advice was largely based on status and working conditions. These themes seemed similar to other discussions of ELT commitment in Asia (e.g., Gao & Xu, 2014; Hayes, 2005, 2009). The normative influence of parents was unsurprising considering the Confucian value hyodo, ‘filial piety’. However, this finding lends further support for the dominance of continuance mindsets. Even participants whose commitment exemplified normative mindsets (e.g., J.H, M.O, and Mia) did so because of the influence of parents who were considering the tangible benefits of the teaching profession in Korea.

Roughly 80% of participants were female, a figure comparable to the larger population of primary teachers (Chapter 2). E.-G. Kim (2009) explained that for women in Korea, teaching is a sought after career because of the status and working conditions, and for the 17 females writing NF1, this was the dominant theme for entering the profession. The stories from female participants suggested many lacked viable alternatives for comparable career tracks. Further, as in Gao and Xu’s (2014) study in rural China, teaching offered a means of upward social mobility for some participants.

Relating to gender, there were notable differences between female and male participants in their commitments to education. Stories from males also reflected continuance mindsets; however, 3 of 5 became teachers because other higher status employment prospects did not turn out (e.g., doctor, lawyer), and a fourth male expressed having no other opportunities for a stable career track in the late 1970s. While continuance commitments were influential for both groups, for males teaching was a fallback career as opposed to a highly sought after one, which may have implications for teacher development and attrition (see below).

Two other notable findings concerned affective commitment. First, affective commitments were the least prevalent type. Only 8 of 22 participants described an interest in education as a reason to become a teacher. Second, all 8 were influenced by
teachers, suggesting the importance of prior education for initial affective commitments to teaching (cf. Lortie, 1975; Nias, 1981).

Findings from Study 1 provide a contrast to general education literature that discusses the prevalence of the affective mindsets in committing to the profession (Lortie, 1975; Nias, 1981, Troman & Raggl, 2008). The dominance of initial continuance commitments may be of significance. For example, In P. L. Choi and Tang’s (2009) life history study with 23 teachers in Hong Kong, they found that the affective side of teaching, particularly the love for students, was the prevalent theme in sustaining their commitments to the profession. Data from the present study regarding this topic is limited, but the role of affective commitments in education may be worth further investigation, particularly if initial commitment mindsets correlate to longer-term retention and commitment to professional development (see Chapter 10; see also Moodie & Feryok, 2015).

9.1.2 Reasons for Teaching English in Study 1

Regarding participants’ initial commitments to teaching English, continuance mindsets were also more evident than affective mindsets. The dominant theme for 9 of 20 primary school participants was that they were delegated by the principal; only 6 expressed interest in English as a reason for teaching it. Looking more deeply at these findings revealed that the internal ranking systems in schools were implicated in ELT assignments (Chapter 2), enabling longer-tenured teachers to have more agency in being assigned positions, whereas novice and newly transferred teachers had less.

Stories from the youngest participants suggested that their commitments were more normative than those of the older teachers because of the shared expectation of teachers and principals that younger teachers would take assigned positions regardless of personal interest or expertise. These findings corroborate prior studies from Korea that expressed how principals have the ultimate say on assigning positions in their schools (E.-G. Kim, 2009), and the assumption that younger teachers will be better at teaching English than older teachers (Jung & Norton, 2002). Interestingly, the younger teachers’ stories expressed less positive feelings than experienced teachers about teaching English, perhaps because they were assigned to teach it rather than volunteering.
As above, the paucity of affective mindsets evident in the data may be of significance. Although stated differently, P. L. Choi and Tang’s (2009) interpretation suggested the importance of affective commitments for teacher retention. Further, Day and Gu (2007) have linked commitments to teaching efficacy. But is it intrinsic interest in the subject matter, English, and the desire to teach it related to teaching outcomes? There is some data from Study 1 that suggests affective mindsets towards ELT were important for efficacy, insofar as participants perceived their first year teaching English. Looking at findings from the categories reasons for teaching English (NF1 Item 4) and overall impressions the first year ELT (NF4 Item 8), there were data for 11 primary school teachers. Of these participants, 7 chose to teach English and 4 were delegated to teach it. Notably, 6 of 7 choosing to teach English described overall positive outcomes from their first year (see Section 6.4.4), whereas 2 out of 4 people delegated to teach described overall negative outcomes, and both participants had no interest in teaching English again (J.Y. NF4-18; J.G. NF4-30). Despite the limited data, these findings may be worth further consideration, particularly regarding the role of affective mindsets for retention and development of English teachers in Korean primary schools (see below).

9.1.3 Commitments to Teaching and ELT in Study 2

9.1.3.1 Becoming teachers.

Study 2 investigated teacher commitment more deeply, uncovering important factors behind English teacher recruitment, retention, and turnover in Korea. First, consideration will be given to what drew participants to teaching, then attention will be given to their English learning experience and what led them to becoming English teachers.

Similar to Study 1, continuance and normative mindsets were dominant themes and there was little evidence of affective mindsets for the participants in becoming teachers (see Table 9.1 below). As above, the participants’ commitments to teaching related to career prospects more than intrinsic interest in teaching. The normative influences of parents were particularly strong in Mia’s case, but Eunjeong and Yuna were also encouraged by parents to become teachers because of the status and security of teaching (E.-G. Kim 2009). Even Sami, whose homeroom teacher recommended teaching, did so on the advice that teacher’s college was more affordable than other
national universities. These themes were covered above, but it is interesting to note the contrast to research from other contexts describing participants’ interest in children and pedagogy as primary reasons for committing to education (e.g., P. L. Choi & Tang, 2009; Troman & Raggl, 2008).

Table 9-1 Summary of Influences for Becoming Teachers (Case Study Participants)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Normative Influences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parental pressure (Mia, Eunjeong) or encouragement (Yuna)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher’s recommendation (Sami)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socialization from community members (Mia)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Continuance Influences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CSAT results limiting more desired career tracks (Mia, Yuna, Eunjeong)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial constraints for other post-secondary education (Mia, Sami)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9.1.3.2 Critical incidents in language learning.

In one of the most monolingual countries in the world (Song, 2011), these participants were relatively successful learners, an obvious but important fact considering their profession. CI analysis from the case studies revealed insights into their commitments to learning English.

Experiences of the older and younger participants reflected changes in the object for English education in Korea. Sami and Mia began learning English prior to changes in the national curriculum (see Chapter 2). Socialization, that is, being known as “good” language learners in their communities provided motivation, for example, Mia “somehow” becoming “the English expert in the neighborhood” (Chapter 7). Yuna and Eunjeong, in contrast, started learning English because of the policy changes, enrolled by parents in hagwon as Korea’s English fever increased (J.-K. Park, 2009). For all participants, competition provided motivation and being known as top English students encouraged them to maintain this status. For Sami and Mia learning English was related to their identities as Korean women and both took up studying again as adults (Moodie & Feryok, 2015).

Crucially, participants’ L2 proficiency provided workplace opportunities otherwise unavailable. In Korea, globalization increased the economic value of English
proficiency, so being able to teach English helped the younger participants get teaching jobs, an important factor given teacher unemployment in Korea (see E.-G. Kim, 2009). Similar to other participants in Study 1, their proficiency provided them more agency in the workplace compared to peers: They were able to choose ELT, enabling Mia to become refreshed as a teacher and Sami to feel self-actualized (Moodie & Feryok, 2015).

The significance of these findings pertains to at least two important themes below. First, prior learning experiences influenced their conceptions of teaching English (see Section 9.3). Second, their reasons for teaching English implicate an issue for language teacher development in primary schools: Although participants were committed teachers, they were not necessarily committed to teaching English.

**9.1.3.3 Commitment mindsets and ELT turnover in Study 2.**

Study 2 extends this discussion by considering the participants’ mindsets in volunteering for or accepting ELT positions. As in Study 1, being *delegated by the principal* was a dominant theme for participants becoming English teachers. Only Sami expressed an *affective mindset* when initially committing to ELT. However, like Mia, her rationale also reflected a *continuance mindset* as she navigated the administrative system, alternating between HRT and ELT when transferred. Table 9.2 below summarizes the participants’ reasons for teaching English from the case studies.

*Table 9-2 Commitment Mindsets to HRT and ELT in Study 2*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Reasons</th>
<th>Commitment Mindset</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mia’s 1st year ELT</td>
<td>Wanted to be recharged</td>
<td>Affective (to HRT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More flexible schedule than HRT</td>
<td>Continuance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Believed ELT is easy</td>
<td>Continuance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thought less duties than HRT</td>
<td>Continuance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mia’s return to HRT</td>
<td>Too many extra duties</td>
<td>Continuance (to HRT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Difficulties with behavior/language use</td>
<td>Continuance (to HRT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mia’s 2nd year ELT</td>
<td>Better than sixth grade HRT</td>
<td>Continuance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(after transferring)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After study Mia</td>
<td>Better than sixth grade HRT</td>
<td>Continuance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>continued ELT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sami’s 1st year ELT</td>
<td>Interest in English</td>
<td>Affective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant</td>
<td>Reasons</td>
<td>Commitment Mindset</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sami’s 2nd and 3rd year ELT</td>
<td>No one else volunteered</td>
<td>Continuance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sami’s return to HRT</td>
<td>Missing relationships with students</td>
<td>Affective (to HRT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sami’s 4th to 6th year (after transferring)</td>
<td>Missing using English</td>
<td>Affective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Missing teaching English</td>
<td>Affective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Better than sixth grade HRT</td>
<td>Continuance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After study Sami continued ELT</td>
<td>Continued interest in English and ELT</td>
<td>Affective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Become better teacher</td>
<td>Normative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Then Sami wanted to return to HRT</td>
<td>Missed having homeroom class</td>
<td>Affective (to HRT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eunjeong’s 1st year</td>
<td>Youngest teacher at school</td>
<td>Normative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Better than fifth or sixth grade HRT</td>
<td>Continuance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After study Eunjeong continued ELT</td>
<td>Enjoying ELT</td>
<td>Affective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Administrative pressure</td>
<td>Normative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Avoid sixth grade HRT</td>
<td>Continuance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuna’s 1st year ELT</td>
<td>Replaced teacher on army duty</td>
<td>Continuance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After study Yuna began HRT</td>
<td>Desired homeroom class</td>
<td>Affective (to HRT)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the findings summarized in Table 9.2, the alternation of HRT and ELT found with the experienced teachers raises issues in need of attention regarding commitments and ELT turnover. The administrative system pressures new and young teachers to teach English (see also Jung & Norton, 2002). This pressure might be normative, as was the case with Eunjeong who felt pressure to “volunteer” for English, or it might be based on a continuance mindset, as was the case with Yuna who did not have any input into her first assignment, English being the only option for beginning her career (see Table 9.2 above).

However, the system of teacher selection and rotation in Korea does not encourage long-term commitments to ELT. The findings from both studies show how ELT turnover is high, often based on the continuance calculations of teachers. Experienced teachers may volunteer for ELT to avoid less appealing grades (e.g., fifth
and sixth) when transferred, as both Mia and Sami did. Then, after accruing required points (or social capital), teachers can choose more appealing assignments (e.g., third and fourth grade). There were no administrative measures evident that facilitate sustained commitments to ELT.

The high turnover of English teachers presents an issue for language teaching efficacy in Korean primary schools. As Day and Gu (2007, 2009) found, committed teachers who are resilient and persevere throughout their careers have higher efficacy than those who do not (i.e., their students perform better). The rotation and transfer system appears to disincentivize ELT development by disincentivizing resilience and perseverance in the primary school system. For example, Yuna, perhaps the most proficient English speaker in Study 2, had no interest in teaching ELT, and was relieved to escape the English classroom, seeing the year as “just for practice” (Chapter 8). Assigned to teach something she did not want to teach and that did not reflect her specialization (mathematics), Yuna did not do any in-service ELT training. She lobbied for another position, and the system facilitated her move to homeroom teaching the year after, with the consequence that her initial investment in ELT was lost to the system.

Findings from these studies have implications for ELT efficacy in Korean primary schools, particularly in how English teacher retention is low, disincentivized by the administrative system. This issue is addressed in the conclusion (Chapter 10).

9.2 RQ2: What are the Stated Cognitions of Korean English Teachers about ELT?

Discussion of RQ2 reviews themes in stated cognitions from the four case study participants. Data were triangulated from reflective writing (i.e., NFs), critical incident logs (CIL), and semi-structured interviews. While participants’ identities and teaching philosophies reflected their individual personalities and experiences, synthesis emerged from themes in their approaches to language pedagogy, but there were notable differences between experienced and novice teachers regarding beliefs about language teaching and how languages are learned (J. Richards, 1998b; Tsui, 2003). GT methods described in Chapter 5 led to the development of a framework for the remainder of the discussion: the professional knowledge base (PKB) for Korean primary school English
teachers. Themes from the cases are summarized below; these are then discussed in light of the PKB.

9.2.1 Themes in Conceptions of Teaching English

Regarding LTC research, Borg (2006) highlighted two issues relevant to the discussion of participants’ stated cognitions. First, in order to increase coherence in the field, he suggested researchers rationalize constructs used in research, so I will clarify my decision to use the term *conceptions* here. During analysis I considered many concepts (e.g., maxims, principles, theories, images, etc.) but ran into complex terminological issues; for example, some findings, such as *the primacy of rapport*, seemed to be a different ilk to ones like *a linear view of language learning*. An earlier attempt to categorize data into cognitive typologies was interesting, but seemed superfluous regarding the emerging research aims. Therefore, I adapted notion of *conceptions of ELT* as described by D. Freeman (1993) and Tsui (2003), which encompassed the data on the participants’ stated cognitions (see Chapter 5). Second, Borg (2006) discussed a need to focus more on cognitions collectively within a given context as opposed to individually (see also Shulman & Shulman, 2004). Therefore, cross-case analysis synthesis is discussed here in order to summarize data for the interpretations that follow.

Across cases, there were commonalities found regarding participants’ conceptions of teaching English. Importantly, all participants identified as homeroom teachers (as opposed to English teachers) and their images of teaching English seemed to stem from their HRT experience (see 9.3). As researchers have found of teachers in other contexts (Clandinin & Connelly, 1986; Golombek, 1998), participants’ conceptions had affective and moral qualities. It seemed clear that participants were conscientious about students’ development as people, not just language learners. They were caring and concerned teachers, and their values reflected feelings of obligation with regard to their practices.

Affective and moral qualities were particularly expressed by the words and actions that exemplified *the primacy of rapport*. This notion was particularly emphasized by the experienced teachers. They were keenly aware of the “troublemakers,” often preempting behavioral incidents, for example, with Yuna creating the “seats of love” (see 8.2), or with Sami making sure they were on her “side”
The primacy of rapport was evident in strategies for classroom management, for example, in the various reward systems employed. They built relationships with students, and all teachers knew (nearly) all their students by name. As the most experienced teachers explained, rapport was needed first, and teaching English was impossible without it (see Chapter 7).

This finding was unexpected in that it was not salient in a review of ELT research in Korea (Moodie & Nam, forthcoming). One reason, perhaps, was that most research occurred in secondary school contexts. Moreover, the research on primary ELT tended towards looking at treatments of discrete methods, rather than taking a more holistic approach to interpreting teacher knowledge (e.g., Tsui, 2003).

Rapport overlapped with other themes, for example, that English education must be fun. Fun was emphasized by all teachers. It was evident in practices, for example, in the number of games and communicative activities used as supplementary materials (see Appendices Q & R). They also believed that making class interesting was important to foster motivation, which reflected beliefs about language learning (see 9.2.2). Apparently, participants’ prior language learning experience was quite influential in this regard (see 9.3).

Lessening level gaps was a major concern for all teachers. They shared particular concern for low-level students and volunteered to help after class. Participants’ empathy for students with low English proficiency seemed out of concern for future learning outcomes, aware of the importance of English in the secondary curriculum. All were cognizant of the influence of private education and believed their contact hours were too limited to have a profound effect on students’ language learning. This reflected their knowledge of context (see Golombek, 1998).

Considering prior comparative studies on ELT experience (e.g., J. Richards, 1998b; Tsui, 2003), this project found unsurprising differences between novice and experienced teachers. For example, the experienced teachers expressed more sophisticated approaches to language teaching than did the novice teachers. As in Tsui’s (2003) study, the less experienced participants tended to dichotomize interrelated aspects of ELT. For example, the novice teachers tended to have a more linear view of language learning, for example, with Eunjeong theorizing about vocabulary acquisition and Yuna expressing a discrete order of skill development (Chapter 8). The experienced teachers seemed to understand language learning more as a complex process. They emphasized the importance of collaborative learning more than the younger teachers.
This was also evident in observations, with much more group and pair work in the experienced teachers’ classes than in those of the novice teachers (see 9.4).

Although all teachers expressed the professional discourse of AL/TESOL to some degree, participants often mapped terminology onto practices that were not indicative of the professional discourse, an issue raised in prior studies (e.g., Feryok, 2008; D. Freeman, 1993; J. Richards, Ho, & Giblin, 1996). Crucially, for all participants uncertainty about effective practices was a dominant and ongoing theme. This was frequently apparent in CIL data and follow up interviews, for example, with Mia expressing during member-checking, “How do I know if something is effective or not? It’s still the biggest puzzle for me” (MFN6). It seemed uncertainty was greatest regarding how languages are learned and how to teach them (see Andrews, 2007; Bartels, 2005). As a researcher, making sense of these findings led to developing the professional knowledge base (PKB) described below, a heuristic encompassing the above themes, and central to the remaining discussion.

9.2.2 The Professional Knowledge Base: A Grounded Model

Developing the professional knowledge described here provided a framework for understanding themes in LTC for the participants according to kinds of pedagogical knowledge evident in data, and importantly, to make sense of what was lacking. Drawing on AL/TESOL (e.g., D. Freeman & Johnson, 1998; Kubanyiova, 2014) and educational literature (e.g., Elbaz, 1981, 1983; Shulman, 1986; Wilson, Shulman, & Richert, 1987), the five-part knowledge base proposed below facilitated categorizing LTC findings from Study 2. It provides a means of discussing LTC collectively for a cohort of teachers (Borg, 2006; Shulman & Shulman, 2004). Moreover, it is locally appropriate, providing a context-specific typology for describing cognitions and practices, important criteria identified in prior literature (D. Freeman & Johnson, 1998; Kubanyiova, 2014), and it is grounded in the findings (D. Freeman & Johnson).

The proposed knowledge base consists of the following categories:

1. **Practical knowledge.** Adapted from Elbaz (1983), this category “encompasses first hand experience of students’ learning styles, interests, needs, strengths and difficulties, and a repertoire of instructional techniques and classroom management skills” (p. 5). Elements of practical knowledge may be taught in coursework (e.g.,
child development), but such knowledge is highlighted here as knowledge gained through the practice of teaching. This experientially-based general pedagogical knowledge (see Roberts, 1998; Shulman, 1987; Wilson, Shulman, & Richert, 1987), would include knowledge about planning, instructional routines, and managing activities, all procedures related to language teaching; however, unlike Elbaz’s description, this knowledge is distinguished from disciplinary knowledge, for example, language teaching methodology, and curricular knowledge (see below).

2. **Content knowledge.** This is the first L2 proficiency related category. It means understanding the language content in the curriculum for the grade level. For example, this would mean understanding the vocabulary, grammatical structures, etc. in the textbooks. However, this is differentiated from subject-matter knowledge, a disciplinary understanding of content described below as knowledge about language learning and teaching (cf. D. Freeman & Johnson, 1998). For example, content knowledge does not imply an understanding about materials development. Distinctions such as these are helpful for interpreting what language teachers know about the discipline (cf. Bartels, 2005).

3. **Knowledge of language for teaching.** This is the second L2 proficiency category. It is defined as adequate proficiency for L2-mediated instruction, that is, being able to use classroom English, being able to do instructional routines, manage activities, and explain content using English.

4. **Curricular pedagogical knowledge.** This is defined as knowing how to teach curricular content following recommended approaches and methods (i.e., student-centered, collaborative activities, TBLT, etc.). This knowledge enables selecting activities and enacting pedagogy corresponding to curricular aims, but not necessarily understanding or being able to articulate the professional discourse contributing to the national English curriculum. This category can be understood as procedural knowledge of recommended curricular methods, whereas the next category relates to declarative knowledge.
5. **Knowledge about language teaching and learning.** This category encompasses disciplinary knowledge about the English curriculum. It comprises three sub-categories: (a) linguistic knowledge, (b) knowledge of ELT methodology, and (c) knowledge about SLA. The first (a) would be general linguistic knowledge about L2 and L1 phonology, morphology, syntax, semantics, etc. for being able to teach the four skills and explain TL to a given grade level in a manner consistent with the professional discourse of linguistics for language teaching (cf. *folklinguistic theories* described below). This is linguistic knowledge about content, for example, knowledge of grammar. As such, it relates to teachers’ L2 proficiency but is differentiated from the *knowledge of language for teaching* defined above (i.e., general L2 proficiency). This distinction untangles SLA and ELT methodological knowledge from linguistics knowledge (cf. Bartels, 2009). Of the three, this is perhaps the least important and not necessarily needed for effective teaching (Borg, 1998). However, some linguistic knowledge is necessary for understanding the other knowledge types. Sub-category (b) would be knowledge of the professional discourse of ELT methodology influencing the curriculum. For example, this would include understanding what is meant by a communicative approach and TBLT and why they are thought to be efficacious. Sub-category (c) would be understanding SLA research and theory influencing the curriculum. This would include knowing how to assess student needs consistent with the field of SLA and being able to adapt strategies and methods to foster L2 development. There is overlap among these sub-categories; for one, SLA theory influences ELT methodology, but for clarity of discussion it is useful to distinguish them. In summary, *knowledge about language teaching and learning* refers to the ability to understand and assess the effectiveness of practices in terms of the professional discourse for language teaching, that is, being able to reconstruct practices and rename experience (D. Freeman, 1993).

Figure 9-1 outlines this proposed PKB model. Discussion of the PKB continues below.
In this study, *practical knowledge*, the general pedagogical knowledge that teachers draw on from their experience, is distinguished from *curricular pedagogical knowledge*, the subject-specific ELT knowledge needed to teach the primary school English curriculum, which in turn is distinguished from disciplinary knowledge of AL/TESOL, that is, *knowledge about language teaching and learning*. In this way the knowledge base roughly follows from practical to theoretical and personal to impersonal knowledge, two spectra described by D. Woods and Çakir (2011) with implications for the direction of SLTE in Korea (Chapter 10; see also Golombek, 1998; Johnson, 2006).
The PKB described above is a hierarchy in the sense that each lower-level category is proposed to be more essential than the next for more effective English education in Korean primary schools. It supposes that practical knowledge is the most important: without knowledge of students and of the context and general teaching skills, efficacious language teaching would be virtually impossible. The PKB also supposes that many of the challenges faced in the classroom are explainable through gaps in the knowledge types described above.

As the broadest category, practical knowledge requires further distinction, particularly in its terminological resemblance to personal practical knowledge (PPK) (see Golombek, 1998, 2009). In this thesis, practical knowledge has similarities to Shulman’s (1987) general pedagogical knowledge (GPK); however, the modifier practical was chosen to emphasize the importance of prior experience in developing pedagogical approaches. In this way it is broader than GPK. For example, practical knowledge would be influenced by institutional knowledge, such as knowing the administrative systems and collegial and parental milieu. It would also be influenced by knowledge of context, that is, sociocultural, sociopolitical, and historical awareness of Korean education. The emphasis in this study is on practical knowledge as a construct for interpreting how HRT knowledge is adapted to ELT (see Section 9.3), not as an all-encompassing description of situated teacher knowledge (cf. Elbaz, 1983). However, a situated view is necessary for integrating the PKB model with an emic perspective of language teaching, as is discussed in Section 9.2.3.

Overlap among categories is inevitable; for example, items (2), (3), and (5a) relate to teacher proficiency. Furthermore, curricular pedagogical knowledge would require at least tacit knowledge about language learning and teaching; however, the distinctions are pragmatic, for example, in discussing incidents leading to change (see Section 9.5).

A concept related to the PKB is folklinguistic theories (Miller & Ginsburg, 1995). These could be defined as experientially-based understandings of language teaching and learning that are (or may be) in opposition to linguistics research and theory (see also Warford & Reeves, 2003). This category is useful for describing the data but is not part of the proposed PKB, a heuristic for discussing findings as they pertain to the disciplinary knowledge of AL.

The PKB is proposed as a framework for discussing ELT expertise in Korea. Cognitions and practices of English teachers could be described according to their
exemplification of these knowledge types, thereby giving an indication of ELT development (see 9.2.3).

The PKB above is a grounded model, a rarity according to D. Freeman & Johnson (1998), and it fills a gap in knowledge about LTC in EFL contexts (see Kubanyiova, 2014). Although the model faces epistemological limitations (see Chapter 10), it finds utility through interpreting themes in stated cognitions and practices in this study, as is done below.

9.2.2.1 The primacy of practical knowledge.

In relating findings to the PKB, two related considerations emerged. First, an important theme from participants’ stated cognitions about language teaching was that practical knowledge was the dominant knowledge-type. Participants drew on prior HRT experiences for teaching English, which helps explain their emphasis on rapport-building, approaches to classroom management, and concern for student needs (see 9.3.3).

Second, practical knowledge seemed dominant in part because of uncertainties about language teaching and learning. Trained as primary teachers, not language teachers per se, participants were uncertain of how languages are learned and of how to teach them. Although all teachers expressed the professional discourse to some degree (e.g., the role of motivation in language learning), all participants expressed a lot of uncertainty about how to assess student progress, how to provide corrective feedback, how to select appropriate materials, and about the effectiveness of their practices in general. Therefore, it seemed teachers drew on practical knowledge while planning and it influenced their development as language teachers. This helps explain why they tended to assess the effectiveness of their practices in terms of student engagement, a common theme in CIL findings (see Appendix Q).

A reasonable interpretation of these findings relates to their identity as teachers: Participants primarily saw themselves as HRTs first, and ended up teaching English for different reasons, but mostly relating to assignment of teaching positions in the administrative system (see 9.1 above).

9.2.2.2 Language proficiency and the PKB.

There are three language-oriented categories in the PKB: content knowledge, knowledge of language for teaching, and linguistic knowledge. The case study findings
are notable for their contrast with prior research from Korea (see below), particularly regarding KET proficiency (see also Moodie & Nam, forthcoming).

First, content knowledge did not seem to be a significant issue for the participants. Although all teachers expressed dissatisfaction with textbooks, they understood the language in them (see also 9.4.2 on materials selection). Second, their knowledge of language for teaching appeared adequate (e.g., Eunjeong) to exceptional (e.g., Yuna) for enacting effective L2-mediated instruction.

Similar to Hiver’s (2013) study, participants expressed concerns about their own proficiency in relation to their identity as English teachers in Korea. However, with the possible exception of Eunjeong, their English competence allowed them to navigate the curriculum with relative ease. As in Kang’s (2008) study of a primary classroom, the participants understood the language content, gave clear instructions, demonstrated activities in English, and code-switched effectively. Therefore, as intermediate to advanced users their concerns revolved around methodology more so than their own proficiency or the language content of the textbooks. This finding is significant in that it contrasts with a number of previous Korea-based studies which suggested that teachers’ English proficiency was a primary concern for ELT efficacy (e.g., J. Jeon, 2009; Yook, 2010; see also Kwon, 2000). The present thesis suggests that teacher L2 proficiency is overemphasized and that it is important to address the gap in teacher knowledge about language teaching and learning (see 9.2.2.3 below).

Third, while there were gaps in linguistic knowledge for all participants, as Borg (1998, 2006) discussed, these gaps did not seem to significantly limit participants’ ability to be effective primary English teachers. For the most part their prior language learning provided them with sufficient linguistic knowledge for leading primary English classes. Although they all contradicted the professional discourse at times, for example, with Eunjeong incorrectly describing differences between L1/L2 vowel articulation, or Mia with the syntax of modal verbs, these details seemed trivial when looking at the bigger picture of their practices; such issues seemed unlikely to negatively affect student learning compared to gaps in other types of knowledge, particularly knowledge about ELT methodology and SLA.

Similarly, Andrews described TLA as encompassing LTC, knowledge about learners, and teacher L2 proficiency. In this study, distinguishing different types of language proficiency from the disciplinary knowledge of AL was necessary for highlighting gaps in the knowledge base for the discussion of ELT expertise below.

9.2.2.3 The gaps between practical knowledge, curricular pedagogical knowledge, and knowledge about language teaching and learning.

As Borg (2006) discussed, language teaching experience is not necessarily synonymous with expertise (see also Farrell, 2015a; J. Richards, 1998b; Tsui, 2003). In this study, even the most experienced teachers frequently expressed uncertainties regarding the effectiveness of their practices. In order to explore this issue, the discussion below will focus on one major reform in particular, that is, the recommendation of CLT, a topic receiving much attention in Korea (see Chapter 3).

For all participants it seemed practical knowledge informed approaches to language teaching, which was quite salient when looking at the rationale for CIL entries. While communicative activities were frequently linked to positive incidents (see Appendix Q), effectiveness tended to be judged in terms of how fun or engaging they were for students, not on other criteria such as promoting communicative competence or facilitating negotiation of meaning (see Mangubhai et al., 2004). As in Tsui’s (2003) study, it seemed participants sometimes dichotomized aspects of practice that need not be mutually exclusive, for example “fun and learning” (p. 223). They were concerned about the experience for the students but rarely did this concern indicate a rich awareness of the disciplinary knowledge of AL/TESOL.

Participants held positive perceptions of CLT, but as in other studies they expressed uncertainties regarding how to make activities more meaningful and authentic (Butler 2005; Jung & Norton, 2002; Sato & Kleinsasser, 1999; S. H. Yim, 2009; Yook, 2010). In contrast to research from Korea that found teacher proficiency to be inhibiting CLT (Butler, 2005; J. Jeon, 2009; Yook, 2010), this did not seem to be a factor for avoiding CLT in Study 2. The gap in knowledge about language teaching and learning appeared more limiting.

Mia’s case is useful for illustrating this point. During collaborative group work Mia took note of student utterances (Chapter 7; also 9.5 below). However, she did not consider using this information for purposes such as providing delayed corrective feedback. Rather, her intent with this information was to encourage students by
complimenting them for using English after the activity. While her practical knowledge (i.e., attuning to student needs) and curricular pedagogical knowledge (i.e., collaborative learning) deepened, a gap in knowledge about language teaching and learning remained. Like the novice teachers, she seemed uncertain about why language errors were made and the implications they have for acquisition. It seemed she would have benefited from awareness of topics discussed by Ellis (2009), such as interpreting learner errors and an understanding of interlanguage.

Moreover, observations of interaction in her classes relate to four mainstream SLA hypotheses influencing the curriculum that could have helped Mia understand the learning processes she was witnessing. For example, her focus on classroom English facilitated opportunities for meaningful TL-practice for (nearly) all students every lesson, thereby creating opportunities for negotiation of meaning (Long, 1983) in addition to consistently providing comprehensible input (Krashen, 1985) every class. In addition, learning classroom English stimulated noticing (Schmidt, 1992), for example, when she was surprised by a student clarifying the meaning (in L2) of “how about” (see 7.1), and she was observed to elicit pushed output (Swain, 1993), such as when she expected students to use appropriate request forms. From my perspective as researcher, it seemed that knowledge of these mainstream hypotheses might have helped Mia gain more confidence in her practice and are examples of where her knowledge base could expand.

As the most experienced language teacher, Sami’s stated curricular pedagogical knowledge and knowledge about language teaching and learning were more elaborate and coherent than the others (see Marina in Tsui, 2003, p. 223). However, although she expressed knowledge of the professional discourse (e.g., comprehensible input, TBLT, collaborative learning), at times it seemed she had renamed practices, not reconstructed them in the sense of D. Freeman’s (1993) discussion (see also Feryok, 2008). It seemed practical knowledge was more influential because of concerns for negatively affecting students, for example, when limiting interaction during communicative activities (see 7.2). It seemed that the older participants were expert teachers, but as they recognized, were not necessarily expert language teachers. The topic of expertise in language teaching continues below as the PKB is extended.
9.2.3 An Integrated Developmental Model of the Professional Knowledge Base

In addressing gaps in literature, the sections above defined a locally appropriate knowledge base (Kubanyiova, 2014), grounded in the activity of teaching (D. Freeman & Johnson, 1998). The PKB provided a means of interpreting findings in terms of the disciplinary knowledge of AL. However, this model could be described as an etic one, and its utility is extended through connecting it to a more emic view of teacher cognition.

The deductive PKB model above faces an epistemological challenge in that there are multiple ways of interpreting teacher knowledge (Fenstermacher, 1994; D. Freeman & Johnson, 1998; Johnson, 2006; Tsui, 2003). Broadly, teacher knowledge can be categorized in two paradigms. One paradigm views teacher knowledge as content knowledge (Shulman, 1986; Wilson et al., 1987), which I describe as the disciplinary view of LTC. In this view, knowledge is generally assessed in terms of what is done to teach subject matter effectively. This is the function of the model above. It is an analytical tool with practical applications for understanding LTC in terms of the knowledge types exemplified in stated beliefs and observed teaching practices.

The second view interprets teacher knowledge as situated knowledge, a perspective emphasizing the personal experience of teachers for developing pedagogies. Situated knowledge includes the sociocultural (see Johnson, 2006), reflective practice (see Farrell, 2015b) and narrative traditions (see Clandinin & Connelly, 2000). These strands of research grew out of a key issue in that a priori knowledge from the respective disciplines (e.g., math, science, linguistics/AL, etc.) is quite different to how teachers perceive the practice of teaching. Researchers have shown that the context of education and the prior experiences of language teachers are integral aspects in the processes of learning to teach (see Borg, 2003, 2006; D. Freeman & Johnson, 1998; Roberts, 1998; Tsui, 2003; D. Woods, 1996; Wright, 2010; Velez-Rendon, 2002). Recent trends in the field for TESOL suggest a growing appreciation for the experiences of trainees in how they learn to teach and how they conceptualize pedagogic knowledge (Farrell, 2007b, 2008c; Johnson, 2006; Johnson & Golombek, 2002, 2010; Wright, 2010).
This more emic interpretation of teacher knowledge is described here as personal experiential knowledge (PEK), a concept analogous to personal practical knowledge (PPK), a term closely associated with NI (Clandinin, 1986; Golombek, 1998, 2009). While terminologically similar, PEK was a pragmatic choice given the definition of practical knowledge above. Further, this is intended to disassociate experiential knowledge from the constructs of image, rhythms, and narrative unity theorized into PPK (Connelly & Clandinin, 1987; see Fenstermacher, 1994; Willinsky, 1989 for discussion of theoretical issues in PPK/NI research; Chapter 4). This view is represented on the right side of Figure 9-2 below. The model uses PEK as an abstraction of the situated view, drawing attention to the influences of prior experiences on beliefs and practices. The categories are adapted from Golombek’s (1998) study. They are not intended as units of analysis, but rather to create symmetry in representing a conceptual divide for LTC research.

Figure 9-2. A conceptual divide for language teacher cognition.

(PEK categories are adapted from Golombek, 1998)
The conceptual divide as illustrated above amounts to what could be described as etic (i.e., disciplinary) and emic (i.e., situated) views of teacher cognition. The left side is the model derived from GT methods (see Chapter 5). This side could be thought of as representing what kinds of knowledge are indicated by LTC data. On the right is a representation of experiential knowledge. This side could be thought of as representing how and why language teachers came to their current practices. Further, the right side could be seen as an alternative approach for interpreting data.

Thus the conceptual divide also provides a visual representation of what was discussed in Chapter 4 as the differences between grounded narrative inquiry (GNI) and phenomena-and-method narrative inquiry (PAM NI) in LTC research. However, a problem with this dichotomy is that in essence both views represent something similar: the knowledge about language teaching that constitutes an ELT practice. This is an important consideration for the model. Understanding what language teachers know (and perhaps what they should know) is an important step for issues such as language policy (see Chapter 10), but the PKB is not a developmental model. The conceptual divide presents a challenge for SLTE and integrating these views seems necessary for extending the PKB model from one not only focused on content but also useful for language teacher development.

Below I propose a means of doing so. First, however, it is necessary to discuss a category notably absent from the knowledge base above, that is, pedagogical content knowledge (PCK) (Shulman, 1986), a term widely used in general education but one D. Freeman (2002) found problematic for language teaching. D. Freeman (2002) questioned the adaptation of PCK for language teaching, calling it “a messy and possibly unworkable concept” (p. 6) because of the overlapping areas of subject-matter and content knowledge. However, his critique of PCK could be thought of as problematizing the issue rather than as an argument to reject the concept. For example, Andrews (2003, 2007) proposed that this distinction is precisely the kind of issue a knowledgeable language teacher would be aware of and adapt practices accordingly.

This line of thinking is how the construct PCK is defined in this thesis, that it is knowledge of effective language teaching practices. Therefore, PCK can be thought of as a representation of ELT expertise in that this knowledge would be evident in the cognitions and practices of efficacious language teachers. This would span the spectrum of disciplinary knowledge of AL to local knowledge that is context specific.
As Turner-Bisset (1999) wrote, “It is in expert teachers that we can detect this kind of thinking, reflected in their performance” (p. 51).

As an analytical tool, then, the PKB can provide an indication of language teaching expertise insofar as the content of participants’ cognitions and practices relate to the knowledge base, and in doing so, suggest where gaps in that knowledge might be addressed. This seems important because participants’ uncertainties about the disciplinary knowledge created tensions that were resolved; however, the adaptations in their practices were not always indicative of efficacious language teaching (see also 9.5 below). As in Mia’s case discussed above (9.2.2.3), it seems likely that participants would have been more effective (and confident) language teachers had they been more aware of the disciplinary knowledge of AL.

It may be helpful to demonstrate this proposition with another example. In Yuna’s case, when starting a new unit she had students think about the topic and read the unit objectives (Chapter 8). This schema-building, it could be argued, was more indicative of expertise than omitting introductory sequences, as happened occasionally in other teachers’ classes. As a counter example, her decision to recycle the Kimchi Game every unit did not seem indicative of growing ELT expertise. She adapted procedures in order to keep students interested, but as interested as they were, there was no interaction because the game’s procedures actually hindered TL input/output. Moreover, her decision-making excluded adapting more communicative activities evident in her textbook. In this case, while she gained practical knowledge, her decision-making was not indicative of curricular pedagogical knowledge or knowledge about language teaching and learning. This gap in knowledge is one worth addressing if Yuna were to develop further as an English teacher.

However, Yuna’s decision-making was grounded in complex personal experiences in the classroom, influenced by her prior language learning, education, and teaching experience. Broadly, this would include her identity as a teacher, her knowledge of students, of context, of the subject matter, and of language pedagogy (Golombek, 1998). As SLTE researchers have stressed, language teacher education needs to connect the more theoretical, disciplinary knowledge with Yuna’s personal experiences in the classroom (D. Freeman & Johnson, 1998; Johnson & Golombek, 2002; Kubanyiova, 2012, 2014; D. Woods & Çakir, 2011).

The construct PCK can provide a means of envisioning this link. By defining it as a representation of effective language teaching practices, PCK can be seen as the
overarching construct of the knowledge base (see also Andrews, 2003, 2007; Turner-Bisset, 1999). From the disciplinary view, PCK is interpreted as content, that is, cognitions and practices indicate teachers’ professional knowledge, or in other words their language teaching expertise. From the situated view, PCK is seen as an outcome of the processes of language teaching development, that is, an expression of experiential knowledge. In this way PCK can be understood as both a knowledge base and a personal attribute of a language teacher (Gess-Newsome & Carlson, 2013). Figure 9.3 below presents a model for this proposal.

![Figure 9.3: An integrated model of the professional knowledge base.](image)

In the model above, the right side represents a developmental model bringing focus to how teachers came to their current beliefs and practices and the left side represents a way to describe the beliefs and practices in terms of the disciplinary knowledge. Thus PCK can be understood as a link for discussing both language teaching expertise and development. Although this theoretical model glosses over complexities regarding LTC and language teacher cognitive development (Feryok, 2010; Kubanyiova, 2012), it provides a means to envision what teachers think, know, believe, and do (Borg, 2006) in terms of the effectiveness of their practices while at the
same time appreciating the dynamic personal experiences leading to their current practices.

While there are limitations to this model, it has implications for SLTE research in Korea where the situated view appears marginalized (Moodie & Nam, forthcoming), and these are addressed in the conclusion. Below, the discussion continues by adapting a more emic view of teacher knowledge, looking at how participants came to their knowledge of ELT and the stated influences of the four phases of experience on cognitions and practices from both studies.

9.3 RQ3: What are the Stated Influences on the Cognitions and Practices of Korean English Teachers?

In this section, findings are discussed relating to the four phases of language teacher development discussed in Chapter 3. In answering RQ3, the discussion below compares influences on participants’ cognitions and practices regarding their:

1. prior language learning experience and education,
2. pre-service teacher education,
3. experience in the classroom as teachers, and
4. in-service language teacher education.

Distinguishing these phases provide useful categories for discussing the stated origins of teaching beliefs, and provide background on their situated knowledge. The themes discussed below provide the basis for further discussion of implications for the PKB model introduced above (see Chapter 10).

9.3.1 Phase 1: The Anti-apprenticeship of Observation

In an influential book, Lortie (1975) described the importance of prior education in developing pedagogies. In this thesis, participants’ experiences strongly exemplified an *anti-apprenticeship of observation*, generally describing the influence of their public school experience as examples of what not to do as English teachers. Lacking positive models of effective ELT, descriptions were often in terms of opposites (cf. *anti-model* in Velez-Rendon, 2002). Table 9.3 below summarizes the influences of prior schooling on the beliefs and practices reported by five teachers quoted in NF2 (Section 6.2).

These participants’ stories covered dominant themes on this topic from NF2.
Table 9-3  Summary of the Anti-Apprenticeship of Observation Expressed in NF2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant, Story Number</th>
<th>Experience as Learner</th>
<th>Influence on Stated Cognitions and Practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B.G., NF2-2</td>
<td>Observing corporal punishment</td>
<td>Make positive class atmosphere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.H., NF2-19</td>
<td>Grammar-translation &amp; L1 instruction</td>
<td>Speaking more important than translating; practice speaking every class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.K., NF2-23</td>
<td>Strict teacher &amp; boring classes</td>
<td>Classes should be fun with various activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.A., NF2-24</td>
<td>Grammar-focused lessons</td>
<td>Communication more important than grammar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y.M., NF2-2</td>
<td>Grammar-translation methods</td>
<td>Use meaning-focused activities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As Borg (2003, 2006) discussed, prior language learning influences cognitions throughout one’s career and provides the dominant model during SLTE (see Bailey et al., 1996; Golombek, 1998; Johnson, 1994, 2006; J. Richards et al., 1996). Nearly all participants in Study 1 were critical of public school English classes, and as teachers, their negative public school experiences seemed to strongly influence approaches to language teaching. In the case studies, negative experiences as learners were an apparent source of practical knowledge. As in Johnson’s (1994) study, this was particularly evident regarding their emphasis on making classes fun in contrast to their secondary school experience.

Similar to studies in Hong Kong (Cheng et al. 2009; Urmston, 2003) the older and younger participants attended school before and after national curricular reforms. Apart from the youngest teachers, none of the participants in Study 1 or 2 experienced similar conditions as students to the ones in which they were expected to teach. Furthermore, even for the youngest participants, there was little evidence of transferring positive teaching practices witnessed in this first phase (see also Nishino, 2012; Numrich, 1996). As teachers they were required to adapt to a changing education system without the benefit of experience as students of the reforms outlined in the new curriculum, namely, collaborative learning, student-centeredness, CLT, and TETE. As
research from Korea has found, teachers lacking a model of CLT in their own experience as learners are less likely to teach communicatively (K. Ahn, 2009; J. Choi, 2008; Guilloteaux, 2004). Therefore, pre- and in-service SLTE are important for instilling change in teacher practice; however, as discussed below, developing pedagogic knowledge in these phases has also been problematic (see also Moodie & Nam, forthcoming).

9.3.2 Phase 2: From “A Waste of Time” to “Very Helpful”

Relating to pre-service teacher education, perhaps the most important findings demonstrated the differences between older and younger participants. The older participants had no pre-service ELT education and they were very critical of educational course work, describing boring, impractical, and theory-based lectures. The younger participants seemed better prepared for ELT than the older participants when they started. This suggested, then, that the older teachers needed to rely more on practical knowledge than the younger teachers who learned ELT skills as part of their undergraduate teacher training.

Looking at evidence between the older and younger participants reflected improved pre-service teacher education in Korea and more practically-oriented education (see Kwon, 2000). Eunjeong and Yuna both felt their pre-service education prepared them well for planning and organizing lessons; they were confident teachers and they generally had clearer activity procedures, and at times more coherent sequencing, than the experienced teachers. They attributed this practical knowledge to peer-teaching sessions and the practicum. These were unexpected findings, but support the notion that experience does not necessarily imply expertise (Borg, 2006; Farrell, 2015a; Tsui, 2003).

Yuna and Eunjeong both described the effectiveness of classroom English courses for developing curricular pedagogical knowledge (i.e., TETE). They were required to demonstrate how to effectively use TL instruction. Further, they were taught appropriate times for code-switching to the L1, for example, while explaining complex procedures or checking comprehension. Through guided peer-teaching sessions, they were able to connect the policy with personal experience in the classroom. These were practices Sami struggled with in order for them to become part of her knowledge base (Section 7.2; see also Kang, 2008).
However, as found in many studies on CLT in Korea (J. Jeon, 1997, 2009; E.-J. Kim, 2008, 2010; Yook, 2010) and other Asian countries (e.g., Butler, 2005; Carless, 2004; Farrell, 2006, 2008b), it seemed pre-service education was insufficient for instilling communicative approaches in classrooms of novice teachers. Similarly, a gap in this aspect of curricular pedagogical knowledge is implied by only one TBA occurring in all the data sets.

Yates and Muchiskey (2003) discussed concerns that the influence of a situated and reconceptualized knowledge base (see D. Freeman & Johnson, 1998) was marginalizing the disciplinary knowledge of AL in SLTE. As argued above, disciplinary knowledge is also an issue for Korea, but not, however, because a situated view of SLTE displaced it. Rather, there was not much existing ELT coursework to begin with (see Kwon, 2000; see also Moodie & Nam, forthcoming). Moreover, findings from Study 1 and 2 suggest that knowledge of language teaching and learning tends to be transmitted through lectures and as terms to be memorized for application exams. The disciplinary knowledge of AL does not seem to be effectively transmitted because it is not developed into new understandings that are mediated through experience (D. Freeman & Johnson, 1998; D. Woods & Çakir, 2011, p. 389). This was an issue also discussed in Nishino’s (2012) study in Japan whose four interview participants discussed the problems of theory-driven pre-service SLTE there. As discussed above, it suggests the efficacy of pre-service education would likely be improved by continuing to adapt a more situated view of teacher knowledge.

Of further importance was that no participants specialized in ELT, but all ended up teaching it (see also Jung & Norton, 2002). This meant that much of their development as language teachers came from being “thrown in the classroom” (see 7.1). The influences of their in-service experience are discussed below.

9.3.3 Phase 3: Homeroom Teaching as the Source of Practical Knowledge

In NF4, teachers’ expectations for teaching English contrasted with demands of teaching in public schools. The vision versus reality (Johnson, 1996) was clearly a theme in both studies, particularly for the older teachers who had no pre-service ELT training. As in Farrell’s studies (2006, 2007a), participants in general did not seem to feel prepared or confident before starting. It appeared that teachers in general were
inadequately prepared for the demands of ELT and thus relied on their *practical knowledge* from HRT as a means of coping with the situation.

In the case studies, prior teaching experiences were particularly evident in their planning, instructional routines, strategies for classroom management, and concern for student needs. As Sami expressed it, ELT was seen as “simplified” homeroom teaching (7.2). All teachers adapted HRT knowledge while teaching English. In linking HRT to ELT practices, these findings appear to be a new contribution for primary English education in Korea (see Moodie & Nam, forthcoming). Because the influence of prior HRT experience was embedded in the case studies and discussion above (Section 9.2.2.1), it will not be repeated here. However, one important finding was that *the primacy of practical knowledge* was a dominant theme in their knowledge base. This could be a topic that should be discussed in future studies, particularly considering the turnover of English teachers in primary schools (see Chapter 10).

### 9.3.4 Phase 4: Variable Outcomes: “The Turning Point” to “a Wasting of Time and Money”

To begin, it may be helpful to review the findings from case studies on this topic. While Sami recognized her INSET course as “the turning point”, Mia’s experiences in over 400 hours of shorter courses were described as “a wasting of time and money”. For Eunjeong, 180 hours of training appeared to have minimal influence, whereas two observations of “famous” teachers had a profound impact on her development. (Yuna had no in-service training.) Although individuals bring diverse experiences and expectations to in-service training, discussing the types of programs these participants attended is helpful for interpreting why the findings were so different with these English teachers.

Sami was the only participant to attend the INSET course. For Sami this course was influential and she found that she improved her English proficiency and learned ideas for games and communicative activities. The course also included six months paid leave and a month-long ELT course in California, an experience she really enjoyed.

Researchers looking at INSET have made many criticisms of the program (see 3.7.1). For example, while teachers tended to give positive evaluations, Yang (2009) criticized evaluation instruments for eliciting superficial impressions. Further, there is
scant evidence of the influence of in-service programs for changing practices (Moodie & Nam, forthcoming). Training may be ineffective because it does not connect to the classrooms of trainees (see Roberts, 1998). Sami had taught English for a year prior to the INSET and was eager to improve and this likely helped her contextualize the training she received.

Mia and Eunjeong attended multiple 60-hour TEE courses and both were quite critical of these. As many scholars have reiterated, SLTE needs to connect to teachers’ personal and practical experiences in the classroom in order to facilitate change (D. Freeman, 1993; Golombek, 1998; Johnson, 1994; D. Woods & Çakir, 2011). The decontextualization of SLTE seems to be the biggest issue for in-service training in Korea in that occurs in isolated settings, often during school vacations.

Understanding the origins of in-service SLTE in Korea is helpful for discussing its current manifestation. Program administrators considered the perceived needs of the teachers as stakeholders in retraining courses as the new curriculum came online (Kwon, 2000). Teachers felt that as experienced teachers who knew how to teach, their biggest obstacle for new reforms would be English proficiency (see also Llurda, 2005; Medgyes, 1983, 1994). Because of this, in-service SLTE in Korea has prioritized teacher L2 learning over ELT pedagogy (see Section 3.7.1).

Recent research such as Hiver’s (2013) study of trainees’ possible selves and Yeum’s (2012) qualitative evaluation of an INSET program discussed how participants seemed preoccupied with proficiency, seemingly underappreciating the disciplinary knowledge of ELT. Their studies demonstrate that teacher proficiency is still an important issue for ELT in Korea (cf. Kwon, 2000), particularly with matters of identity. However, on the whole it appears that this emphasis on knowledge of language for teaching (i.e., proficiency), has led to questionable results for such a significant investment in teacher training. In three of four cases in Study 2, proficiency was not an issue for the participants and data pointed to gaps in other knowledge types in the PKB hierarchy (see 9.2.2.3). It appears that curricular pedagogical knowledge and knowledge about language teaching and learning are not effectively transmitted, despite Korea being an OECD leader in hours of in-service training (see E.-G. Kim, 2011).

Eunjeong’s experience watching two experienced English teachers in classrooms similar to her own is notable in this regard. With just two observations her beliefs aligned closer to policy (i.e., TETE) and she began to reconstruct her practice
(D. Freeman, 1993). It seems that program administrators should reconsider the direction of in-service SLTE by adapting a more situated view of teacher knowledge in order to support more of these kinds of situated experiences for trainees. This is an implication addressed in the conclusion that is strengthened by discussion of the final RQ (Section 9.5). Next, however, the discussion will turn towards the observation data, grounding the thesis in the practices of teachers and looking at the knowledge base in action.

9.4 RQ4: What are the Observed Practices of Korean English Teachers?

This section synthesizes observation data from the four case studies with primary school KETs, beginning with a discussion of language use, followed by mixed-method analysis of pedagogic activities from observation reports (see Appendices R & S). The PKB provided a framework for the analysis that focuses on curricular pedagogical knowledge by looking at curricular themes evident in teaching practices. As covered in Chapter 2, major curricular reforms called for English to be the language of instruction (i.e., TETE) and for more:

- communicative activities,
- task-based learning,
- student-centered classes,
- collaborative learning, and
- focus on meaning.

Observation reports were designed for tracking data on these themes (Appendix N). First, TETE policy is discussed before turning to notable differences between the experienced and novice teachers regarding the communicativeness of their lessons (cf. Tsui, 2003).

9.4.1 Language Use in Class: Reconceptualizing TETE

In this section, language use is discussed in light of TETE policy, a reform recommending the use of English as the language of instruction. TETE is generally interpreted as a mandate for teachers to use TL exclusively in class but has been criticized for its ambiguity on this point as teachers were uncertain about how much
English they needed to use (I. Jo, 2011). Prior research suggested maximizing teachers' L2 use in classrooms (e.g., Kang, 2008; S.-Y. Kim, 2008), but the question remains as to what that should look like in practice.

Prior studies showed that especially in secondary schools, teachers tended to avoid using English for a number of reasons, for example, classroom management issues and socialization of colleagues (Nam, 2011; S.-K. Shin, 2012). In contrast to these findings, with the exception of Eunjeong, these teachers used English extensively, effectively giving instructions, demonstrating activities, complimenting students, and managing activities, demonstrating their knowledge of language for teaching. Socialization to the status quo of L1 instruction was markedly different to S.-K. Shin’s (2012) study. Through enacting TETE policy, their practices demonstrated curricular pedagogical knowledge. However, as in Kang’s (2008) study, participants code-switched effectively while attuning to the needs of students, which was a divergence from policy recommendations (e.g., Appendix A, Item M). As Kang suggested, it seems exclusive TL is not ideal for primary English education (see also I. Jo, 2011).

Moreover, an important contribution from Study 2 came from observations in Mia’s classes. In research from Korea, evidence of student TL use was conspicuously absent in reviewed studies (Moodie & Nam, forthcoming). Her decision to teach and insistence that students used classroom English provided opportunities for meaningful TL interactions between the students and herself, and importantly, allowed for much more student-student interaction than in any other setting, especially when combined with collaborative activities.

This change in her teaching was notable (see 9.5), particularly given the ambiguity over TETE policy in research (see Moodie & Nam, forthcoming). The policy is vague and this is an issue for efficacy. It seems teachers generally interpret TETE only as a directive for using English themselves (see also I. Jo, 2011), quite possibly based on folklinguistic interpretations of the input hypothesis (Krashen, 1985). There is little to suggest that KETs give much consideration to student TL interaction in classrooms (see Moodie & Nam, forthcoming). These findings imply that clarifying and revisiting TETE could be efficacious, for example, by providing directives for stimulating meaningful, ongoing student-teacher and student-student TL interaction through the use of classroom English (see Section 10.3.3).
9.4.2 Planning: Supplementary Materials and indischool.com

In the following sections, pedagogic activities from observations are discussed, highlighting important differences between the experienced and novice teachers (cf. Tsui, 2003). Figure 9-4 below displays sources for pedagogic activities as a percentage of class time for the four teachers. Strikingly, their assigned textbooks were used less than 30% of the time and all teachers sourced most materials from elsewhere, especially from indischool.com.

Moodie and Nam (forthcoming) noted how research on primary ELT materials looked for ways to include more collaborative, meaningful, and learner-centered materials. Interestingly, teachers often skipped the most student-centered, communicative activities from their textbooks, sometimes downgrading tasks and communicative activities to language exercises.

Participants were critical of their textbooks; however, criticisms were infrequently directed not at the language content, but rather over how they were constructed. This might be explained through two interrelated observations: Teachers criticized the materials because (1) there were issues regarding the cohesiveness of textbook design (e.g., see 8.2.8) but also that (2) participants lacked knowledge about materials development. An important point is that participants’ L2 proficiency did not seem to be an issue for avoiding communicative activities (cf. Butler, 2005; J. Jeon, 2009; Yang, 2009; Yook, 2010), rather, a better explanation might be a combination of poorly designed materials and a gap in knowledge about language teaching and learning (i.e., materials design).

These findings suggest that while (1) the textbooks themselves need to be better designed for the needs of inexperienced language teachers, (2) the participants’ gap in knowledge about materials design contributed to the avoidance of the most communicative textbook activities as they sourced materials elsewhere, most frequently on indischool.com. Indischool.com is a closed teacher message board only available to public school primary teachers. This grassroots initiative provided a platform for collaboration, a notable finding considering the negative processes of workplace socialization discussed elsewhere (K. Ahn, 2010b; S.-K. Shin, 2012). However, it seems necessary to investigate the quality of materials recommended by teachers on indischool.com, particularly regarding the communicativeness of activities (see 10.3.5).
Sources of Materials

Experienced Teachers

Mia (16th year, 2nd ELT)

- NEST: 0%
- Other: 13%
- TB: 11%
- IS: 6%
- FH: 64%

Sami (20th year, 6th ELT)

- NEST: 5%
- Other: 2%
- TB: 33%
- IS: 29%
- FH: 0%

Novice Teachers

Eunjeong (2nd year, 1st ELT)

- Other: 18%
- NEST: 0%
- SM: 27%
- FH: 0%
- IS: 20%

Yuna (1st year, 1st ELT)

- Other: 38%
- NEST: 0%
- SM: 6%
- FH: 0%
- IS: 6%

Figure 9-4. Sources of materials in observed classes as percentage of class time in Study 2.

[Textbook (TB), inidschool.com (IS), 500 Activities for the Primary Classroom (Read, 2007) (FH), self-made (SM), native English speaking teacher (NEST)]
9.4.3 The Communicativeness of Pedagogic Activities for Experienced and Novice Teachers

Analysis of pedagogic activities reflects *curricular pedagogical knowledge* as evident in teachers’ practices. This section addresses a gap in research on the differences between experienced novice teachers in Korea (cf. J. Richards, 1998b; Tsui, 2003) and addresses two methodological shortcomings in research on CLT in Korea, namely, (1) reliance on self-report instruments and (2) the paucity of longitudinal data (see Chapter 3). Study 2 included 27 observations occurring over two semesters with triangulated data from field notes, video-recordings, transcripts, and observation reports. The analysis below continues based on three observation reports (Chapters 7 & 8) from each participant. On the observation reports, I tracked the activities observed in classes and used curricular themes to categorize the coding (see Appendix P). First, findings from cross-case analysis are presented for the convenience of the reader with the discussion continuing below (see 5.5.4.4 for the analytic procedures).

First, Figure 9.5 below displays the percentage of class time teachers spent on various pedagogic activities. Analysis revealed notable differences between the experienced and novice teachers regarding the communicativeness of their activities, for example, the experienced teachers spent much more class time on communicative activities (64% and 40% versus 25% and 8%). In contrast, novice teachers more frequently included language exercises (11 and 9 versus 3 and 6). Experienced teachers’ activities were more indicative of CLT, a point of emphasis in the curriculum. Novice teachers spent much more class time on things other than pedagogic activities (24% and 39% versus 13% and 4%). The experienced teachers filled nearly all classes with activities, generally moving from one to the next. Part of this may be attributable to HRT experience in that they were drawing on practical knowledge for their ELT pedagogic routines. Interestingly, the novice teachers had clearer sequences in some ways, for example, spending more time on opening sequences, schema building, and reviewing than the experienced teachers.

No task-based activities were observed (and only one occurred in all CIL data). This demonstrates a clear gap in curricular pedagogical knowledge for all participants regarding TBLT, although this is not a phenomenon unique to Korean teachers (see Ellis, 2009).
Figure 9-5. Activity types in observed classes as percentage of class time.

(Data were tabulated from three classes per participant)

[Language exercise (LE), communicative activity (CA), task-based activity (TBA), singing (SG)]
Figure 9.6. Percentage of class time spent on different groupings in observed classes.

[Individual activity (IA), pair work (PW), group work (GW), full class activity (FCA)]

Second, Figure 9.6 above displays data comparing groupings for activities, a feature relating to the degree of student-centeredness observed. Key findings were as follows: Experienced teachers spent much more time on group and pair work (72% and 29%), whereas novice teachers did none (0% and 0%). Novice teachers did more individual activities (17% and 13%) than experienced teachers who did none in these classes (0% and 0%). These findings corroborate CIL findings revealing similar trends (Appendix Q) and provide quantified evidence that experienced teachers’ classes were more student-centered.
Sami, Eunjeong, and Yuna organized most activities as full-class activities. Present-practice-produce (PPP) seemed an influential method for structuring lessons. Their classes were more teacher-centered than Mia’s. Mia was more experimental in her procedures, an observation associated with experienced teachers in other contexts (J. Richards, 1998b; Tsui, 2003). More data on student-centeredness came from looking at interaction occurring during activities (see below).

Third, Figure 9.7 above displays the percentage of class time that included activities with student-student interaction. Nearly 80% of Mia’s class time came from activities including student-student interaction, whereas 40% of Sami’s did, but only 10% and 8% of Eunjeong and Yuna’s classes did.

Together these data sets provide fairly clear evidence that the experienced teachers were more closely aligned with the call for communicative, student-centered classrooms (MEST, 2008a). However, these data sets are limited because they do not account for how teachers managed activities, something addressed qualitatively in the case studies.
Fourth, looking at the subcategories of activity type (i.e., “descriptors” on the observation reports) revealed that experienced teachers included more collaborative activities than the novice teachers who did none. As shown in Figure 9.6 above, Mia did the most group work by far of all participants (66%; Sami 25%; Eunjeong and Yuna 0%). Inevitably, these findings are not a reliable indication of the entire year; however, as a general observation Mia did have much more communicative group work than the others, and referred to them more frequently in CILs (see Appendix Q). Moreover, she often included collaborative group work, for example, the envelope race activity. Although Sami sometimes included collaborative activities, they had more limited procedures than Mia’s (see Chapter 7).

Fifth, Figure 9.8 looked at whether activities were predominantly form-focused or meaning-focused. All teachers spent much more time on form-focused activities than meaning-focused activities, showing that they all diverged from this curricular objective. As a general observation, speaking and writing activities were usually supported by prompts written on presentation files or blackboards, thereby limiting authentic language use even during ostensibly meaning-focused activities. An
interpretation for this finding is that perhaps teachers were applying *practical knowledge* in that they seemed concerned about negatively affecting low-level students. Also, providing language structures enabled more control over time management during class.

Overall, through describing the activities observed from four teachers, the above analysis provides some quantified data of CLT in Korean classrooms, a problematic area for research from Korea (Moodie & Nam, forthcoming). As in other studies (Butler 2005; Jung & Norton; S. H. Yim 2009; Yook 2010), participants held positive perceptions of CLT, but their practices were not necessarily indicative of the discourse (D. Freeman, 1993). Communicative activities were much scarcer in the novice teacher classes and PPP seemed an influential method for structuring classes with three of four participants. Although they expressed the terminology of CLT to some degree, it became apparent that uncertainties about the approach were limiting implementation. These findings contributed to developing the PKB models above.

Nevertheless, this study provided evidence of some elements of CLT being effectively applied in Korean primary classrooms, particularly in Mia’s case where cooperative learning and student-centeredness were most evident. Although Mia demonstrated the most student-centered, collaborative, and communicative teaching in this study, she also experienced many challenges with classroom management (see below).

In summary, discussion of findings of classroom practices filled a gap in the literature for primary English education (Moodie & Nam, forthcoming). Further, it contributes to the discussion of the differences between novice and experienced teachers (e.g., Farrell, 2006, 2008c; J. Richards, 1998b; Tsui, 2003) and curricular reform and CLT in Asia (K. Ahn, 2009; E.-J. Kim, 2008; Littlewood, 2007; Nishino, 2012; J. Richards & Pennington, 1998; Urmston & Pennington, 2008) by suggesting that CLT can be appropriate and effective in EFL contexts.

### 9.4.4 Habituation and the Tolerance of Negative Behavior

In a large-scale survey of teachers, the biggest issues inhibiting CLT in Korea were found to be large classes, insufficient SLTE, and the lack of appropriate materials (J. Jeon, 2009). While these issues were evident in the present study, *classroom management problems* seemed a greater inhibitor of communicative teaching.
Prior studies suggested that novice teachers were more concerned with student behavior, whereas experienced teachers tended to give more attention to language and learning objectives (D. Freeman, 2002; Nunan, 1992; J. Richards, 1998). However, in Study 2, the more experienced teachers focused more on behavior than the younger teachers who placed more emphasis on language, an unexpected finding considering these studies.

In research from Korea, many issues for implementing CLT and TETE have been discussed (Moodie & Nam, forthcoming), three of which seemed most relevant here: (1) classroom management problems, (2) large classes, and (3) the socialization of students (see also 3.6.2.2). These interrelated issues seemed critical for discussing teaching practices and making sense of teacher decision-making. Similar to Jung and Norton’s (2002) study, as English subject teachers, participants persistently faced troubles with student behavior. Despite applying their practical knowledge through rapport building, reward systems, and maintaining rules, discipline was an ongoing challenge. To illustrate, Table 9.4 below lists some of the incidents occurring at these schools recorded in field notes during Study 2.

Table 9-4 A List of Behavioral Incidents Occurring During Study 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incidents observed or heard about at these schools</th>
<th>Incidents observed during classes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• a student defecated and urinated on HRT’s chair</td>
<td>• kicking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• a student urinated on books in the library</td>
<td>• pushing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• students broke into school after hours to use computers</td>
<td>• pulling hair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• students broke into another school’s English Zone to have a sleepover</td>
<td>• fighting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• students stealing from other students and teachers</td>
<td>• yelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• numerous cases of physical violence and bullying</td>
<td>• insulting classmates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• numerous cases of verbal abuse</td>
<td>• racial slurs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• swearing in L1 and L2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• student writing “fuck” and “sex” on the wall before class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• panmal ‘informal Korean’ with NEST</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Student behavior often negatively influenced the learning environment. From an etic perspective, teachers appeared to have a high tolerance of negative behavior, often ignoring or paying little attention to many incidents negatively influencing other learners. Problems with classroom management are in part explained through the subject-homeroom teacher dichotomy, a theme discussed by all participants at some time. Tsui (2009) wrote that “in many Asian cultures, expert teachers are those who can maintain discipline in the classroom” (p. 191). English teachers were expected to deal with classroom problems internally, but lacked the authority to do so. As Mia said, students think “it’s okay to be crazy in a subject teacher’s class” because “there is no homeroom teacher here” (MI12: 13–16). Not wanting to offend homeroom teachers or lose face, they had little recourse for discipline, and tolerated ongoing behavioral problems. This problem affected experienced teachers like Mia as much as it did first-year teachers like Yuna, but as an experienced teacher Mia had more resources for managing it that Yuna lacked (see also Moodie & Feryok, 2015).

Nevertheless, despite Mia’s emphasis on good manners, behavior problems were a systemic and ongoing issue for her as well. Teachers seemed habituated to negative behavior, seeing it more as matter of course rather than something that needed to be or could be addressed.

These findings were unanticipated, but it seems necessary to provide an interpretation. Although not stated by the teachers, an important principle seemed to be just get by. They felt the burden of extra duties and had limited time to cover all materials (see also J. Jeon, 2009; J. H. Moon & Pyo, 2010). Participants reflected urgency to keep going, moving on to the next class, lesson, even year, leaving an appearance of getting by rather than thriving. Like in other studies (Nam, 2011; S.-K. Shin, 2012), they faced many classroom management issues regarding large classes and student misbehavior, and perhaps thinking just get by was a way to cope. From my perspective as researcher, this seems a critical issue in need of attention by policy makers in Korea (see 10.3.1.2).
9.5 RQ5: What Experiences Led to Change in Cognitions and Practices during the Study?

Answering this final research question led to investigating the experiences of English teachers that led to changes in cognitions and practices during the study. First, findings from Study 1 are synthesized before turning to the critical incident analysis from Study 2.

9.5.1 Discussion of Changes in Beliefs about ELT in Study 1

In NF4, nearly everyone described clear changes in opinions before and after beginning ELT (Section 6.4). These changes trended towards seeing it as more challenging than anticipated. Overall, language related beliefs were more commonly written about as prior thoughts, such as needing only English proficiency to teach, whereas ELT method-oriented comments were much more frequently written about under current thoughts or future hopes. For example, Table 9.5 below provides a summary of responses from three participants quoted in NF4.

Table 9-5 Summary of Reasons to Teach English, Prior and Current Thoughts, and Future Hopes from NF4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant, Story Number</th>
<th>Prior Thoughts</th>
<th>Current Thoughts</th>
<th>Future Hopes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K.H., NF4-25</td>
<td>Need L2 proficiency</td>
<td>Should know ELT methods</td>
<td>Help students achieve high level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.S., NF4-5</td>
<td>Easier than HRT</td>
<td>Getting harder</td>
<td>Improve ELT methods and L2 proficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y.S., NF4-12</td>
<td>Need only L2 proficiency</td>
<td>Harder than other subjects</td>
<td>Improve as teacher</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recurring themes from participants’ stories revealed a trend in their changes in opinions before and after starting ELT. It seemed that many teachers initially believed that English proficiency was of primary importance (i.e., knowledge of language for teaching); however, after starting they stressed more appreciation for knowledge about language teaching and learning.
Using K.H.’s story to contextualize this interpretation also extends the discussion of the PKB. She wrote:

Before I thought … teachers should speak English well … have a knowledge about grammar and culture. Now I think … English teacher should have lots of knowledge about children, know methods about English teaching, have a philosophy about English education. (K.H., NF4-25)

In K.H.’s words, we can see appreciation for practical knowledge and knowledge about language teaching and learning after starting to teach English, whereas initially she believed that knowledge of language for teaching and linguistic knowledge were more important.

The significance of these findings is that these participants as a cohort seemed to hold unrealistic expectations regarding the demands of ELT, that is, conflicts in the vision versus reality of language teaching (Johnson, 1996). As discussed above, it seems that teachers may be overly preoccupied with proficiency at the expense of other knowledge types (see 9.2.2). While teachers’ affective stance regarding their own proficiency is an undoubtedly important consideration for language teacher development (see Hiver, 2013), from an etic perspective this appeared not to be a significant limitation for effective teaching in Study 2. Describing gaps in practical knowledge (e.g., effective classroom management), curricular pedagogical knowledge (e.g., adapting student-centered, communicative materials), and knowledge about language teaching and learning (e.g., ELT methodology and SLA) provided a more convincing interpretation for explaining the issues for primary English education than problems with teachers’ English proficiency, their own concerns notwithstanding.

Study 1 provided retrospective data on changes in beliefs about ELT. This is useful as a starting point, but Study 2 extends this discussion by considering the changing cognitions and practices that occurred in the context of teaching during the study.

9.5.2 The Gap in Research on Language Teacher Cognitive Change

Research on language teacher cognitive change has scarcely investigated development of in-service teachers in the context of their classrooms. The majority of research in this area has investigated the influence of pre-service teacher education on
cognitions, and to a lesser degree, in-service training courses (Borg, 2003, 2006; Kubanyiova, 2012). This fact is understandable considering researchers are likely to have the most access and incentives to look at these settings.

While the body of work has contributed much towards understanding LTC (see Chapter 3), methodologically, evidence for cognitive change has been problematic, often including self-reported data or observations of demonstration classes or the practicum experience, settings that are not indicative of the normal conditions that teachers work (Borg, 2006; Kubanyiova, 2012). Moreover, this research has generally looked for evidence of discrete concepts or methods as taught in coursework.

Kubanyiova (2012) raised three further conceptual criticisms of the research. First, she found the field to be largely fragmented, rarely linking thought and action. Second, it “is marked by the absence of relevant frameworks” (p. 10), and third, there has been “limited geographical and subject matter coverage” (p. 11). Her critique influenced the analysis below.

First, attention is given to the process of changes occurring naturalistically in the practices of in-service teachers during the study (but see 10.4 for a discussion of reflexivity). Second, the analysis included a two-stage framework: Initially, CI analysis (Webster & Mertova, 2007) was used in the case studies to identify changes in practices concurrent with changes in cognition, then GT methods (Charmaz, 2014) were used to uncover underlying themes. Both stages included triangulated data. Third, through investigating change in the practices of four Korean primary school English teachers, it focuses on a gap in research from state school EFL contexts taught by NNESTs.

9.5.3 A Critical Incidents Model for Interpreting Language Teacher Cognitive Development

This thesis contributes to understanding language teacher change by adapting a grounded, naturalistic approach. Rather than beginning top-down with a construct from applied linguistics or SLTE, GT (Charmaz, 2014; Corbin & Strauss, 2008) facilitated interpreting the process of language teacher cognitive change occurring in participants’ practices during the study.

CI analysis from the case studies provided insight into the processes of change. To review, Table 9.6 below summarizes the most prominent incidents from the four participants in Study 2.
Mia – (Experienced teacher, novice language teacher)
- Trying collaborative group work (Envelope Race Activity)
- Had laryngitis and planned collaborative activity “because I can’t talk…It was the only way”
- Commitment mindset: Normative
- Surprised at effectiveness: “somehow it’s really working”
- Evaluation: “they write but they don’t realize they have to write” …
  “…the best thing [was]…I could really observe them…I could make notes about the English that they said to each other [in order to compliment them]”
- Change in practice: planned more collaborative activities in future lessons
- Type of knowledge change: curricular pedagogic knowledge (i.e., collaborative learning and CLT)

Sami - (Experienced teacher, experienced language teacher)
- Adapting coupon reward system for portfolio checks
- Narrowing level gaps is the “biggest problem that I have”
- Commitment mindset: Normative
- Surprise at effectiveness: “They had done it! … They said … I only thought about coupons”
- Evaluation: “I saw the delighted or joyful face when they got the sticker”
- “They are really motivated … I think I’m really clever ((laughter))”
- Change in practice: Assigning homework to stimulate TL practice outside of class
- Type of knowledge change: practical knowledge (i.e., adapting classroom management routine from HRT); also knowledge about language teaching and learning (i.e., fostering motivation)

Eunjeong – (Novice teacher, first-year language teacher)
- Feeling obligated to use L2 for instruction but “[in] our school 100% teaching English in English is impossible”
• After observing first teacher: “I want to speak English more.”
• Commitment mindset: Normative
• Surprise after observing second teacher where students used only English: “I was shocked.”
• Change in practice: Began using more English during instructional sequences
• Type of knowledge change: curricular pedagogical knowledge (i.e., TETE)

Yuna (First-year teacher, first-year language teacher)
• Rejecting textbook activities “I cannot understand this textbook’s aim”
• Commitment mindset: Continuance
• Substituted textbook activities with games (Kimchi Game and Zombie Game)
• Evaluation: “I realized, oh, I can use this game every lesson [unit]”
• Change in practice: Recycled games making more elaborate procedures as students lost interest through the year
• Type of knowledge change: practical knowledge (i.e., planning and routines)

Although Kubanyiova (2012) wrote that “teacher conceptual change does not follow a predictable trajectory” (p. 191), CI analysis from these case studies offer a direction for understanding LTC development as occurring in the context of teaching. Cross-case and constant comparative analysis uncovered a few features of the conditions leading to change in the practices of KETs in this study. The following themes were evident in CI analysis in the case studies:

First, the process of change was mediated by personal experiences connected to specific practices, for example, planning pedagogic activities or the language used during instructional sequences (e.g., L1 or L2).

Second, experience involved tensions relating to specific practices (D. Freeman, 1993). Tensions seemed to involve cognitive dissonance (Festinger, 1962), often with moral or emotional qualities (see also Golombek & Doran, 2014).

Third, incidents occurred initiating changes in practices (see Chapter 5 on CI theory). These ranged from the more dramatic, such as Mia reorienting plans because she could not speak, to the more practically oriented, such as Yuna experiencing difficulties with textbook activities.
Fourth, in seeking to resolve tensions, participants seemed *compelled* to change. They were committed to self-directed development. *Normative mindsets* (Meyer & Herscovitch, 2001) were most evident in commitments to change in these incidents.

Fifth, changing practices involved *heuristic decision-making*. They were not necessarily seeking *curricular pedagogical knowledge* or *knowledge about language teaching and learning*. Teachers sought practical solutions to in-class problems.

Sixth, teachers *applied* a new practice. They tried something different, not just thought about doing so.

Seventh, there was a *positive evaluation* of the new practice. This was generally marked by an element of *surprise in the effectiveness* of the new practice.

Eighth, evaluating new practices led to *consciousness-raising*. They gained deeper awareness of developmental and/or pedagogical aspects associated with the practice. However, expressions of new knowledge were not always indicative of the professional discourse (see D. Freeman, 1993).

Ninth, change was evident in *committed actions to changing practices coinciding with changes in cognitions*. Through persistence, participants reformed their teaching practice. As other researchers have noted (Borg, 2006; D. Woods, 1996), there was not necessarily a causal link between changes in beliefs and practices; however, what was important was that both practices and cognitions changed.

Tenth, changes in cognitions indicated an *expanding professional knowledge base*. However, not all changes were indicative of language teaching expertise (see Tsui, 2003, 2009).

These themes were evident to some degree in all CI from the case studies. The analysis is proposed as a model for understanding change in LTC in the context of teaching. This is summarized in Figure 9-9 below.
Figure 9-9. A critical incidents model for understanding language teacher cognitive change with in-service teachers.

Notably, this process generally occurred sequentially in the order written above (see Appendix X for checklist). Eunjeong’s implementation of TETE was the one exception to this order, applying a new practice after observing expert teachers. Moreover, her change involved applying *curricular pedagogical knowledge* rather than *heuristic decision-making*. However, her case could be interpreted as an exception that proves the rule. This change involved observing experienced teachers in similar classrooms which she could connect to her own (D. Freeman & Johnson, 1998; Johnson & Golombek, 2002; Kubanyiova, 2012, 2014; D. Woods & Çakir, 2011). Sami’s case
was also an exception in some ways, for example, seeing the research process as an opportunity for development. Her case did not fit the model as closely as the others; however, her experience as a research participant was important in that it supports the ongoing discussion that questions the status quo of SLTE in Korea.

As D. Woods and Çakir (2011) wrote, “New understandings evolve first by going beyond the terms and developing personal conceptions through experience” (p. 389). Rather than beginning with *a priori* constructs, the CI model began with the experiences of language teachers, looking at conceptual change in the context of teaching. A contribution from this model is that it provides a means of interpreting the trajectory of language teacher cognitive change. While complimentary to Gregoire’s (2003) cognitive-affective model and the possible selves model proposed by Kubanyiova (2012), it extends on these by linking thought and action and brings a grounded approach unifying emotions, cognitions, and classroom practices (cf. Golombek & Doran, 2014). Moreover, it leads to practical implications and recommendations for SLTE as it relates to PCK and language teaching expertise in Korea, an important topic addressed in the concluding chapter.
CHAPTER 10: CONCLUSION

This concluding chapter begins with a review of the research aims followed by a summary of the main contributions. Subsequently, it discusses implications and addresses limitations. The chapter closes with recommendations for future research and researcher reflections.

10.1 Research Aims

This thesis investigated language teacher cognition (LTC) and development in a public school EFL context with non-native speaking teachers; this is an area that has been previously underrepresented in research (Borg, 2006; Kubanyiova, 2014). Seeking to address gaps in literature on language teaching commitments, LTC, and research on language teacher cognitive change, the project grew from the following aims that emerged during the study:

1. To explore the role of commitment in learning English, becoming teachers, and teaching English in Korean public schools;
2. to investigate the stated thoughts, beliefs, and knowledge of Korean primary school English teachers;
3. to interpret how prior experiences in the four phases of language teacher development influenced cognitions and practices;
4. to investigate and compare novice and experienced teachers’ practices in light of curricular aims; and
5. to understand the experiences occurring during the study that led to changes in cognitions and practices.

In order to investigate these aims, a qualitative research project was designed that adapted grounded theory (GT) methods (Charmaz, 2014; Corbin & Strauss, 2008; Glaser & Strauss, 1967), critical incident (CI) analysis (Webster & Mertova, 2007), narrative inquiry (NI) (Polkinghorne, 1995), and case study methods (Chase, 2005; Yin, 2014). Designed as two studies, the first was an exploratory grounded narrative inquiry (GNI) including stories of experiences from 27 Korean English teachers (KET). Story compositions were prompted with narrative frames (NF) (Barkhuizen & Wette, 2008),
and topics in Study 1 included reasons for teaching English, prior learning and education experience, pre-service teacher education, and the first year teaching English.

The second study included four case studies, two with experienced primary teachers and two with novice teachers. Through in-depth and longitudinal engagement, Study 2 explored the experiences of English language teachers in the activity of teaching, looking at their reasons for teaching English, their conceptions of ELT, the influences of prior experience on stated cognitions and practices, their enactment of curricular aims, and the process of change in cognitions and practice. Triangulating multiple sources of data, including open and semi-structured interviews, reflective writing, critical incident logs, and observations, the study also addressed methodological issues in local research specifically (Moodie & Nam, forthcoming) and in the field more generally (Borg, 2003, 2006). The main contributions are summarized below, followed by a discussion of the implications, limitations, and future research directions.

10.2 Summary of Major Contributions

10.2.1 ELT Commitment and Turnover in Korea

An overlooked aspect of LTC research has been investigating why people commit to teaching in the first place (see Moodie & Feryok, 2015). Through applying workplace commitment theory (Meyer & Herscovitch, 2001, 2004), systemic issues regarding English teacher placements were identified, and it was found that the KET selection process in primary schools incentivizes short-term commitments (Section 9.1).

Both studies looked at reasons why participants became teachers and the findings were interpreted in the discussion chapter. To summarize, as with prior research (E.-G. Kim, 2009), Study 1 found that the legal status and working conditions were more influential than interest in education, suggesting that continuance mindsets were more evident than affective mindsets in participants’ initial commitments to teaching. Moreover, it was found that principal decision-making was the dominant reason why participants began teaching English. Few of the 20 primary teachers writing NF1 expressed an interest in English (or ELT) as a reason to teach it, and this may have implications for ELT efficacy (see 10.3 below).
Critical incident analysis from Study 2 provided more in-depth investigations of commitments to ELT. Importantly, all four participants majored in elementary education, none in ELT. Only Sami (the oldest participant) expressed an initial (positive) affective mindset towards ELT. For the younger two participants, normative and continuance mindsets were most evident; both Eunjeong and Yuna were assigned to teach English by administrators because they were young. In the case of older participants, the administration system allowed these experienced teachers more agency over assignments. An important finding of this study was how the commitments of the experienced teachers alternated, as both switched from HRT to ELT multiple times. For them, continuance mindsets were also evident as they alternated between HRT and ELT, choosing English to avoid sixth grade when transferring schools. Affective mindsets towards ELT were the least evident commitment mindset in the case studies, and this may be of significance because affective commitments have been linked to teacher retention, particularly in overcoming negative workplace factors (P. L. Choi & Tang, 2009), and also to teacher efficacy (Day & Gu, 2007, 2009; Gu & Day, 2007). Findings from this study suggest that ELT turnover is high in Korean primary schools, a fact attributable to the teacher assignment and rotation system. It seems that short-term commitments to ELT are incentivized by the administrative system, and this has implications for the efficacy of English education in Korea (see 10.3).

10.2.2 Developing a Locally-appropriate Professional Knowledge Base

GT procedures led to developing a professional knowledge base (PKB) model for discussing ELT cognitions and practices (see Section 9.2). The PKB provides a heuristic for assessing language teacher expertise in Korea by indicating the types of knowledge evident in cognitions and practices. The model encompasses the following categories: practical knowledge, content knowledge, knowledge of language for teaching, curricular pedagogical knowledge, and knowledge about language teaching and learning (including knowledge about ELT methodology, knowledge about SLA, and linguistic knowledge).

In this study, practical knowledge was most evident. Teachers drew on prior experiences, HRT in particular, which seemed to influence their emphasis on the primacy of rapport. In contrast to prior research on Korean teachers (see Moodie & Nam, forthcoming), participants’ content knowledge and knowledge of language for
teaching did not appear to be significant issues for effective ELT, as participants were relatively proficient users of English. Rather, gaps in curricular pedagogical knowledge and knowledge about language teaching and learning seemed to better account for teachers’ uncertainties about language teaching and the issues they faced in their practices.

10.2.3 An Integrated Developmental Model of Pedagogical Content Knowledge

The knowledge base presents a disciplinary view of teacher knowledge (see 9.2). Its categories are analytical and useful as a heuristic for assessing ELT expertise, but as many educational researchers have emphasized, an etic view of teacher knowledge is insufficient for SLTE. A situated view of teacher knowledge is necessary for understanding the process of learning to teach and the influence of experience on teaching practices. Further, Day and Gu (2007) also emphasized that situated knowledge is critical to understanding commitment and resilience over a career. In Chapter 9, this view was described as personal experiential knowledge (PEK), highlighting the influence of prior experience in developing ELT pedagogies (see below).

These two perspectives (PKB and PEK) represent a conceptual divide in interpreting LTC. The PKB focuses on content, indicating the kinds of professional knowledge evident in the data, whereas PEK highlights the personal experiences that led to participants’ beliefs and practices.

Using pedagogical content knowledge (PCK) as an overarching construct, a further model was proposed for integrating these etic (i.e., disciplinary) and emic (i.e., situated) paradigms of teacher knowledge (see 9.2). From a disciplinary view, PCK was defined as representing language teaching expertise, that is, knowledge of effective, context-appropriate practices that promote language learning. This expertise can be discussed by classifying data according to the knowledge base. From a situated view, PCK is seen as an outcome, a kind of experiential knowledge that is based on their prior experiences in a context. In this way PCK can be understood as a construct linking theoretical, disciplinary knowledge with personal and practical experiences of teachers (cf. D. Freeman & Johnson, 1998; Johnson & Golombek, 2002; Kubanyiova, 2014; D. Woods & Cakir, 2011). Although this proposal faces epistemological limitations (see
10.4.2), its value lies in its usefulness in suggesting directions for SLTE and SLTE research in Korea (see 10.3.3).

### 10.2.4 The Influence of Prior Experience on LTC and Practices

This thesis also explored the influence of experience from the four phases of language teacher development (see Chapter 1). The prevailing theme was that participants’ prior language learning provided an *anti-apprenticeship of observation*. Their public school English education tended to provide models of what not to do as teachers, and the significance of this finding was that teachers drew on other experiences in developing ELT pedagogies.

Regarding pre-service education, it seemed the experiences of younger and older teachers reflected improved SLTE in Korea. In the case studies, the younger teachers had clearer procedures at times compared to the older participants, and demonstrated *curricular pedagogical knowledge*, for example, in using English for instructions and managing activity procedures, and they attributed this knowledge to pre-service education.

However, it still was evident that many aspects of *knowledge about language teaching and learning* were not evident, in part because teachers were not trained specifically for ELT, but rather as general teachers. The case studies described how HRT influenced their *conceptions of ELT*. Participants adapted a range of strategies reflecting their *practical knowledge*, particularly regarding strategies for classroom management.

Although differing opinions about in-service training were expressed, interpretations based on the PKB suggested that much formal in-service SLTE in Korea is often ineffective because it prioritizes teacher L2 learning over *knowledge about language teaching and learning*. Moreover, it is decontextualized so it faces challenges connected to the personal and practical experiences of trainees (see 9.3.4).

### 10.2.5 Key Differences Between Experienced and Novice Teachers

**Regarding Curricular Pedagogical Knowledge**

Comparative analysis uncovered important differences between novice and experienced teacher participants regarding their choices of materials and communicativeness, student-centeredness, and collaboration in their pedagogic
activities. These topics are emphasized in the national curriculum; however, prior research from Korea has generally shown they raise issues for how teachers implement them in their classes (Moodie & Nam, forthcoming). This thesis contributes to an understanding of the differences between experienced and novice teachers by taking a mixed-method approach to investigating practices. Analysis of observation data from three classes per participant showed that:

- Activities from textbooks were used for less than 30% of class time and supplementary materials were most frequently sourced from indischool.com.
- The two experienced teachers spent more than twice as much class time on communicative activities than novice teachers.
- The experienced teachers spent 72% and 29% of class time respectively on group or pair work, whereas novice teachers spent no time on such activities, arranging most work as full-class activities.
- The two novice teachers devoted 17% and 13% of class time to individual activities, whereas experienced teachers devoted no time to such activities.
- The experienced teachers had much more interactive classes, with 80% and 40% of class time devoted to activities with student-student interaction, whereas only 10% and 8% of the novice teachers’ class time could be categorized as interactive.
- The experienced teachers included many more collaborative activities in classes than novice teachers who included no such activities.
- No participants used task-based activities during observations (and there was only one in all data sets).

The analysis showed that the experienced teachers’ practices were generally more aligned with curricular policy than the novice teachers.

However, all participants often avoided or downgraded communicative activities and task-based activities from textbooks, suggesting gaps in curricular pedagogical knowledge. Unlike prior studies (see Moodie & Nam, forthcoming), socialization by colleagues into maintaining the status quo of teacher-centered L1 instruction was not an issue. In fact, much problem-solving occurred in the community of teachers on indischool.com, an exclusive website for Korean primary school teachers.
Regarding TL use, in Mia’s case study, her insistence on student use of classroom English led to far more student TL use than in other settings. This finding suggests that TETE policy should be revisited to emphasize the importance of stimulating student TL use in class, and teaching and encouraging classroom English use provides a means of doing so (see 10.3.1.4 below). Sami encouraged the most TL use outside of class, something other participants struggled to do. Doing portfolio and conversation checkups every unit and having her students self-assess progress both typified practical knowledge and language teaching expertise.

In contrast to prior research (e.g., J. Richards, 1998b), experienced teachers emphasized behavior more than novice teachers. An etic interpretation of many observed behavioral issues described habituation towards negative student behavior. This seemed a systemic issue partly attributable to the division of labor in primary schools, for example, the subject-homeroom teacher dichotomy. Furthermore, the burden of extra duties, large classes, and limited contact hours appeared to lead to the principle of just get by, as teachers had little time to prepare and reflect on practices (see 9.4.4).

10.2.6 A Critical Incident Model for Understanding the Process of Development and Change in Cognitions and Practices

Using an inductive approach by looking at change in cognitions occurring naturally in the practice of teaching, this thesis contributes to the literature about what is considered evidence of language teacher cognitive change (Borg, 2006; Kubanyiova, 2012). Cross-case analysis of CI findings led to a model for interpreting language teacher cognitive development (see 9.5). The process of change in cognitions and practices generally followed the following sequences:

1. personal experience with a specific practice,
2. tension(s) with the practice (i.e., cognitive dissonance),
3. incident(s) that initiated change
4. commitment to changing practice,
5. heuristic decision-making (i.e., choosing a new practice),
6. trying a new practice,
7. positive evaluation of the practice,
8. consciousness-raising of pedagogic or developmental principles of the new practice,
9. committed action to incorporate a new practice (e.g., recycling an activity) that corresponded with changing cognitions, and finally,
10. an expanding professional knowledge base.

Through looking at the processes of change in the activity of teaching, this grounded approach seems promising for better understanding the complex trajectories of language teacher cognitive change (see Kubanyiova, 2012).

10.3 Implications and Recommendations

The contributions discussed above have practical and theoretical implications. First, policy and pedagogical implications are discussed, followed by the theoretical implications of the models proposed in Chapter 9.

10.3.1 Policy Implications

10.3.1.1 Systemic turnover disincentivizes development of ELT expertise in Korean primary schools.

An important implication of RQ1 findings is that the system of teacher assignment and rotation incentivizes English teacher turnover; both studies suggest that ELT attrition is commonplace among primary teachers. Young teachers are often pressured or assigned to teach English despite their lack of interest in doing so. Others choose English with a continuance mindset, wanting to avoid sixth grade, for example, when transferring schools. Initial commitments based on normative and continuance mindsets are often short term, lasting until teachers have the required points and/or social capital to get assigned more desirable grades (e.g., third or fourth).

The systemic ELT turnover is problematic in at least two ways. First, it is possible that teachers are less likely to be committed to developing as English teachers if they know that the position is short term. Second, any expertise developed through in-service training or ELT experience is lost to the education system as individuals return to HRT. At a minimum, revising the point system seems necessary.

One recommendation would be to review procedures for delegating teachers. Policy makers should consider ways to develop and sustain commitments to ELT along
with expertise in ELT. It may be important to foster affective commitments, in other words, having English teachers who want to teach English. Prior research has suggested that affective mindsets are important in teacher development and sustaining commitments (P. L. Choi & Tang, 2009), and this seems worthy of consideration by Korean administrators regarding English teaching assignments.

Second, given the status of English in the education system (see Chapter 2), it would seem efficacious to have more primary teachers who specialize in ELT. Perhaps consideration could be given to place civil servant teachers who specialized in English education in permanent or long-term appointments in primary schools. As an alternative, there are non-tenured Korean English instructors teaching in schools (see B.-C. Lee, 2010, for a discussion of hiring criteria) and it may be worth investigating the efficacy of these instructors, for example, through the PKB model, and considering longer term placements (as of now they receive yearly contracts). However, the status of non-tenured staff is controversial among civil servant teachers (Kwon, 2000) and this suggestion would require much more consideration than can be discussed here.

### 10.3.1.2 In-class issues and threats to ELT commitment.

Like other research from Korea, this study found many in-class issues were problematic for successful English instruction, for example, classroom management, level gaps, and extra duties. What this thesis adds is a discussion of how these issues factor into ELT turnover in primary schools.

These findings require the attention of administrators and policy makers. One relatively straightforward matter would be lessening the burden of extra duties, which pose issues for efficacy (Day & Gu, 2007). As subject teachers in primary schools, English teachers in North Gyeongsang Province are routinely assigned more administrative duties than homeroom teachers. In Study 2, the extra duties threatened the commitments of Eunjeong and Mia. Further, B.G., a participant in Study 1 offered this unprompted statement after a member check:

> Another school year has begun and we are busy as usual. It might also be an interesting research topic to look into how admin work and paper work imposed upon English teachers systematically harm and suffocate their competence as a language teacher. (Email 7.3.2013)

Perhaps burdens could be eased with more administrative staff or regional planners for English programs as opposed to having each school develop their own extracurricular
programs independently. This might free up time for self-directed development with committed teachers such as B.G.

Another issue is student behavior, which negatively influenced not only turnover but also learning outcomes. The *homeroom teacher-subject teacher dichotomy* is something that could be addressed to encourage more coordinated efforts to deal with student behavior problems, which, in my opinion as an observer in these schools, seemed to be a systemic issue in need of attention from administrators.

**10.3.1.3 Policy and the PKB.**

As a heuristic for expertise, implications arise from the proposed PKB regarding English teaching assignments. First, it is necessary to consider criteria beyond tenure status, age, proficiency, and willingness to teach English while delegating teachers. Applying the PKB provides a means of doing so, and criteria based on the five categories could be developed to assess candidates’ suitability for ELT, in particular, considering their *knowledge about language teaching and learning*.

Relatedly, if *practical knowledge* is most essential, perhaps more consideration should be given when assigning novice teachers because they are perceived as more proficient English users. Perceived proficiency may be important, but classroom management skills are essential. Novice teachers may lack the resources to deal with behavioral issues that seem to plague Korean primary school English classes, which presents a challenge to the curricular aims of collaborative, communicative language classrooms.

These implications also apply to the hiring of English instructors, and their ability to manage classes should be an important consideration (cf. B.-C. Lee, 2010). Also, the PKB suggests that proficiency is over-prioritized as a criterion and there needs to be a practical way to assess instructors’ *knowledge about language teaching and learning*.

The PKB also implies contradictions between EPIK aims and NEST qualification criteria. Applicants require no training in AL/TESOL, nor any teaching experience; however, this contrasts with two central objectives, namely, (1) improving ELT methodology and (2) developing materials (see Chapter 3).
10.3.1.4 Reconceptualizing TETE: Implications from Mia’s case study.

TL use in the case studies implies that revisiting TETE policy may be efficacious. Mia’s case provided evidence of the effectiveness of reinforcing the use of classroom English and showed how it facilitated ongoing TL interaction between students and teachers and especially among students (see 7.1). This was something she discovered by chance. Like participants in other studies, she was uncertain about what TETE was supposed to mean. TETE policy has generally been understood as a directive for teachers to use only English for instruction but it is vague on the topic of student TL use (see Moodie & Nam, forthcoming). Importantly, it seems that TETE should be clarified to explicitly suggest approaches for stimulating meaningful student-student and student-teacher TL interactions in classrooms. Teacher trainers might play an important role in this regard. Also, materials developers could better integrate classroom English into textbooks and teachers’ guides.

10.3.2 Pedagogical Implications

The knowledge base provides a framework with practical implications for SLTE in Korea. These implications are discussed below, followed by the theoretical implications of the model.

10.3.2.1 Practical knowledge and materials selection.

Teachers generally disliked their assigned textbooks and looked for materials elsewhere, particularly on indischool.com. This finding implies a need for improved textbooks and guides (see also Yoo & Lee, 2010). However, another issue was that participants regularly chose materials based on entertainment value. Therefore, it is important to educate teachers about how to critically evaluate materials according to disciplinary knowledge of AL, for example, by looking at how much student language output and interaction an activity may stimulate. The lack of communicative activities for the novice teachers, the downgrading of some communicative activities for all participants, and the absence of task-based activities demonstrated a clear gap in curricular pedagogical knowledge, an area that teacher education appears in need of addressing.
10.3.2.2 Pre-service SLTE.

In his research survey, Wright (2010, p. 273) wrote of emerging pedagogies for the field of SLTE as (1) emphasizing learning to teach and thinking about the process, (2) incorporating reflective practice, (3) seeing trainees as inquirers into their beliefs and future teaching contexts, and (4) learning from experience. Korean pre-service education should continue evolving towards exemplifying these characteristics. Findings with the novice teachers showed that demonstrations and peer teaching sessions were helpful for developing routines. These courses are widely integrated into pre-service teacher education (Moodie & Nam, forthcoming) and this seems to be evidence of improved SLTE (cf. Kwon, 2000).

Learning experiences influence language teaching approaches, and teacher education could do a better job of making trainees aware of how their own experiences influence their conceptions of ELT. For example, in the present studies the prevalence of the anti-apprenticeship of observation was striking. Coursework could help trainees recognize contradictions between their prior learning and curricular aims, and reflective practice offers a means of doing so (see Farrell, 2007b). It seems CI journaling could be further integrated in coursework (e.g., Y. Kim & Yi, 2010). NI also has potential for bringing awareness of the influences of experience on practice (see Golombek & Johnson, 2004), such as in K. Ahn’s (2010a) study with an in-service teacher. However, trainers need to carefully consider how reflection is stimulated and interpreted (B. Atkinson, 2009) and the efficacy of their approaches to reflective practice (Mann & Walsh, 2013).

Moreover, washback from employment exams seems to be a critical issue for pre-service education and seems to be holding SLTE back from the emerging themes discussed by Wright (2010). The first stage of testing involves a multiple choice exam (see Chapter 2) and the theory, terminology, and policy included in this stage are unlikely to be effectively transferred to practice because they do not connect to practical experiences of trainees. Finally, as discussed above, more consideration should be given towards training specialized EFL teachers for long term positions.

10.3.2.3 In-service SLTE.

A critical implication for in-service ELT training in Korea is that it seems largely ineffective because it is decontextualized (see 9.3.4). As with pre-service education, in-service courses should incorporate reflective practice, but it should also
be ongoing and synchronous with trainees’ practices, mediated by expert teachers or trainers familiar with the context. This reform could help teachers critically evaluate their conceptions of ELT and what they do in class. In-service courses are often de facto language courses and the central focus on teacher L2 learning is problematic. For one, two-week TEE courses are unlikely to make much difference to English proficiency (e.g., see Erben, 2004). Moreover, training undervalues practical knowledge and seems ineffective at transmitting curricular pedagogic knowledge and knowledge about language teaching and learning. Furthermore, opportunities and incentives should be created for committed teachers to undertake self-directed development locally. Eunjeong’s observations of expert teachers provide evidence of the potential impact of these kinds of experiences on development (see 8.1). Such local contextualization of ELT training might also address the relative isolation in which English primary teachers seem to work by helping to develop communities of practice.

10.3.3 Theoretical Implications

10.3.3.1 Reflective practice for developing pedagogical content knowledge.

In Chapter 9, I discussed a conceptual divide for LTC and proposed that pedagogical content knowledge (PCK) can be seen as a construct linking two domains (disciplinary knowledge and situated knowledge). However, a question remains as to how to further integrate this proposal into something practical for developing PCK.

As elsewhere, SLTE in Korea has struggled to connect theory and policy with teaching practice (Moodie & Nam, forthcoming). Curricular pedagogic knowledge and knowledge about language teaching and learning need to be mediated through teachers’ practical experiences to become part of their knowledge base (Golombek, 1998; J. Richards, 1996; D. Woods & Çakir, 2011).

As discussed above, the reflective practice tradition (Schon, 1983) and its application to language teaching (e.g., Farrell, 2007b, 2015b; J. Richards & Farrell, 2005) seems promising in this regard. In Figure 10-1 below, the model from Chapter 9 is extended, depicting the role of reflective practice for building PCK. This figure represents a process that could potentially help English teachers (1) understand what they are doing in terms of disciplinary knowledge and (2) develop awareness of why they might believe the things they do about ELT. Reflective practice could also
generate data to help researchers and teacher trainers become more aware of the sources of beliefs and the kinds of experiences that led to current teaching practices; this in turn might allow such researchers and trainers to find where attention might be focused for developing English language teachers in Korea. If this were done as a research-oriented project, it could contribute to exploring the efficacy of reflective practice as a means of language teacher development (see Mann & Walsh, 2013; see also 10.5 below)

This proposal calls for a contextualization of SLTE in Korea through *praxis* (Freire, 1970), that is, theory-informed practice (Edge & Richards, 1998b; D. Freeman & Johnson, 1998). In the model above, methods such as journaling (Farrell, 2007b, 2011), NI (Johnson & Golombek, 2002), and CIL (Brookfield, 1995; Finch, 2010) are suggested as methods for stimulating reflection. Reflection can help develop professional knowledge, and can also contextualize experiential knowledge, helping teachers make “meaning of this knowledge” (Golombek, 1998, p. 461). Although there are many approaches for incorporating reflection into SLTE, Farrell (2015b) proposed a framework for reflection that may be helpful for teacher educators in that it includes ideas for stimulating reflection as a process linking trainees’ philosophy of education to pedagogic principles to theory and to practice so that they may move *beyond practice*, that is, become educators who are cognizant of their role in contributing to the wider

---

*Figure 10.1. An integrated developmental model of PCK for NNESTS.*

[Narrative inquiry (NI), critical incident logs (CIL)]
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society in addition to developing a knowledge base indicative of the discipline of AL. This recommendation may not be a new contribution to the field (see Wright, 2010), but it does challenge the status quo of in-service SLTE in Korea.

10.3.3.2 Implications of the critical incident model of language teacher cognitive change for ELT development.

The most salient implication of the CI model from Chapter 9 is that it implies a trajectory to language teacher cognitive development as it may occur naturalistically in the context of teaching (cf. Kubanyiova, 2012). If further research confirms this assumption (see 10.5 below), then the model could have potential value for language teacher training. For example, if a teacher trainer had awareness of trainees’ practices, it could be used to stimulate change for developing language teachers.

For example, the model could be used for creating ELT intervention programs. According to the model, it seems that there are five stages in this process of LTC change where mediation would be possible. First, it would be necessary to know specific practices and associated tensions, for example, through data from reflective practice programs. Teacher trainers, researchers, expert teachers, or peers could provide feedback and suggestions for new practices. This proposal is outlined in Figure 10-2 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stages of experience</th>
<th>Stages for possible mediation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. personal experience with practice</td>
<td>(personal reflection)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. tension involving practice (cognitive dissonance)</td>
<td>(personal reflection)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. incident(s) initiating change</td>
<td>(mediated support)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. commitment to change practice</td>
<td>(personal reflection)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. heuristic decision-making (choosing a new practice)</td>
<td>(mediated support)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. trying new practice</td>
<td>(personal action)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. positive evaluation</td>
<td>(mediated support)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. consciousness-raising</td>
<td>(mediated support)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. changing cognitions and practice</td>
<td>(personal action)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. expanding professional knowledge base</td>
<td>(mediated support)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 10-2. Proposed model for designing intervention programs to initiate language teacher cognitive change with in-service teachers.*
This model potentially contextualizes in-service SLTE, grounding it in trainees’ practices. Doing so may better enable participants to rename their experience and reconstruct practice (D. Freeman, 1993) and more closely align their practice with curricular aims. This model contributes to the field by proposing that there may be a general trajectory to language teacher cognitive change and suggests an entry point for stimulating change with in-service language teachers.

10.4 Limitations

This thesis comprises many topics and theoretical models; therefore, limitations are inevitable. The most salient of these are addressed below, followed by recommendations for further research.

10.4.1 Methodological Limitations

First, word limits created a challenge for balancing depth and scope of findings and interpretations in this exploratory thesis. A narrative approach made it challenging to condense data while conserving the complexity evident in participant stories (see Bell, 2011). Adapting GT led to promising frameworks, but it was challenging to build theory while preserving depth regarding participants’ belief systems, personal experiences, and teaching practices within the context of their workplace. For example, commitment mindsets (Meyer & Herscovitch, 2001) were evident in the process of change in cognitions, but this seemed linked to the institutional and administrative systems and wider sociocultural context. I chose to focus more on the particulars of participants’ practices, such as critical incidents relating to pedagogic activities, rather than on their identities as language teachers or on sociocultural influences. An article based on the case studies, however, explores the wider socio-historical context in more depth (Moodie & Feryok, 2015).

Second, in qualitative research co-creation of knowledge is inevitable; the findings entailed reflexivity, which implies a researcher influence in the studies. In Study 1, as the developer of data collection instruments, I selected topics for stories and how they would be structured. Inevitably, form influenced content. Prompts directed topics, thus framing the discourse (hence narrative frames). Priming was evident, in fact, purposeful; however, themes from prior research helped ground stories in the disciplinary knowledge of AL.
In Study 2, procedures were followed to minimize my influence (see Chapter 5), but longitudinal engagement will necessarily influence the phenomena being studied. To my surprise students seemed relatively unaffected by my presence during class. A warming period seemed to lessen my influence. Like Sami said, “they seem like they are accustomed to you ... they don’t care [that you are here]” (SI11: 37).

However, it is hard to say how much the research process influenced the teachers. Sami, for example, explicitly stated that she viewed participation as an opportunity to learn. By participating, teachers were engaged in *de facto* reflective practice, particularly in Sami’s case (see 7.2). The *consciousness-raising* discussed in the CI model (see 9.5.3) was likely influenced by the fact that there was someone there asking questions. Worth noting is that Eunjeong was recruited after an in-service course of which I taught a quarter, so I assume that this would have influenced her practices during the study, despite me clarifying the research aims and her saying that she did not change because of the research. However, I would argue that my ostensible influence on participant practices during the study does not negate the significance of the research implications discussed above.

Third, as a researcher with a different educational and sociocultural background to participants, there were inevitably etic interpretations in places. I tried to reduce my bias by triangulating multiple data sets and grounding interpretations in themes from curricular guidelines and prior literature. These were used for coding and categorizing; also, in-vivo coding was used frequently, emphasizing the voices of participants. As an outsider with prolonged engagement in the context, I consider my position a point of strength (see Ochs & Schieffelin, 1994), but there may be interpretations that an insider would question.

Fourth, data were collected in participants’ L2, which would have influenced findings (see Pavlenko, 2007). Participants in Study 2 were relatively competent English speakers, but their conceptions of practice would likely come across more richly in the L1. As a low-intermediate Korean speaker, I was able to comprehend (most) student and teacher L1 use in class and I encouraged code-switching during interviews if it helped express a view.

Fifth, access was somewhat more open and frequent with the more experienced teachers than with the novice teachers. Younger participants were observed only during the second semester and in less than half the number of classes in which the older participants were observed. It is possible that this influenced findings. For example,
younger teachers’ instructional routines may have appeared less coherent had they been observed in the first semester. Moreover, in order to have a comparable data set for cross-case analysis, observation data tables were only included for three classes with experienced teachers. Therefore, some results in Section 9.4 may be an artifact of analysis; however, there were qualitative differences observed between novice and experienced teachers that lent support to the quantification of time that they spent on various activity types during the study.

Moreover, in order to have a comparable data set for cross-case analysis, observation data tables were only included for three classes with experienced teachers. Therefore, some results in Section 9.4 may be an artifact of analysis; however, there were qualitative differences observed between novice and experienced teachers that lent support to the quantification of time that they spent on various activity types during the study.

Sixth, with limited participant numbers, generalizability suffers. Designing an exploratory study with 27 participants addressed this to some degree. However, case studies were in a provincial working-class city and therefore findings may not typify experiences of KETs in other regions (e.g., Seoul has its own MOE and slightly different procedures for assigning English teachers). I assume that the PKB and CI models are adaptable to wider contexts, but this assumption requires further research (see below).

Seventh, learning outcomes were difficult to qualify. By definition, a primary aim of language teaching must be the successful language learning of students; however, this is a problematic phenomenon to measure (see Moodie & Nam, forthcoming, on issues in local research). I focused on describing practices vis-à-vis curricular aims; however, future research might consider ways to integrate assessments of student language learning into LTC research (see Borg, 2006; Day & Gu, 2007).

10.4.2 Conceptual Limitations

There were also a few conceptual limitations worth addressing. First, it was challenging connecting commitment theory with development, so this claim is rather tentative, and requires further investigation. Participants’ commitment mindsets were linked to development in a related study (Moodie & Feryok, 2015).

Second, as other researchers have done (e.g., K. Ahn, 2009; E.-J. Kim, 2008; Yook, 2010), I used themes from content analyses of curricular guidelines as opposed to stated policy for discussing findings. This was a pragmatic decision. Directives for teachers are vague (e.g., see Appendix A) and therefore almost any activity participants did could be interpreted as following one guideline or another. By using themes, we as researchers are better able to ground the discussion of practices in the disciplinary knowledge of AL.
Third, discussing LTC is epistemologically challenging. Inevitably, findings rely on (1) beliefs, thoughts, and knowledge stated by participants, (2) inferences based on actions, and (3) interpretations based on prior research and theory. Thus, analytic procedures are necessarily interpretive. Further, although cognition is a practical term because it encompasses so many constructs (Borg, 2006), I find the term problematic because of connotations towards cognitive science which has a quite different provenance to research in AL.

Fourth, the PKB model is epistemologically limited. For one, PKB categories of this kind are “more analytical than real” (Tsui, 2003, p. 58). Proposing a hierarchal spectrum in the model warrants further research. In addition, the PKB does not address what constitutes knowledge. As Andrews (2003, 2007) argued, this limitation could be addressed by conceptualizing knowledge as awareness, that is, something like tacit knowledge of ELT methods and SLA theory (see also Kubanyiova, 2014).

Fifth, as a heuristic model the PKB is useful for discussing ELT expertise; however, interpreting pedagogical content knowledge (PCK) as effective practices begs the question of what expertise looks like in the practices of Korean English teachers. Further, it is important to consider how expertise is formed (e.g., Farrell, 2013). These topics are beyond the research aims of this thesis, but are worth addressing in the future (see below).

Finally, I frequently refer to the disciplinary knowledge of AL; however, as I was reminded in a recent conference, there is no monolithic knowledge base of AL and the received knowledge of the field is also subject to change (de Bot, Thomas, Malone, Spolsky, Grabe, & Matsuda, 2015). Interpretations in this thesis depended on my own particular understanding of AL based on my prior education and professional experiences (in particular, teaching ELT materials development courses). However, I attempted to address this limitation by grounding the discussion of disciplinary knowledge in research and theory as discussed in curricular guides.

Although not a comprehensive list, I feel that these limitations were the most important regarding the trustworthiness of the studies, although judgment is left to the reader. Future research suggestions follow.
10.5 Future Research Directions

Through exploring LTC in Korean primary schools, this project contributed to understanding what teachers think, believe, and know, and how this is influenced by experience. Due to the project’s exploratory nature, however, it was not possible to address many important topics relating to this thesis. Ideas for future research appear below, beginning with pedagogically-oriented projects.

10.5.1 Pedagogical Research

The first strand of recommended research relates to a need for finding ways to address the gap in knowledge about language teaching and learning in Korea. This could come from further exploring the notion of PCK and finding out who the expert teachers are, what they do, and what they know. Initially, the PKB from Chapter 9 may be helpful for identifying expert teachers insofar as beliefs and practices could be described according to the knowledge base. Then, one area of research might come through (approximate) replications of influential qualitative studies (see Markee, 2015; Porte & Richards, 2012), such as describing teacher maxims (J. Richards, 1996) or principles (Bailey, 1996), or further contrasting novice/expert/experienced teacher practices (Tsui, 2003). For example, a maxim from Chapter 7 might be establish rapport first and a principle would be maximize student-student interaction through classroom English and collaborative activities. These kinds of findings may be helpful in reducing some of the complexities behind LTC so that research might have a practical impact, for example, in aiding novice English teachers’ decision-making. Such projects could draw on research on ELT expertise (e.g., Farrell, 2015a; Tsui, 2003, 2009) and consider participants’ awareness of AL (e.g., Andrews, 2003, 2007) in order to ground findings in the disciplinary knowledge. Further, a significant contribution would come from making a reliable link between practices and student L2 learning outcomes (see Kubanyiova & Feryok, 2015).

Second, it seems that carefully designed action research could stimulate the development of ELT expertise in Korea. One particular area based on Mia’s case (Chapter 8) would be looking at procedures for stimulating ongoing TL interaction through classroom English and collaborative learning. Some general areas to look at include increasing the efficacy of CLT (Kumaravadivelu, 1993) and how to adapt TBLT (Ellis, 2009). In addition, research could look at ways to incorporate various
modes of corrective feedback (e.g., Ellis, Loewen, & Erlam, 2006) and focus on form (Long, 1991) in the classroom. Also, investigating teachers’ awareness of learner strategies (Oxford, 1989; Zhang, 2003) and how they are incorporated in Korean classrooms may lead to increasing ELT efficacy.

Third, it seems necessary to build professional development programs in Korea based on reflective practice (see Farrell, 2007b; J. Richards & Farrell, 2005). There is a need for reform-minded research addressing the modes of instruction for SLTE in Korea. Reflective practice has potential for contextualizing instruction through mediation with experts or peers. This may look at CILs, journaling, NI, discussion groups, or other established modes of reflective practice. However, as Mann and Walsh (2013) point out, there is also a need to address the efficacy of reflective practice in AL; therefore, program development should not accept reflective practice as orthodoxy, but rather be data-driven and consider the evidence of the influence of reflective practice on changing cognitions and practices.

Fourth, the sociocultural turn for SLTE and research (Johnson, 2006) presents an opportunity to further describe situated knowledge, and a more emic perspective on teaching and learning to teach. Sociocultural research has only just emerged in Korea, for example, with K. Ahn’s (2009) and E.-J. Kim’s (2008) studies, and there is room for more of this kind of research to move the field forward there. One particular area where sociocultural research could make a contribution would be with the experiences of trainees with in-service SLTE programs and providing directions for reform. For example, the CI model (9.3.3.2) suggests an entry point for mediation with in-service teachers and a sociocultural study could contribute to understanding an insider perspective on change as indicated by the model. Another contribution might come from developing a better understanding as to why negative student behavior seems to be such an issue for English education in public schools.

Fifth, there is a need for materials assessment. For example, the grassroots website indischool.com is driving pedagogy in Korean primary schools by providing and recommending activities; however, critical assessment of materials in light of curricular aims seems necessary. The coding scheme in Appendix P could be combined with the PKB model for a wide-scale survey of materials, looking at the communicativeness of recommended activities (cf. Sleeping Elephants and Quiz Bomb Games in 7.2). This approach could also be adapted for assessing textbooks and the materials designed by NESTs in EPIK.
10.5.2 Theoretical Research

There are a few theory-driven research recommendations based on the GT models. First, the role of commitments in language teacher development warrants further investigation. In-depth studies on commitments to ELT in Korean primary schools seem necessary, in particular fleshing out the peculiarities of the teacher rotation and assignment system that seem to incentivize ELT turnover. Also, prior links between affective mindsets and long term commitments have been suggested (P. L. Choi & Tang, 2009), but this has not been explored in Korea. A further contribution could come from seeing if there is a relationship between teacher commitment mindsets (Meyer & Herscovitch, 2001) and student learning outcomes (Day & Gu, 2007).

Second, the PKB model could be applied to other data. For example, the broad notion of practical knowledge would be a more useful construct with further refinement, perhaps exploring subcategories such as the knowledge of context and institutional knowledge that are important for ELT efficacy in Korea. Further, knowledge about language teaching and learning was sufficient for encompassing data in the present studies, but this disciplinary knowledge is worth investigating further, particularly looking at how expert KETs developed their knowledge (e.g., Andrews, 2003; Farrell, 2013; Tsui, 2003).

Third, the CI model of LTC change proposed that there might be a predictable trajectory to language teacher development as it occurs through classroom experience; however, this suggestion would require further evidence to substantiate it. The model could be tested in other contexts (e.g., ESL and other L2 teaching). Moreover, the model might contribute to research on developing reflective practice programs by providing entry points for mediation that initiates increased ELT efficacy.

10.6 Researcher Reflections

The idea for this topic occurred to me while thinking about two kinds of research being discussed in AL/TESOL years ago: First, there was a gap in what was known about LTC in foreign language contexts, and second, there were discussions taking place that called for more narrative accounts of the practice of language teaching and learning. I decided to combine them.

The research context I was most familiar with happened to be South Korea and its so-called English fever. I had lived there for about ten years, working first as an
English teacher with primary students for three and a half years, then later as a lecturer in a TESOL department (but mostly teaching English to undergraduate students). In some ways this project helped me make sense of my experience there, but that was not really my intention; rather, I wanted to understand LTC, that is, how it works and develops. I had completed an MA in Applied Linguistics a few years before starting this thesis and it was that experience which stimulated my interest in AL/TESOL research. Initially, I was more interested in looking at the language side than the teaching side of LTC; however, I soon found out, as many educational researchers have foretold, that the way teachers perceive language teaching is quite different to how an outside researcher interested in linguistics might, and the data made it apparent what course the research would take.

While collecting data I strove to be an objective observer, but reflexivity was inevitable, and presented an interesting finding outside the research aims of this thesis, but an important one nonetheless because of its implications. I am forever grateful to the participants for volunteering their time; however, one surprise for me was how appreciative they were, too, about participating in the project. In particular all four participants in Study 2 explained (unprompted, I should add) how participating got them to think about their practice and that this influenced their future practices and conceptions of themselves as teachers, whether they went back to homeroom teaching (Yuna) or continued teaching English for another year (Eunjeong, Mia, and Sami). I believe Eunjeong, Mia, and Yuna were genuine when they said they did not change for the days I observed (but see the discussion about Sami in 7.1 and 10.4.1). However, as mentioned above, being tasked with writing critical incident logs, telling stories, and answering my questions was a form of reflective practice in itself. Incidentally, participating encouraged them to think about what they do in the class and reflect on that. I know that for future studies, I am more prepared for the inevitability of reflexivity in research of this kind (and the attendant co-creation of knowledge), and even though it is out of the research scope of the present thesis, I believe this is an important area to explore in future LTC research.

As I mentioned in the opening paragraph of this section, discourse within the discipline of AL/TESOL influenced the formation of the research topic, specifically the calls for LTC research and narrative inquiry, and this led to a thesis that is eclectic and wide in scope, which threatened the coherence of the research multiple times, but I feel it could not have been any other way. However, it did mean that I had to abandon plans
for positioning analysis (Bamberg, 1997) and interpreting the social, institutional, and sociocultural context of participant narratives (Barkhuizen, 2008). There was simply not enough room to do this; therefore, Study 2 followed a more conventional case study structure organized around the research questions. The wider social, collegial, and sociocultural context, and how language teachers are positioned in it is another branch of research that I think would be fruitful.

Capturing the Zeitgeist is probably an overstatement for a somewhat esoteric field of research; however, it is interesting to note that Chapter 4 was written in 2012 during two months of challenging scholarship; quite likely during that time, established researchers were working on drafts that conceptualized narrative inquiry much more clearly than I could (Barkhuizen, 2014a; Barkhuizen, Benson, & Chik, 2014; Benson, 2014). I believe these are important contributions because of how they position narrative research in AL, provide an entry point for research, and reduce the necessity to justify a narrative approach at such length in the future.

I described the theoretical framework as a grounded narrative inquiry. As grounded theorists have described (Charmaz, 2014; Corbin & Strauss, 2008), there were many challenges and adaptations along the way, and accepting uncertainty was an essential part of that. There is always more to explore and something deeper to uncover. The GT process in this thesis was genuine; for example, I conceptualized the professional knowledge base on many scraps of paper before I ever read about one in detail, but then there is also the discovery that someone has said something similar before (and often this goes back to ancient Greece). Nevertheless, I believe the insight I felt as a researcher when discovering a way to make sense of coding, categories, and themes for entire data sets lends support to the value of GT in AL research and also to the interpretations of other researchers on similar topics (e.g., Andrews, 2003, 2007, a professional knowledge base; Tsui, 2003, on ELT expertise; and Kubanyiova, 2012, on language teacher cognitive change).

As a final remark, this was indeed an exploratory thesis, and I learned a tremendous amount undertaking it, so in that way I feel it is the beginning of something else as much as it is an end.
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Appendix A: ELT Methods Recommended for Primary English (NCIC, n.d.)

[These are the instructions in the latest curricular revision for primary school English (MEST, 2007)]

A. Apply various teaching methods appropriate to the learning objective.
B. Use games to allow an activity-centered class.
C. Plan and operate classes using chants and songs to induce interest and motivation.
D. Organize learning groups according to activities to achieve student-centered classes.
E. Listening education should allow students to become naturally used to English phonetics in the beginning, and then focus on gradual improvement.
F. Speaking education should focus initially on communicating meaning, and then gradually encourage fluency.
G. At first, if communicating meaning is achieved, speaking errors should not be immediately corrected.
H. Reading education should consider the elementary English education environment and beginners’ learning environment levels, and should relate to phonetic language education. Gradually, students should become more familiar with written language.
I. The beginning level of reading education should include various education methods to allow students to naturally understand the relationship between sound and spelling, and to become more familiar with written language.
J. In the beginning, writing education should emphasize spelling and punctuation, and then gradually focus on transmitting meaning.
K. Along with language education, English-speaking and non-English-speaking cultures should be appropriately introduced so they can be naturally understood.
L. Be conscious of the linguistic differences between English and Korean.
M. Wherever possible, classes should be carried out in English.
N. Various multimedia materials and ICTs should be used to motivate students to get involved in learning activities to promote a great sense of achievement.
O. Individual and cooperative education should both be used to correspond to each student’s level.
P. Educational materials and teaching methods to be used in educational activities should be developed.
Q. Reorganize the instructional content to correspond to each student’s level, and to allow students to have confidence and to actively participate.
Appendix B: Glossary of Terms in Narrative Research

**big story**
An autobiographical narrative or biography such as a life history or case study (see M. Freeman, 2006)

**big story research**
Research either analyzing or creating biographical narratives (Bamberg, 2006); common in ethnography or studies on identity.

**grand narrative**
Overarching historical, cultural, religious, etc. narratives that are shared by a group, culture, or tribe, etc. (Lyotard, 1979)

**grounded narrative inquiry**
Thematic analysis of narrative data using qualitative content analysis or grounded theory (i.e., what Polkinghorne, 1995 described as *analysis of narrative*).

**narrative**
(1) noun (singular) - Story of experience
(2) noun (non-countable) - Narrative genre, text-type, or discourse
(3) noun (non-countable) - Mode of communication
(4) noun (collective) - Body of narrative data
(5) noun (synecdoche) - Narrative inquiry or narrative research
(6) noun (synecdoche) - Method of narrative inquiry or narrative research
(7) noun (collective) - Processes of narrative cognition that construct a storied representations of experience or events
(8) adjective - Relating to processes of narrative cognition
(9) adjective - Relating to processes of narrative research
(10) adjective - Relating to processes or composing, analyzing, or communicating narratively

**narrative analysis**
Compiling research data to create a narrative such as a life history or case study (Polkinghorne, 1995); Connelly and Clandinin (1990) refer to this type as *narrative inquiry*.

**narrative cognition**
Mode of thought (i.e. cognition) that makes sense of events and experience through narrative structures (Bruner, 1986).

**narrative frame**
A scaffold for a written narrative that guides a composition with the use of prompts. (Barkhuizen & Wette, 2008)

**narrative inquiry**
(1) Research with narratives as a central feature of design (see also *narrative research*)
(2) Qualitative research using narrative data to compose narrative reports such as a case study or life history. This type sees *narrative* as both the method and object of inquiry (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000; Connelly & Clandinin, 1990); what Polkinghorne (1995) called *narrative analysis*. 
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>narrative knowledging</td>
<td>The cognitive processes of narrative researchers occurring through the stages of a research project from conceptualization of a project to presenting and reflecting on the study (Barkhuizen, 2011).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>narrative paradigm</td>
<td>Basic set of beliefs behind narrative inquiry that sees a blurring of ontology, epistemology, and methodology centered on narrative data and narrative approaches to interpreting data (Spector-Mersel, 2010).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| narrative positioning, levels of | First level: Relationship of self to others (in the story)  
Second level: Relationship of self to audience  
Third level: Self-identity revealed through narrative (Bamberg, 1997) |
| narrative research | Research with narratives including, although not limited to, grounded narrative inquiry, narrative inquiry, discourse analysis of narratives, and studies of identity. |
| narratives-in-interaction | (see small story) |
| narrative study | A study using narrative approaches. |
| narrative-constructivist paradigm | An adaptation of constructivism where the research approach is centered on analysis of participant stories |
| narratology | Study of narrative genres, structures, composition, content, and cognition, etc. |
| oral narrative structure | Orientation, complication, evaluation, resolution, coda (Labov & Waletzky, 1967) |
| paradigmatic cognition | Logico-scientific thought that enables the categorization of concepts (Bruner, 1986) |
| small story | A brief narrative emerging in a naturalistic setting, in other words, arising in everyday conversation; unlike big stories, they are often unplanned and spontaneous (Bamberg, 2006; Georgakopoulou, 2007). (also called narratives-in-interaction) |
| small story research | Research analyzing brief narratives arising in naturalistic settings (Bamberg, 2006); used for discourse analysis, studies on identity, narrative structure/form, etc. |
| tellership continuum, five dimensions of | Tellership, tellability, embeddedness, linearity, moral stance (Ochs & Capps, 2001). |
| three dimensional narrative space | The (1) social, (2) contextual, and (3) temporal dimensions of narratives (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000). |
Narrative Inquiry into Language Teacher Cognition in Korea

This is an invitation for Korean English teachers to join a research project about English education in Korea. The research will collect stories of your experience learning and teaching English. It seeks to answer questions such as:

What do you think, know, and believe about English language teaching?

Who can join?

- Korean English teachers in public schools.
- Teachers who taught English in the last two years.
- Teachers who are taking in-service English teacher training.
- Looking for 30 elementary, middle, and high school teachers in total.

What will I need to do?

- Write four short, guided stories related to your experience as English teachers and learners.
- While the time may individually vary, each story will take at least twenty minutes to finish.

Benefits

- Research will contribute to the understanding of language teacher cognition in Korea.
- Participation is voluntary, although I would like to offer a small gift (10,000 won gift certificate) as an expression of my gratitude.

If you have further questions, please contact [redacted]
This research project is being conducted as part of the requirements for a PhD in Linguistics.

[This project has been reviewed and approved by the University of Otago Human Ethics Committee. Reference: 12/195]
Narrative Inquiry into Language Teacher Cognition in Korea

What do you think, know, and believe about English language teaching?

영어 교육의 교수자로서 여러분들은 어떤 생각과 지식을 가지고 있으며 이에 대한 믿음은 무엇일까요?

참가자들은 누구입니까?

- 현 공립학교 한국인 초등교사
- 일주일에 한 번 이상 영어과목을 가르치는 담임교사
- 영어교사로서 1급 또는 2급 정교사 자격증 소지자 또는 이에 준하는 회화 전문 강사
  - 초, 중, 고 영어교사 대략 70명에서 120명

참가자들은 무엇을 하게 됐습니까?

- 영어 학습자나 교수자로서의 경험에 관한 네 가지의 짧은 이야기 작성
- 각각의 이야기 작성시 시간은 개인적인 차이를 고려하여 20분 내외

보상 또는 혜택

본 연구는 현 한국 영어 교육의 이해를 증진시키는 데 기여할 것입니다. 본 연구의 참여를 화자하시게 되면 연구자(Mr. Ian Moodie)는 감사의 표시로 각각의 참가자에게 만천에 준하는 상품권을 지급하게 될 것입니다.

본 연구에 대한 질문이 있으면 해당 이메일과 주소를 참고해 주십시오.

[redacted]

본 연구는 언어학 박사 학위 연구 과정의 일부로서 시행되어지고 있습니다.
NARRATIVE INQUIRY INTO LANGUAGE TEACHER COGNITION IN KOREA
INFORMATION SHEET FOR PARTICIPANTS WRITING NARRATIVES

Thank you for showing an interest in this project. Please read this information sheet carefully before deciding whether or not to participate. If you decide to participate we thank you. If you decide not to take part there will be no disadvantage to you and we thank you for considering our request.

What is the aim of the project?

- The purpose of this research project is to investigate what Korean English teachers in public schools think, know, and believe about English language teaching.
- The study will contribute to our understanding of language teacher cognition in Korea.
- This project is being undertaken as part of the requirements for a PhD in Linguistics.

Who may participate in the project?

- Looking for 30 Korean English teachers in public elementary schools.
- Any teacher who has taught English in the last two years.
- Any teacher taking in-service English teacher training.
- You will not be identified in the study. Your anonymity will be preserved in any published version of this project.
- Participation is entirely voluntary.
- After submitting your contribution, you will receive a small gift (10,000 won gift certificate).

What will you be asked to do?

Should you agree to take part in this project, you will be asked to…

- Fill out a short questionnaire with contact information and background information.
- Write four short stories about your experience as learners and teachers of English.
- Topics and themes of the stories will be organized with guided phrases (e.g. My fondest memory of English class in elementary school was…). Each story will be about half a page to one page long.
- It is estimated each story will take at least twenty minutes to write but the time commitment varies from person to person.
• The researcher (Mr Ian Moodie) may contact you with follow-up questions related to your stories.
• Participation in the data-collection process is voluntary. This process is not intended to cause you any risk, discomfort or inconvenience. You are free to choose which experiences you write about and not write about experiences which you feel to be too personal or intrusive. You are free to withdraw from the project at any stage. You will not be disadvantaged in any way if you do either of these things.

What data or information will be collected and what use will be made of it?
• Data for this project are stories of language learning and teaching experience.
• Stories will be collected and analysed according to themes (e.g. motivation)
• The purpose of the study is to bring a better understanding of the Korean English educational context.
• The project is not related to teacher evaluation in any way.
• Personal information (e.g. contact details) will be collected for administrative purposes. This information will be destroyed at the completion of the project.
• Background information (e.g., educational background) will be collected for research purposes in order to make anonymous generalizations about the pool of participants.
• Only the researcher, supervising professor, and Head of Department will have access to data and personal information.
• Data from this study will be securely stored in the supervising professor’s office for a minimum of five years after completion of the study and will be destroyed after that.
• Data are collected electronically (email and online). These cannot be guaranteed to be private but every effort will be made to ensure that they are.
• Overall results of the project will be included in the researcher’s PhD thesis.
• Your anonymity will be preserved in any published version of this project.

What if I have further questions?
If you have any questions about our project, either now or in the future, please feel free to contact either:

[redacted]

This study has been approved by the University of Otago Human Ethics Committee. If you have any concerns about the ethical conduct of the research you may contact the Committee through the Human Ethics Committee Administrator. Any issues you raise will be treated in confidence and investigated and you will be informed of the outcome.
내러티브 탐구를 통한 한국인 영어교사로서의 인지 연구

-내러티브 작성자를 위한 정보 자료-

본 연구에 관심을 보여주심에 대해 감사를 드리며 내러티브 작성 참가여부를 결정하기 전 해당 정보 자료를 숙지할 것을 부탁드립니다. 참가를 희망하지 않으시더라도 어떤 불이익을 받지 않음을 알려드리며 만약 참가를 희망하신다면 본 연구에 대한 관심표준에 대해 다시 한번 감사를 드립니다.

본 연구의 목적

- 본 연구는 한국인 영어교사들의 한국 공립학교 영어교육에 대한 생각, 지식 그리고 신뢰를 알아보기 위함입니다.
- 본 연구는 한국인 영어교사들의 인지에 대한 이해를 돕는데 기여할 것입니다.
- 본 연구는 언어학 박사학위 연구 과정의 일부로서 시행될 예정입니다.

본 연구 참가자들에 대한 정보

- 한국 공립 초등 영어교사 30명 가량
- 주당 적어도 1시간의 영어를 가르치는 담임교사
- 영어교사로서 1급 또는 2급 교사자격증 소지자 또는 화화전문강사
- 연구 중 본 참가자들의 신분은 노출되지 않으며 연구 후 어떤 출판물에도 익명성이 보장될 예정입니다

본 연구에서의 사용되는 질문

- 참가자들은 연락처 및 신상에 관한 짧은 질문에 관련된 설문지에 간단히 답할 것입니다.
- 참가자들은 영어학습자로서와 영어교사로서의 본인들의 경험담을 짧은 이야기 형태로 서술할 것입니다.
- 이야기들의 소재나 주제는 질문지에 나타날 것입니다.(예: 중학교 영어 시간중에서 가장 흥미로웠던 순간은...)
- 각각의 이야기는 20분 내외로 작성되며 개인에 따라서 약간의 시간 오차는 있을 수 있습니다.
- 본 연구의 연구자 (Mr. Ian Moodie)는 참가자에 의해 작성된 각각의 이야기에 대한 질문이 발생할 경우 참가자들에게 연락을 취할 수도 있습니다.
자료 수집 과정의 참여여부는 참가자들의 자의에 의한 것이며 수집 과정 중 어떤 형태의 불편함이나 불쾌감을 야기시키기 위한 의도는 없음을 알려드립니다. 참가자들은 본 연구 자료 중의 하나인 이야기 작성 중 어떤 단계에서든지 자유롭게 탈퇴할 수 있고 너무 개인적인 질문이나 사생활을 침해하는 부분은 이야기에서 언급하지 않아도 될 자유가 있습니다. 이에 따른 불이익은 발생하지 않을 것입니다.

본 연구에서 수집되는 자료나 정보의 내용 및 사용
- 본 연구에서 수집되는 자료는 영어학습과 교육과 관련된 경험에 대한 이야기입니다.
- 이야기들은 주제(예: 동기)에 따라 분석되어질 것입니다.
- 본 연구는 교사평가자료로서 절대 쓰여지지 않음을 알려드립니다.
- 개인신상(예: 연락처)에 관한 자료는 행정적인 목적으로 수집되며 본 연구가 종료되면 파기될 것입니다.
- 배경 및 경력(예: 학력)에 관한 자료는 참가자 전체 연구 결과 일반화 과정에서 쓰여질 것입니다.
- 본 연구자, 지도 교수, 학과장만이 본 연구 자료나 개인 신상 자료를 열람할 수 있습니다.
- 본 연구 자료는 이메일이나 온라인 형태로 수집될 것이며 이 과정에서 발생할 수 있는 정보 유출방지에 대해서 최대한 노력할 것입니다.
- 본 연구의 결과물은 본 연구자의 박사학위 논문에 포함될 것입니다.
- 본 연구 참가자의 익명성은 이 연구의 어떤 출판물에도 보장될 것입니다.

만일 본 연구에 대한 의문점이나 질문은 항상 가능하며 본 연구자와 지도교수의 연락처는 아래를 참고해 주시면 감사하겠습니다.

주 연구자:
[redacted]

이 연구는 오타고대학교의 Otago Human Ethics Committee에 의해 승인 받았습니다. 이 연구에 관련된 어떤 형태의 도의적 불만이 있다면 다음 연구 윤리 담당관에게 연락해 주시기 바랍니다. 참가자들에 의해 제기된 문제들은 극비로 진행될 것이며 해당 결과는 추후에 본인에게 통지될 것입니다.
내러티브 탐구를 통한 한국인 영어교사로서의 인지 연구
-내러티브 작성자를 위한 정보 자료-

본 연구에 관심을 보여주신에 대해 감사를 드리며 내러티브 작성 참가여부를 결정하기 전 해당 정보 자료를 숙지할 것을 부탁드립니다. 참가를 희망하지 않으시더라도 어떤 불이익을 받지 않음을 알려드리며 만약 참가를 희망하신다면 본 연구에 대한 관심 표명에 대해 다시 한번 감사를 드립니다.

본 연구의 목적
- 본 연구는 한국인 영어교사들의 한국 공립학교 영어교육에 대한 생각, 지식 그리고 신뢰를 알아보기 위함입니다.
- 본 연구는 한국인 영어교사들의 인지에 대한 이해를 돕는데 기여할 것입니다.
- 본 연구는 언어학 박사학위 연구 과정의 일부로서 시행됨을 알려드립니다.

본 연구 참가자들에 대한 정보
- 한국 공립 초등 영어 교사 70명에서 120명 가량
- 주당 적어도 1시간의 영어를 가르치는 담임교사
- 영어교사로서 1급 또는 2급 정교사자격증 소지자 또는 회화전문강사
- 연구 중 본 참가자들의 신분은 노출되지 않으며 연구 후 어떤 출판물에도 익명성이 보장됨을 알려드립니다.

본 연구에서의 사용되는 질문
- 참가자들은 연락처 및 신상에 관한 짧은 질문에 관련된 설문지에 간단히 답할 것입니다.
- 참가자들은 영어학습자로서와 영어교사로서의 본인들의 경험담을 짧은 이야기 형태로 서술할 것입니다.
- 이야기들의 소재나 주제는 질문지에 나타날 것입니다. (예: 중학교 영어 시간중에서 가장 흥미로웠던 순간은...)
- 각각의 이야기는 20분 내외로 작성되며 개인에 따라서 약간의 시간 오차는 있을 수 있습니다.
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본 연구의 연구자 (Mr. Ian Moodie)는 참가자에 의해 작성된 각각의 이야기에 대한 질문이 발생할 경우 참가자들에게 연락을 취할 수도 있습니다.

자료 수집 과정의 참가여부는 참가자들의 자의에 의한 것이며 수집 과정 중 어떤 형태의 불편함이나 불쾌감을 야기시키기 위한 의도는 없음을 알려드립니다. 참가자들은 본 연구 자료 중의 하나인 이야기 작성 중 어떤 단계에서든지 자유롭게 탈퇴할 수 있고 너무 개인적인 질문이나 사생활을 침해하는 부분은 이야기에서 언급하지 않아도 될 자유가 있습니다. 이에 따른 불이익은 발생하지 않을 것입니다.

본 연구에서 수집되는 자료나 정보의 내용 및 사용

본 연구에서 수집되는 자료는 영어학습과 교육과 관련된 경험에 대한 이야기입니다.

이야기들은 주제 (예: 동기)에 따라 분석되어질 것입니다.

본 연구는 교사평가자료로서 절대 쓰여지지 않음을 알려드립니다.

개인신상(예: 연락처)에 관한 자료는 행정적인 목적으로 수집되며 본 연구가 종료되면 파기될 것입니다.

배경 및 경력(예: 학력)에 관련 자료는 참가자 전체 연구 결과 일반화 과정에서 쓰여질 것입니다.

본 연구자, 지도 교수, 학과장만이 본 연구 자료나 개인 신상 자료를 열람할 수 있습니다.

본 연구 자료는 이메일이나 온라인 형태로 수집될 것이며 이 과정에서 발생할 수 있는 정보누출방지에 대해서 최대한의 노력을 기울임을 알려드립니다.

본 연구의 결과물은 본 연구자의 박사학위 논문에 포함될 것입니다.

본 연구 참가자의 의명성은 이 연구의 어떤 출판물에도 보장될 것입니다.

만일 본 연구에 대한 의문점이나 질문은 항상 가능하며 본 연구자와 지도교수의 연락처는 아래를 참고해 주시면 감사하겠습니다.

주 연구자:

[redacted]

이 연구는 오타고대학교의 Otago Human Ethics Committee에 의해 승인 받았습니다. 이 연구에 관련된 어떤 형태의 도의적 복면이 있다면 다음 연구 윤리 담당관에게 연락해 주시기 바랍니다 (+64 3 479 8256). 참가자들에 의해 수집된 문제들은 극비로 진행될 것이며 해당 결과는 추후에 본인에게 통지될 것입니다.
Appendix D: Text from Online Questionnaire for Participants in Study 1

Narrative Inquiry in Korean Schools

Greetings!
This is a research study investigating English language teacher cognition in Korea.

1. Read about the study on the next page.
2. Fill out the short questionnaire and submit.
3. The researcher will contact you within one week of submitting this form.

Thanks for your interest in this study!

Ian Moodie, Linguistics Programme, University of Otago, Dunedin, New Zealand

[This project has been reviewed and approved by the University of Otago Human Ethics Committee. Reference: 12/195]

1. Name / 성명 *
   Please write your name in English and Korean here.

2. Email address *
   Please type your current email address here.

3. Phone number
   Please write your cel. phone number here. This is optional. The researcher will contact you by email.

4. Age

5. Gender *
   ● Male
   ● Female

6. School, City, and Province *
   Where do you teach? Note: This is for reference only. It will not be revealed in the study.

7. Kind of school. *
   What kind of school do you teach at? Elementary school Middle school High school

8. Grade level of students *
   What grade are your students in? (ex: Grade 4-6)

9. Job title *
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Full-time English teacher or Homeroom teacher who also teaches English

10. University / Major *

Where did you go to university? What was your major? (ex: Gyeongbuk University of Education / Elementary Education)

11. Other qualifications or degrees

Do you have other degrees or teacher qualifications? If yes, please list them here (ex: MA Elementary Education, TESOL Certificate, etc.)

12. Years teaching in public schools *

Including English and other subjects

13. Years teaching English *
Appendix E: The Narrative Frames

[Instructions for Participants]

Dear teacher,

Thank you for your interest in this study. Please read the instructions below then write a story about your experience. There are some sentence starters to help you begin paragraphs for your story. For more information about this study click here or here (Korean version). If you have any questions please email me any time. -Ian Moodie

Instructions

1. Read through the title and all the sentence starters.
2. Reflect on your experience.
3. Write a story. Try to link all the sentence starters together in your story. You can use as many lines as needed.
4. You can save it as a document file (.doc) OR copy and paste the story in an email.
5. Send back to ianmoodie@gmail.com

Thank you!

[The Seven Narrative Frames]
Note: Spaces between prompts and tabs were deleted for the appendix.

1. Why I Became a Teacher

1. I remember the first time I thought about becoming a teacher. This was... (when)
2. The biggest reasons why I became a teacher include...
3. The people who influenced me most were...
4. They influenced me by...
5. I started teaching English because...
6. Before I started teaching English, I thought that being an English teacher was...
7. Now I think that being an English teacher is...
8. In the future, I hope to...

2. My English Learning Experience in School

   I have studied English for ______ years. I started learning when I was in grade ______.
1. My English classes in school were … (please describe the setting)
2. My English teachers usually… (What did they do?)
3. My best memories from English classes in school include...
4. My worst memories from my English classes in school are...
5. I think my experience as a student in school influenced how I teach by...
6. This is because...
7. These days I think English classes in schools are ...(compared to your experience as a student)
8. As an English teacher, I have had some success learning English. I think the biggest reasons that I was successful learning English are...

3. My Memories of University (Teachers’ College)

1. In university I had a many professors. The things I remember about my professors are...
2. I took many courses there. The things I remember most about my education classes are...
3. These days as an English teacher, the most helpful things from my university experience are...
4. The things I find least helpful are...
5. When I think back to being a university student, I wish I had more opportunities to...

4. My First Year Teaching English

   I remember the first time I taught English in a public school. This was in (year). I started teaching grade(s) ______
1. When I first began teaching English, I felt …
2. I felt this way because...
3. I prepared for my classes by...
4. Other teachers were...
5. The biggest challenges or problems I had my first year were...
6. I tried to overcome these challenges by …
7. My best memories or experiences from my first year were...
8. Overall, I think my first year teaching English was...

5. My Opinions of Teaching English
1. When I think about teaching English, I realize the most important things I do in my classroom(s) are …
2. This is because...
3. My favorite kind of students to teach are …
4. This is because …
5. The kinds of classes or grades I don’t enjoy teaching are …
6. This is because …
7. When teaching English, what I enjoy doing most is …
8. This is because …
9. The things I don’t enjoy about teaching English are …
10. This is because …
11. I usually prepare and plan for my classes by …
12. I know I had a successful class when...

6. Opinions of Communicative Language Teaching

1. In Korea, the national curriculum promotes Communicative Language Teaching (CLT). To me I think CLT means ...
2. Some examples of CLT I tried in my classes are …
3. I usually use CLT when …
4. My best experience using CLT in class was …
5. I think this was because …
6. My worst experience trying CLT in class was …
7. I think this was because …
8. I do not (or cannot) use CLT all the time. The reasons I do not use CLT are …
9. Overall, for my classes I think CLT is …

7. Curriculum and Materials

1. I would like to briefly describe my curriculum and materials. The curriculum and planning for my English classes come from …
2. The name of the textbooks I use are _____________. The reasons I use these books are …
3. My opinions about these books are …
4. Other materials I use come from …
5. I think the best materials I use are …
6. This is because …
7. I usually give about _____ hours of English homework a week to my students.
8. My opinions about giving homework are that it …
9. The things I like most about my English curriculum are …
10. The things I would like to change about my curriculum are …
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Appendix F: Example Story

[Researcher commentary: The following story is from NF2. As the longest story, this is not indicative of the entire data set. However, it addresses many of the themes that emerged in analysis. Moreover, it is interesting to read and demonstrates the potential of narrative frames as data collection instruments so I am including it here.]

My English Learning Experience in School
(by Participant 2, B. G.)

I have studied English for about 16 years. I started learning when I was in grade 1 in middle school but stopped at age 19 as I became a university student. At age 28 I restarted learning English to stay in Australia for a year. Before I went to Australia (it was 2000, long before I became a teacher), my English was basically next to nothing.

My English classes in school were kind of a strange mixture of horror and excitement. It was about 25 years ago when there were more than 50 students in one class. No teaching methodology existed except for beating and threatening students. There were no technology aids at all and the teachers' reading vocabulary and sentences were the only reference we had. I'd never seen anyone who actually had a conversation in English until high school 3rd grade. I'm pretty sure most of my English teachers didn't have many chances to talk in English and they weren't equipped with decent communication skills. I was never involved in any types of active activities. We were supposed to listen to the teacher's explanations about grammar stuff, word meanings, and translation into Korean, sitting quietly. In my secondary education period, which lasted 6 years, I was never asked to express myself in English, either in speaking or writing. As to listening, teachers didn't show or let us listen to any authentic conversations. English classes=choral/individual reading, grammar, vocabulary, translation, and corporal punishment and its accompanying terror. That was it.

My English teachers were usually harsh and strict. When the bell rang, the teacher entered the classroom with the textbook and a thick stick. We were supposed to hand in a daily assignment called "Kamji," or "Pak-ji." 'Ji' means 'paper' and 'kam' means 'black.' 'Pak' comes from an adjective "Pak-pak-ha-da" meaning 'very dense.' As its name suggests, the assignment was supposed to look black because the paper was densely filled with English words. We were given this homework almost every day. We had three to four English classes a week and were told to put the assignment on the teacher's desk before she arrived. It was somewhat useful to memorize words and practice English handwriting, but it was painful at the same time and took too long to complete two pages of A4 size, so most students hated it. Many of us tried to cheat the teacher, using two pens at the same time, or enlarging letters, etc. There was nothing meaningful or fun in the assignment. We managed to do it anyway, however, because we knew that we would be beaten by the teacher if we didn't.

My best memories of English classes in school include praise and recognition I was given by the teachers when I successfully read some sentences and translated them into Korean, or answered their questions. Even though the classes weren't
enjoyable at all, I think I had some vague excitement and longing toward this new language and the people who use it. Those feelings, I guess, were one of the impetuses for my hard work in class. No matter how scary or harsh the teachers were, I was always the one adored by them, and that kind of recognition and the sense of being loved naturally made me work even harder and like the subject.

My worst memory about English classes in school is when I had to see my friends beaten by the teachers. It was not uncommon for teachers those days to use corporal punishment, but the cruelty of English teachers were always on the top. My first English teacher was a beautiful young lady with a meticulous make-up and outfit, and she was one of the notorious ones in terms of using physical punishment. She used a 2-3 cm-thick wooden stick and hit my friends' backs of hands (not palms). She gave us a vocabulary quiz (containing 10 items) in every class before starting that day's lesson. She called out some English words and we were supposed to write equivalent Korean translations, and vice versa. Then she told us to exchange the test paper with partners. After marking done, the 'massacre' started. One wrong item meant one stroke. I was lucky enough to avoid the punishment, but witnessing my friends' groaning in pain was always too painful to watch.

I think my experience as a student in school has influenced how I teach by making me decide on how my class atmosphere should be. Although I wasn't a direct victim of the violence of the teachers (I always got all correct), and they were always nice to me and I'm grateful for that (I didn't live with my parents and couldn't get parents' care. I was able to survive those days, however, thanks to their care and kindness), I should admit they were not "good" teachers. Even though I didn't get a single stroke of the horrible stick, the likeliness of being beaten was terrifying enough to make me so nervous whenever I took the quiz. Day 1 I became an English teacher, I secretly swore to myself that I would never ever use corporal punishment. This is because I didn't want to run down the same feeling of horror to my students, and I strongly believe that learning doesn't happen in horror and negative emotions and state of mind will eventually make learners dislike the subject. I am a language teacher and it is natural to think about the effectiveness and efficiency of learning and teaching. I don't want to waste both my and students' time and efforts. Also I wasn't happy or comfortable when I saw my friends suffering. Rather I was horrified and felt vicarious pain. I felt like my backs of hands aching. In 2009 as the law forbidding corporal punishment passed, I don't have to worry about sticking to the promise anyway, but I was quite serious and determined at that time, because I was one of the few teachers who didn't rely on corporal punishment to discipline students when I became a teacher.

These days I think English classes in schools are much more enjoyable and fun in general. Thick sticks are disappearing in language classrooms. Teachers are working hard to improve their classes. Almost all schools are equipped with English-only classrooms full of technology, books, and other learning tools and aids. However, students and teachers are still suffering. So many classes have discipline issues which hinder learning to happen. Students don't listen to their teachers and teachers don't know how to deal with the situation without relying on physical means. In some terrible cases, even when a teacher scolded a student constantly spitting on the floor during her class, he wouldn't stop it saying, "Why, you surely know you're not gonna hit me.
It's illegal, you know." Recently this nation has suddenly flooded with this kind of speechless incidents. Some English teachers are publicly or implicitly humiliated by the students who spent years abroad and came back with native-like oral skills. We can't help feeling small in front of those students. We, English teachers, are struggling every day between those who think school English class is too easy and those feeling too difficult.

As an English teacher, I have had success learning English. I think the biggest reasons that I was successful learning English are my instrumental and intrinsic motivations plus my personality and working style. I love everything about English and it has given me many things: job I like, good social reputation and recognition, stable life, and success, etc. I am a generally hardworking and responsible person and can hold immediate needs for my goals. However, my hard work derives from my intrinsic motivation and eternal love for English, I believe. I am happy when I speak in English. I am happy when I write in English. I love the sound of English and this makes me watch English TV shows or movies for more than 1-2 hours on a daily basis. Sometimes I meet some colleagues saying they hate English and they came to major in English just because their parents or/and teachers recommended/wanted. I feel deeply sorry for them and that contrasts my case. How lucky I am!

People often ask me whether there is/are any shortcut(s) to master English and what I have done to achieve this level of English. I don't really know, honestly. One thing I know is there is no single method accredited by many to learn this language. Methods can vary. If you love it, however, you will eventually find the right way for you by yourself, just like I did. Therefore, the main goal of English teachers is to help and lead our young generation to love this language by providing pleasant learning environment and experiences.
## Appendix G: Example Categories and Codes Used in Study 1 and 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Codes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Critical incidents in language learning</td>
<td>Parental encouragement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Socialization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recognition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interaction w/ native speakers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasons for becoming teachers</td>
<td>Parental/family influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Confucian values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Working conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Legal status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasons for teaching English</td>
<td>Avoid 6(^{th}) Grade homeroom teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Delegated by principal/school committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interest in English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Change from homeroom teaching</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix H: Screenshots of Code Systems in Study 1

**NF1: Why I Became a Teacher**

- 1st time considered teaching
- as PS student
- as SS student
- as adult
- Biggest reasons to become T
  - parental influence
  - teacher influence
  - interest in teaching
  - working conditions
  - legal status
  - social status
  - other
- Influential people
  - influenced by (parents)
  - influenced by (teachers)
    - positive T influence
    - negative T influence
- Reasons to teach English
  - delegated by principal/scho...
  - interest in English
  - change from HRT
  - encouraged by others

**NF2: My English Learning Experience**

- NF2 Prior L2 learning (AofO)
- L2 as PS
- L2 as SS in MS
- English class descriptions
- KET Methods
  - text books
  - grammar/translation methods
  - A/L methods
  - Neg. KET descriptions
  - KET proficiency
    - Extensive L1 use
    - Lacked English proficiency
  - best memories
  - worst memories
  - influence on teaching
    - none
    - be different
    - be interesting
    - importance of rapport
  - changes in ELT since
  - reasons for L2 success
    - Blank/understood

**NF3: My University Experience**

- professors
  - negative memory
  - positive memory
  - neutral comment
- courses
  - most helpful things
    - not much/anything
    - classroom English course
    - practicum
    - Improved L2 proficiency
    - learning T methods
    - cooperative learning
  - least helpful
    - impractical courses
    - traditional style/lectures
    - student demonstrations
    - too competitive
    - exam
    - military training
    - all helpful
  - want more opportunities to...
  - improve L2
  - ELT methods
  - learn teaching philosophy/me...
  - extra-curricular activities
  - longer practicum
  - travel abroad
  - learn more
  - more practical courses
  - misunderstood/plank

**NF4: My First Year Teaching English**

- initial feeling
- negative feeling
- mixed feelings
- positive feeling
- reasons
- preparation
- other teachers
  - challenges or problems
  - teaching
    - lack of proficiency
    - lack of experience/training
    - keeping it interesting
  - maintaining ELT
    - materials
    - students
    - level gaps
    - motivating SS
    - student behavior
  - reasons for
    - solutions
  - best memories
  - overall impression
  - positive outcomes
  - negative outcome
  - so-so
  - misunderstood/black
  - cor relations and outcomes
  - positive outcomes
  - negative outcome
  - so-so
Appendix I: Example Excerpts from Study 1

A few excerpts are included here as documentation of the analytical procedures in Study 1. These are from NF1, “Why I Became a Teacher.” The category is reasons to become a teacher and the code is working conditions. This is not a comprehensive set but it gives a sense of the kinds of NF data appearing in Study 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant Number</th>
<th>Excerpt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NF1-2</td>
<td>I started to think about the life in my fifties and sixties. I was working in a private institute which taught adult students (like office workers or university students) English. The job was enjoyable and never boring, but thinking about myself working at age of fifty something made me feel miserable. I knew the job would not be available for women over fifty, and I didn’t want my fifties and sixties to be jobless relying on some man (husband, probably).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NF1-3</td>
<td>working hours of 8 to 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NF1-5</td>
<td>the only path that I could get to new work in the poor condition of my childhood in late 1970’s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NF1-7</td>
<td>I also wanted to have a stable job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NF1-11</td>
<td>I have vacation. Having vacation was good for being teacher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NF1-24</td>
<td>She said to me “Teacher is a good job.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NF1-24</td>
<td>happiness, steady money.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NF1-24</td>
<td>Teacher have a long vacation. This period is valuable to me. I can do many things, go anywhere.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NF1-24</td>
<td>It is a way to relieve stress and take a rest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NF1-28</td>
<td>have a long vacation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NF1-28</td>
<td>As a job, teacher is a good and salary is not so bad</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix J: Information Sheets and Consent Forms for Study 2
Reference Number 12/195
 Approved July 23, 2012

NARRATIVE INQUIRY INTO LANGUAGE TEACHER COGNITION IN KOREA
INFORMATION SHEET FOR CASE STUDY PARTICIPANTS

Thank you for showing an interest in this project. Please read this information sheet carefully before deciding whether or not to participate. If you decide to participate we thank you. If you decide not to take part there will be no disadvantage to you and we thank you for considering our request.

What is the aim of the project?

- The purpose of this research project is to investigate what Korean English teachers in elementary schools think, know, and believe about English language teaching.
- The study will contribute to our understanding of language teacher cognition in Korea.
- This project is being undertaken as part of the requirements for a PhD in Linguistics.

Who may participate in the project?

- Three to five licensed Korean English teachers in public elementary schools.
- Korean teachers who teach English at least once a week.
- Teachers willing to meet with the researcher throughout the school year.

What will you be asked to do?

Should you agree to take part in this project, you will be asked to discuss your experience as learners and teachers of English by:

- Meeting for audio- or video-recorded interviews (or arranging for email interviews) once or twice a month throughout the 2013 school year.
- Having one or two English classes per month observed with notes taken and, with your permission, video-recorded.
• Meeting for audio- or video-recorded interviews to discuss the observations to explain your in-class decision-making based on notes or video-recordings.
• Writing a weekly journal entry related to your teaching.
• Participation in the data-collection process is voluntary. This process is not intended to cause you any risk, discomfort or inconvenience. You are free to withdraw from the project at any stage, or to avoid answering questions which are felt to be too personal or intrusive. You will not be disadvantaged in any way if you do either of these things.

What data or information will be collected and what use will be made of it?

• Data for this project come from (1) audio- or video-recorded semi-structured interviews, (2) class observations with field notes and, with your permission, video-recordings, (3) audio- or video-recorded interviews based on classroom observations, (4) weekly journals, and (5) email interviews.
• This project involves an open-questioning technique. The general line of questioning relates to experience as teachers and learners of English. The precise nature of the questions which will be asked have not been determined in advance, but will depend on the way in which the interviews develop and that in the event that the line of questioning develops in such a way that you feel hesitant or uncomfortable you may decline to answer any particular question(s) and/or may withdraw from the project without any disadvantage of any kind.
• Data will be transcribed and analyzed thematically by the researcher.
• You may be contacted throughout the analysis process to maintain accuracy of results.
• You will have the opportunity to review, correct, or withdraw data from analysis.
• You have the right to exclude any data from analysis which makes you uncomfortable for any reason.
• Any personal information collected will be deleted at the completion of the project.
• All personal information which could reveal your identity will be made anonymous in analysis.
• Only the researcher, supervising professor, and Head of Department will have access to data and your personal information.
• Data from this study will be securely stored in the researcher’s office for a minimum of five years after completion of the study and will be destroyed after that.
• Electronic data and communications cannot be guaranteed to be private but every effort will be made to ensure that they are.
• Overall results of the project will be included in the researcher’s PhD thesis.
• Your anonymity will be preserved in any published version of this project.

What if I have further questions?

[redacted]
NARRATIVE INQUIRY INTO LANGUAGE TEACHER COGNITION IN KOREA
INFORMATION SHEET FOR SCHOOL PRINCIPALS

This is an information sheet for supervising principals at the respective schools where the research will take place. The following passages describe the research.

What is the aim of the project?

- The purpose of this research project is to investigate what Korean English teachers in elementary schools think, know, and believe about English language teaching.
- The study will contribute to our understanding of language teacher cognition in Korea.
- This project is being undertaken as part of the requirements for a PhD in Linguistics.

Who may participate in the project?

- Three to five licensed Korean English teachers in public elementary schools.
- Korean teachers who teach English at least once a week.
- Teachers willing to meet with the researcher throughout the school year.

What will participating teachers be asked to do?

Participating teachers will be asked to discuss their experience as learners and teachers of English which includes:

- Meeting for audio- or video-recorded interviews once or twice a month throughout the 2013 school year.
- Having up to two English classes per month observed and/or video-recorded.
- Meeting at school for audio- or video-recorded interviews to discuss the observations to explain in-class decision-making based on notes or video-recordings.
• Writing a weekly journal entry related to teaching.

• Participation for teachers is voluntary. This process is not intended to cause any risk, discomfort or inconvenience. Teachers are free to withdraw from the project at any stage, or to avoid answering questions which are felt to be too personal or intrusive.

What data or information will be collected and what use will be made of it?

• Data for this project come from (1) audio- or video-recorded semi-structured interviews, (2) class observations with field notes and, video-recordings, (3) audio- or video-recorded interviews based on classroom observations, (4) weekly journals, and (5) email interviews.

• This project involves an open-questioning technique. The general line of questioning relates to experience as teachers and learners of English.

• This research is not related to performance evaluation of either teachers or the school.

• Neither the teachers, students, staff, or school will be identified in this research.

• Any personal information collected will be deleted at the completion of the project.

• Only the researcher, supervising professor, and Head of Department will have access to data and personal information.

• Data from this study will be securely stored in the researcher’s office for a minimum of five years after completion of the study and will be destroyed after that.

• Electronic data and communications cannot be guaranteed to be private but every effort will be made to ensure that they are.

• Overall results of the project will be included in the researcher’s PhD thesis.

• Your anonymity will be preserved in any published version of this project.

What if I have further questions?

If you have any questions about our project, either now or in the future, please feel free to contact either:

The researcher:

[redacted]

This study has been approved by the University of Otago Human Ethics Committee. If you have any concerns about the ethical conduct of the research you may contact the Committee through the Human Ethics Committee Administrator (ph +64 3 479 8256). Any issues you raise will be treated in confidence and investigated and you will be informed of the outcome.
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학교장을 위한 정보 자료

해당 정보 자료는 본 연구참여 영어교사들이 재직중인 학교의 학교장을 위한 것으로 자세한 내용은 아래와 같습니다.

본 연구의 목적

- 본 연구는 한국인 영어교사들의 한국 공립학교 영어교육에 대한 생각, 지식 그리고 신뢰를 알아보기 위함입니다.
- 본 연구는 한국인 영어교사들의 인지에 대한 이해를 돕는데 기여할 것입니다.
- 본 연구는 언어학 박사학위 연구 과정의 일부로서 시행됨을 알려드립니다.

본 연구 참가자들에 대한 정보

- 한국 공립 초등학교에 재직중인 영어 교사 3명 내지 5명
- 주당 적어도 1시간의 영어를 가르치는 담임교사
- 학기 중 해당 학교에서 주 연구자와의 만남이 가능한 교사

본 연구에서 연구참여교사들에게 주어지는 질문

연구참여교사들은 영어학습자와 영어교사로서의 본인들의 경험들에 대해서 이야기할 것이며 자세한 내용은 아래와 같습니다.

- 미팅은 2013학년도 학교교육과정 수행 중 월 1회에서 2회 정도의 오디오 녹음나 비디오 녹화를 바탕으로 진행됩니다.
- 월 1회에서 2회 정도의 해당 영어교사의 영어참관수업이나 비디오 녹화가 이루어집니다.
- 녹음이나 녹화가 이루어지는 미팅 중 영어교사의 수업에 관한 것은 수업 계획, 실행, 결과 등에 관한 것입니다.
- 본 연구참여교사들은 주 1회 수업에 관한 일지를 작성합니다.
- 본 연구에 대한 참가여부는 교사들의 자발적인 선택사항이며 연구 수행 중 어떠한 불편이나 불이익을 당하지 않을 것입니다. 또한 참여교사들은 연구 수행 과정에서 탈퇴가 보장되며 질문지 작성이나 인터뷰과정 중 개인적인 불편함을 야기시키는 부분에 대해서는
본 연구에서 수집되는 자료나 정보의 내용 및 사용

- 본 연구에서 수집되는 자료는 일상적인 인터뷰, 수업 참관 및 일지 등입니다.
- 본 연구의 주제는 영어 교사들의 인지에 관한 것입니다.
- 본 연구는 해당교사들의 교원평가에 절대 반영되지 않을 것입니다.
- 본 연구에 참여하는 교사, 학생, 교직원의 신상 관련 내용과 학교명은 추후 연구 논문에 비공개로 명시될 것입니다.
- 본 연구 중 표집된 모든 개인 신상 자료는 연구가 종료되는 즉시 파기되어질 것입니다.
- 본 연구의 자료 및 개인 신상 자료는 주연구자나 해당 지도 교수 및 학과장만이 열람할 수 있습니다.
- 본 연구에 사용되어진 자료는 최소 5년간 연구자 사무실에 보관되어지며 이후 즉시 파기되어질 것입니다.
- 본 연구 자료 중 주 연구자의 이메일이나 온라인 형태로 수집된 자료는 연구 수행 중 정 보누출이 되지 않도록 최대한 노력할 것입니다.
- 본 연구의 결과물은 주 연구자의 박사학위 논문에 포함될 것입니다.
- 본 연구 참가자의 익명성은 해당 연구의 어떤 출판물에도 보장될 것입니다.

본 연구에 대한 의문점이나 질문은 항상 가능하며 주 연구자와 지도교수의 연락처는 아래를 참고해 주시면 감사하겠습니다.

주 연구자:

[redacted]

이 연구는 오타고대학교의 Otago Human Ethics Committee에 의해 승인 받았습니다. 이 연구에 관련된 어떤 형태의 도의적 불만이 있다면 다음 연구 응리 담당관에게 연락해 주시기 바랍니다 (+64 3 479 8256). 참가자들에게 의해 제기된 문제들은 극비로 진행될 것이며 해당 결과는 추후에 본인에게 통지될 것입니다.
A NARRATIVE INQUIRY INTO LANGUAGE TEACHER COGNITION IN KOREA
CONSENT FORM FOR SCHOOL PRINCIPALS

I have read the Information Sheet concerning this project and understand what it is about. All my questions have been answered to my satisfaction. I understand that I am free to request further information at any stage.

I know that:-

1. Teachers' participation in the project is voluntary and anonymous;

2. Teachers may withdraw from the project at any time without any disadvantage;

3. Personal identifying information on documents, electronic files, video files, and audio files will be destroyed at the conclusion of the project but any raw data on which the results of the project depend will be retained in secure storage for at least five years. Electronic data and communications cannot be guaranteed to be private but every effort will be made to ensure they are;

4. This project involves an open-questioning technique. The general line of questioning includes experience as teachers and learners of English;

5. The researcher may visit the school up to twice per month to observe or record participating teachers' English classes and interview them on site.

6. The project is not intended for assessment or evaluative purposes of the teachers, students or the school;

7. The results of the project may be published and will be available in the University of Otago Library (Dunedin, New Zealand) but every attempt will be made to preserve anonymity of participants and locations.

8. I am free to withdraw permission at anytime for this research to take place at this school without any disadvantage to myself, the school, or participating teachers.

I give permission for the researcher to observe classes and interview teachers at this school as outlined in the information sheet.
This study has been approved by the University of Otago Human Ethics Committee. If you have any concerns about the ethical conduct of the research you may contact the Committee through the Human Ethics Committee Administrator (ph +64 3 479 8256). Any issues you raise will be treated in confidence and investigated and you will be informed of the outcome.

Reference Number 12/195
Approved July 23, 2012

내러티브 탐구를 통한 한국인 영어교사로서의 인지 연구 중

본 연구 참여에 대한 동의서

본인은 해당 정보자료를 열람 및 숙지했으며 이에 대한 더 이상의 질문 사항은 없습니다. 또한 연구 수행 과정 중 연구에 관련된 사안에 대해서 추후에 질문을 할 수 있습니다.

본인은 아래사항에 대해서 알고 있습니다.

1. 해당 교사들의 참가 여부는 자발적이며 익명이 보장됩니다.
2. 해당 교사들은 연구 수행 중 만약 탈퇴시 불이익을 당하지 않습니다.
3. 본 연구 중 표집된 모든 개인 신상 자료는 연구가 종료되는 즉시 파기되어질 것이며 연구 자료는 최소 5년간 연구자 사무실에 보관되어지며 연구자의 이메일이나 온라인 형태로 수집된 자료는 연구 수행 중 정보누출이 되지 않도록 최대한 노력할 것입니다.
4. 본 연구 중 수집되는 질문은 서술식이며 연구참여교사들의 영어에 관한 학습자 및 교수자로서의 경험에 관련된 것들입니다.
5. 본 연구의 주 연구자는 월 1회에서 2회 정도 학교를 방문해서 연구참여교사들의 수업을 참관하거나 면담을 하게 됩니다.
6. 본 연구는 연구참여교사, 학생 및 학교의 평가 자료로 절대 쓰여지지 않을 것입니다.

7. 본 연구 결과물은 박사학위논문으로 게시 및 출판될 것이며 오타고대학교 (뉴질랜드, 드니든 시) 도서관에서 열람이 가능하며 연구참여교사들의 성명이나 지역은 익명임을 보장합니다.

8. 본 연구 수행 과정 중 만일 본인, 학교 및 연구참여교사들에게 불이익이 발생 할 경우 연구 수행 중지를 요구 할 수 있습니다.

본인은 본 연구의 주 연구자에게 연구참여교사들을 면담하거나 수업을 참관할 수 있도록 허가했습니다.

..............................................................
(성명) 서명 (날짜)

이 연구는 오타고대학교의 Otago Human Ethics Committee에 의해 승인 받았습니다. 이 연구에 관련된 어떤 형태의 도의적 불만이 있다면 다음 연구 윤리 담당관에게 연락해 주시기 바랍니다 (+64 3 479 8256). 참가자들에 의해 제기된 문제들은 극비로 진행될 것이며 해당 결과는 추후에 본인에게 통지될 것입니다.
Appendix K: Topics for Open and Semi-structured Interviews


**Life History Topics**

- Family background
- Educational experiences
- English language learning experience
- Reasons for becoming a teacher
- Reasons for becoming an English teacher

**Language Teacher Cognition Topics**

- Pre-service teacher education experience
- Practicum experience
- Homeroom teaching experience
- In-service teacher training
- Reflections on teaching English
- Beliefs about ELT
- Materials and planning
- Influence of prior learning on ELT beliefs and practices
- Influence of pre-service education
- Influence of prior ELT and HRT
- Influence of in-service education

**Post-observation and Critical Incident Log Interview Topics**

- Sources of materials, rationale
- In-class decision-making
- Clarification and explication of critical incident log entries (see below)
Appendix L: Transcription Conventions

Interview Transcriptions

. pause with lowering intonation indicating speaker has concluded utterance
, shorter pause with intonation indicating speaker will continue
— longer pause with intonation indicating speaker will continue
? questioning intonation
! exclamatory intonation

*italics* speaker emphasis

() unclear

(() nonverbal response

[] researcher clarification

… deletion for space or clarity

(Adapted from K. Richards, 2003, pp. 81-82)

Classroom Interaction Transcriptions

Same as above, plus:

T: teacher utterance

SS: class/multiple students speaking

S1, S2, S3, … first, second, third (etc.) student speaking in transcript

( ) researcher commentary/description

[ ] overlapping utterances

‘ ’ translation of Korean utterance

Note: Some interaction sequences were described in text rather than fully transcribed, for example, pedagogic activities with lots of repetition.
Appendix M: Data Reference Conventions

Study 1
NFX-x  Story number - participant number

Study 2
XNFx  Participant initial and narrative frame number (e.g., ENF1)
XOx  Participant initial observation transcript number (e.g., EO1)
XORx  Participant initial and observation report number (e.g., EOR1)
XFNx  Participant field note number (e.g., EFN1)
XIx: x  Participant initial interview number: line number (e.g., EI1: 1)*

*The form “XIx.x: x” was used when multiple interviews occurred on the same day (e.g., XI1.2 would be the second interview on the first day of interviews).
Appendix N: Observation Report Template

**OBSERVATION REPORT**

**Date and Location:**

**Classroom Description:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic, unit, and pages</th>
<th>Other materials (and sources)</th>
<th>Homework assigned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Observations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity Description and Procedures</th>
<th>Interaction</th>
<th>Comments / Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other Comments/Questions:
# Appendix O: Critical Incident Log Template

**Weekly Journal - Elementary School English - 2013-2014**

## Critical Incident Log

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>Unit Number/Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pages:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Omissions</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(What activities did you skip?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other materials</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Where did you get ideas for extra activities?</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What homework did you assign, if any?</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Critical Incident Log</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. When were the students most engaged during this unit?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. When were they most distanced as learners?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. What did they find most helpful for learning English?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. What did they find most puzzling or confusing?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. What was the most effective thing you did during the unit?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. What was the least effective thing you did?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. What did you find most affirming as a teacher?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Did anything amusing happen or were there any surprises?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Did you have any problems during this unit?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. How did you solve them?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Did you do anything different than usual during this unit?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. What would you do differently if you taught this unit again?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Adapted from Brookfield, 1995)
## Activity Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LE</td>
<td>Language Exercise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Communicative Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>Task-based Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG</td>
<td>Singing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH</td>
<td>Chanting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Activity Focus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FF</td>
<td>Form-focused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MF</td>
<td>Meaning-focused</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Activity Descriptors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CE</td>
<td>Close-ended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OE</td>
<td>Open-ended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CZ</td>
<td>Cloze Exercise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT</td>
<td>Matching/Multiple Choice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Structure Drill/Pattern Drill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR</td>
<td>Choral Response/Chanting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DT</td>
<td>Dictations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL</td>
<td>Cooperative Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RP</td>
<td>Role Play</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IG</td>
<td>Information Gap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS</td>
<td>Problem Solving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BL</td>
<td>Blended Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GM</td>
<td>Game</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG</td>
<td>Song</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CF</td>
<td>Corrective Feedback</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Groupings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IA</td>
<td>Individual Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PW</td>
<td>Pair Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GW</td>
<td>Group Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCA</td>
<td>Full Class Activity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Interactions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TT</td>
<td>Teacher Talk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS</td>
<td>Teacher-Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>Student-Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST</td>
<td>Student-Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LR</td>
<td>Listening &amp; Repeating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CETQ</td>
<td>Close-ended Teacher Questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OETQ</td>
<td>Open-ended Teacher Questions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Language

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Korean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KE</td>
<td>Korean then English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EK</td>
<td>English then Korean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TL</td>
<td>Target Language (English)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1</td>
<td>First Language (Korean)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Source

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TB</td>
<td>Textbook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TG</td>
<td>Teacher’s Guide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS</td>
<td>indischool.com</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FH</td>
<td>Supplementary Book (Read, 2007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>Homeroom Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CW</td>
<td>Co-worker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEST</td>
<td>Native-Speaking Co-teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SM</td>
<td>Self-made</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix Q: Critical Incident Log Data

Mia’s CIL Data

### Item 1: Most Engaging for Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity Name/Incident</th>
<th>Activity Type</th>
<th>FF or MF</th>
<th>Descriptors</th>
<th>Skill focus</th>
<th>Grouping</th>
<th>Interaction</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jenga reading</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>FF</td>
<td>GM</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>GW</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>IS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New word PPT</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>FF</td>
<td>BL</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>FCA</td>
<td>TS</td>
<td>IS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentence race</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>FF/MI</td>
<td>CL</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>GW</td>
<td>SS ST</td>
<td>FH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical clinic</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>MF</td>
<td>RP</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>FCA</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>TB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentence race</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>FF/MI</td>
<td>CL</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>GW</td>
<td>SS ST</td>
<td>FH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guessing game</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>MF</td>
<td>GM BL</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>FCA</td>
<td>TS</td>
<td>IS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Item 2: Most Distancing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity Name/Incident</th>
<th>Activity Type</th>
<th>FF or MF</th>
<th>Descriptors</th>
<th>Skill focus</th>
<th>Grouping</th>
<th>Interaction</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Writing activity</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>FF</td>
<td>CZ</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>TB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Train tracks survey</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>MF</td>
<td>IG</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>FCA</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>IS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>FF</td>
<td>LK</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>FCA</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>TB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Look &amp; Say</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>FF</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>TB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listen &amp; Match</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>FF</td>
<td>MT</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>TB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check up (Review exercise)</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>FF</td>
<td>CZ MT</td>
<td>G W</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>TB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ordering sentences</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>FF</td>
<td>MT</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>TB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading text</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>FF</td>
<td>GM</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>PW</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>IS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worksheet</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>FF</td>
<td>CZ MT</td>
<td>G W</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>IS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Item 3: Most Helpful

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity Name/Incident</th>
<th>Activity Type</th>
<th>FF or MF</th>
<th>Descriptors</th>
<th>Skill focus</th>
<th>Grouping</th>
<th>Interaction</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentence race</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>FF/MI</td>
<td>CL</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>GW</td>
<td>SS ST</td>
<td>FH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical clinic</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>MF</td>
<td>RP</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>FCA</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>TB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self correction</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>FF</td>
<td>CF</td>
<td>G W</td>
<td>FCA</td>
<td>TS</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Month song</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>FF</td>
<td>SG</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>FCA</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>TB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Map activity</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>MF</td>
<td>IG</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>GW</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>IS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparing two pictures</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>MF</td>
<td>IG</td>
<td>S L</td>
<td>PW</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>FH</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Item 4: Most Puzzling

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity Name/Incident</th>
<th>Activity Type</th>
<th>Descriptors</th>
<th>Skill focus</th>
<th>Grouping</th>
<th>Interaction</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TL instructions</td>
<td></td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
<td>TT E</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TL instructions</td>
<td></td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
<td>TT E</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammar points</td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary too advanced</td>
<td></td>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity instructions (virus game)</td>
<td></td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
<td>TT EK</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary (ordinals)</td>
<td></td>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity instructions (map activity)</td>
<td></td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
<td>TT EK</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TL instructions (treasure hunt)</td>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td>TT EK</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TL instructions (guessing game)</td>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td>TT EK</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Item 5: Most Effective Practice**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity Name/Incident Theme</th>
<th>Activity Type</th>
<th>FF or MF</th>
<th>Descriptors</th>
<th>Skill focus</th>
<th>Grouping</th>
<th>Interaction</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Worksheet</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>FF</td>
<td>CZ MT, W</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>IS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentence race</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>FF</td>
<td>FEMF</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>GW</td>
<td>SS ST E</td>
<td>FH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparing materials (RP cards)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self corrections</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>FF</td>
<td>CF</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>GCA</td>
<td>TS</td>
<td>SM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparing materials (flash cards)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentence race</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>FF</td>
<td>EEF</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>GW</td>
<td>SS ST E</td>
<td>FH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finding the differences</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>FF</td>
<td>IG</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>GW</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>FH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraging TL use</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Item 6: Least Effective Practice**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity Name/Incident Theme</th>
<th>Activity Type</th>
<th>FF or MF</th>
<th>Descriptors</th>
<th>Skill focus</th>
<th>Grouping</th>
<th>Interaction</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fortune teller (too bad)</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>MF</td>
<td>OE</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>IS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenga reading (too distracting)</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>FF</td>
<td>GM</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>GW</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>IS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>True &amp; false game</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>FF</td>
<td>GM</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>FCA</td>
<td>TS</td>
<td>TB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read along</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>FF</td>
<td>CR</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>FCA</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>TB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worksheet</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>FF</td>
<td>CZ MT</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>IS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listen &amp; write</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>FF</td>
<td>CZ</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>TB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listen &amp; match</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>FF</td>
<td>MT</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>TB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading race (not helpful)</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>FF</td>
<td>GM</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>PW</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>IS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listen &amp; repeat</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>FF</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>FCA</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>TB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Item 7: Most Affirming Incident**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity Name/Incident Theme</th>
<th>Activity Type</th>
<th>FF or MF</th>
<th>Descriptors</th>
<th>Skill focus</th>
<th>Grouping</th>
<th>Interaction</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SS using TL during activity</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>SS E</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS using TL during activity</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>SS E</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS using TL during activity</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>SS E</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS using TL during activity</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>SS E</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS enjoying activity (medical clinic)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS using TL in class</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>ST E</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS asking about TL culture</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>ST EK</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS enjoyment activity (sentence race)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class reward for TL use and good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>behavior</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS enjoying activities (guessing game)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS using TL in class</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>SS E</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Items 8, 9, 10, 11, and 12: Surprises, Problems, Solutions, Changes, Future Changes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Surprises</th>
<th>Problems</th>
<th>Solutions</th>
<th>Changes</th>
<th>Future changes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time management</td>
<td>SS attitude</td>
<td>Used more TL (but didn’t seem to work)</td>
<td>more TL practice time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helped SS (when sick)</td>
<td>SS behavior</td>
<td>Addressed with 2.1</td>
<td>Using SS helpers (when sick)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special needs (behavior)</td>
<td>SS behavior</td>
<td>Addressed after class</td>
<td>Encouraged TL use</td>
<td>prepare more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS using TL (duration CA)</td>
<td>SS behavior (late)</td>
<td>Started reward system</td>
<td>Started class reward system</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS interest in culture</td>
<td>SS behavior</td>
<td>Asked them to focus</td>
<td>Ranked (5% of seats per day)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS helping another (during CA)</td>
<td>SS behavior</td>
<td>New CA survey</td>
<td>More positive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS class doing better than</td>
<td>SS behavior</td>
<td>IA-GW successful</td>
<td>Change class reward (or, no game)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>others</td>
<td></td>
<td>Related</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td>Used mostly TL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td>Used mostly TL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td>SS behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td>Addressed after class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td>Related</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td>Related</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td>Related</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS attitude</td>
<td></td>
<td>Related</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Sami’s CIL Data

#### Item 1: Most Engaging for Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity Name/ Incident Theme</th>
<th>Activity Type</th>
<th>FF or MF</th>
<th>Descriptors</th>
<th>Skill focus</th>
<th>Grouping</th>
<th>Interaction</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>MF</td>
<td>IG</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>MCA</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>TB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rap box competition</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>FF</td>
<td>CR</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>MCA</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>TB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fun &amp; Fun 2</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>FF</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>PW</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>TB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apose activity</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>MF</td>
<td>CETQ</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>MCA</td>
<td>TS</td>
<td>SM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telepathy game</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>MF</td>
<td>GM</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>MCA</td>
<td>TS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passing the ball</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>FF</td>
<td>GM</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>MCA</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>BS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banker Robbins 31</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>FF</td>
<td>CR</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>MCA</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>TB SM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary Contest</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>FF</td>
<td>GM</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>GW</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>BS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Card Games</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>FF</td>
<td>GM</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>GW</td>
<td>SS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Item 2: Most Distancing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity Name/ Incident Theme</th>
<th>Activity Type</th>
<th>FF or MF</th>
<th>Descriptors</th>
<th>Skill focus</th>
<th>Grouping</th>
<th>Interaction</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading activity</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>FF</td>
<td>MT</td>
<td>CZ</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write it</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>FF</td>
<td>UN</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>TB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explaining grammar</td>
<td>TT</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>TT</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read &amp; Write</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>FF</td>
<td>MT</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>TB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Look &amp; Listen</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>FF</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>TB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read &amp; Write</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>FF</td>
<td>CZ</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>TB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rap Box</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>FF</td>
<td>CR</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>MCA</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>TB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read &amp; Do p. 114</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>FF</td>
<td>CZ</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>TB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write it p. 116</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>FF</td>
<td>CZ</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>TB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Item 3: Most Helpful

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity Name/ Incident Theme</th>
<th>Activity Type</th>
<th>FF or MF</th>
<th>Descriptors</th>
<th>Skill focus</th>
<th>Grouping</th>
<th>Interaction</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Country survey</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>MF</td>
<td>IG</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>MCA</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>TB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rap box competition</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>FF</td>
<td>CR</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>MCA</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>TB SM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sleeping elephants</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>FF</td>
<td>UN</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>GW</td>
<td>SS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fun &amp; Fun 3 survey</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>MF</td>
<td>IG</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>MCA</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>TB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Running dictations</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>FF</td>
<td>CL</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>GW</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>SM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fun &amp; Fun 2</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>FF</td>
<td>GM</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>GW</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>TB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Together</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>MF</td>
<td>IG</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>GW</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>TB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Song, I’m a Canada Kid</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>FF</td>
<td>SG</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>BS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary Contest</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>FF</td>
<td>GM</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>GW</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>BS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t laugh at me song</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>MF</td>
<td>SG</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>MCA</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Item 4: Most Puzzling

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity Name/ Incident Theme</th>
<th>Activity Type</th>
<th>FF or MF</th>
<th>Descriptors</th>
<th>Skill focus</th>
<th>Grouping</th>
<th>Interaction</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Board game (hard vocab)</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>FF</td>
<td>GM</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>PW</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>TB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing task (too hard)</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>MF</td>
<td>OE</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>TB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammar points (Where...)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Til instructions (low level SS)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key expressions (too hard)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read &amp; Write (poor design)</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>FF</td>
<td>CZ</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>TB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read &amp; Write p. 107 (low levels)</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>FF</td>
<td>CZ</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>TB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammar past tense reg, irreg</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read &amp; write p. 117</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>FF</td>
<td>CZ</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>TB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Item 5: Most Effective Practice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity Name/ Incident Theme</th>
<th>Activity Type</th>
<th>FF or MF</th>
<th>Descriptors</th>
<th>Skill focus</th>
<th>Grouping</th>
<th>Interaction</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Singing</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>FF</td>
<td>SG</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>MCA</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>BS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Story box (using PPP)</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>MF</td>
<td>OE</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>MCA</td>
<td>ST</td>
<td>TB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LE to GW</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>FF</td>
<td>MT</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>GW</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>SM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using relia and pictures</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving clear instructions</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retrieved TT</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fun &amp; Fun 2</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>FF</td>
<td>GM</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>GW</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>BS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can you join us? Song</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>FF</td>
<td>SG</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>MCA</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>BS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enact CP through LE</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>FF</td>
<td>CF</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>PCA</td>
<td>TS</td>
<td>SM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listen &amp; Draw monitors</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>MF</td>
<td>OE</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>PW</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>SM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Item 6: Least Effective Practice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity Name/ Incident Theme</th>
<th>Activity Type</th>
<th>FF or MF</th>
<th>Descriptors</th>
<th>Skill focus</th>
<th>Grouping</th>
<th>Interaction</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Soo much teacher talk</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>TT EK</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read &amp; Do</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>FF</td>
<td>MT</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>TB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Story Time</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>MF</td>
<td>OE</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>TB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write H</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>FF</td>
<td>UN</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>TB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write H C</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>FF</td>
<td>CZ</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>TB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too much teacher talk</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>TT EK</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fill in the blanks (too hard)</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>FF</td>
<td>CZ</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>SM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Item 7: Most Affirming Incident

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity Name/ Incident Theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S said &quot;Time flies in English class&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved class atmosphere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS wanted to continue after bell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS using TL (during TT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS engagement (telepathy game)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS using TL (during activity)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felt rapport with SS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS enthusiasm for activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S change attitude. HRT noticed difference, too</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS wrote her name 100s of times on board w/ hearts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Items 8, 9, 10, 11, and 12: Surprises, Problems, Solutions, Changes, Future Changes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Surprises</th>
<th>Problems</th>
<th>Changes</th>
<th>Future Changes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SS not knowing V (countries)</td>
<td>Level gaps (low level SS)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>More CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest in SS</td>
<td>Level gaps</td>
<td>Prepared more for Story time</td>
<td>Less TT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS enthusiasm for level checks</td>
<td>Level gap</td>
<td>Order of activities</td>
<td>More OE creative A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inauthentic materials</td>
<td>Used relia</td>
<td>Change story box</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-level S</td>
<td>time management</td>
<td>New game</td>
<td>Plan extra class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>improved effort</td>
<td>too many SS</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Change story box</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S found error in book</td>
<td>level gap</td>
<td>Used video clips</td>
<td>More CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low level S</td>
<td>giving TL instructions</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Bring relia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>improving</td>
<td>Level gap</td>
<td>More CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>low level S</td>
<td>Unfamiliar TL</td>
<td>Maximize S participation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trying even though hard</td>
<td>Behavior</td>
<td>Make it less teacher centered</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S vomited in class</td>
<td>More time with Low level students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S bowel movement in hall</td>
<td>more focus on accuracy and tidiness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low level SS</td>
<td>Listen and Draw CA</td>
<td>more role play time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ss expect more games</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS don't like TB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Eunjeong’s CIL Data

### Item 1: Most Engaging for Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CIL No.</th>
<th>Activity Name / Incident Theme</th>
<th>Activity Type</th>
<th>FF or MF</th>
<th>Descriptors</th>
<th>Skill focus</th>
<th>Grouping</th>
<th>Interaction</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item 1</td>
<td>Read 1 p. 80</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>FF</td>
<td>Coloring</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>TB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 2</td>
<td>Reading Group</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>MF</td>
<td>GM</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>GW</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 3</td>
<td>Watching video</td>
<td>Video</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>YT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 4</td>
<td>Weather Song</td>
<td>SG</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>SG</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>YT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 5</td>
<td>Singing</td>
<td>SG</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>SG</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>YT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 6</td>
<td>Watching video</td>
<td>Video</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>YT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 7</td>
<td>Singing</td>
<td>SG</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>SG</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>FCA</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>YT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 8</td>
<td>Vocalizations (speaking practice)</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>FF</td>
<td>GM</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>FCA</td>
<td>TB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 9</td>
<td>Board Game</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>FF</td>
<td>GM</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>PW</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>IS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 10</td>
<td>Singing</td>
<td>SG</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>SG</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>YT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Item 2: Most Distancing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CIL No.</th>
<th>Activity Name / Incident Theme</th>
<th>Activity Type</th>
<th>FF or MF</th>
<th>Descriptors</th>
<th>Skill focus</th>
<th>Grouping</th>
<th>Interaction</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item 1</td>
<td>Phonics Time p. 79</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>FF</td>
<td>CR</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>FCA</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>TB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 2</td>
<td>Singing (do you like an?/?)</td>
<td>SG</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>FCA</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 3</td>
<td>Singing ABC song (rock ver.)</td>
<td>SG</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>FCA</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 4</td>
<td>Alphabet test</td>
<td>Test</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>SM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 5</td>
<td>Write 101</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>FF</td>
<td>CZ</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>TB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 6</td>
<td>Write 113</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>FF</td>
<td>CZ</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>TB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 7</td>
<td>Hello School 115</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>FF</td>
<td>MG</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>PW</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>TB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 8</td>
<td>Family Song</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>SG</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 9</td>
<td>Practice test</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Test</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 10</td>
<td>Listen and repeat 115</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>FF</td>
<td>LR</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>FCA</td>
<td>TS</td>
<td>TB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Item 3: Most Helpful

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CIL No.</th>
<th>Activity Name / Incident Theme</th>
<th>Activity Type</th>
<th>FF or MF</th>
<th>Descriptors</th>
<th>Skill focus</th>
<th>Grouping</th>
<th>Interaction</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item 1</td>
<td>Phonics Review</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>FF</td>
<td>LR</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>FCA</td>
<td>TS</td>
<td>SM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 2</td>
<td>Listen &amp; Repeat</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>FF</td>
<td>CR</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>FCA</td>
<td>TS</td>
<td>SM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 3</td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>MF / FF</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>FCA</td>
<td>TS</td>
<td>SS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 4</td>
<td>Singing (Weather song)</td>
<td>SG</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>SG</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>FCA</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 5</td>
<td>Info Gap Cities and weather</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>FF</td>
<td>IGI</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>PW</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>IS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 6</td>
<td>Info Gap Prices</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>FF</td>
<td>IG</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>FCA</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>TB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 7</td>
<td>Speaking practice PPT</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>FF</td>
<td>LR</td>
<td>CR</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>FCA</td>
<td>TS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 8</td>
<td>Info gap worksheet</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>MF</td>
<td>IG</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>FCA</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>SM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 9</td>
<td>Speaking practice PPT</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>MF</td>
<td>CETQ / CR</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>FCA</td>
<td>TS</td>
<td>SM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 10</td>
<td>Read p. 124</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>FF</td>
<td>GM</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>TB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Item 4: Most Puzzling

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade 3</th>
<th>Activity Name</th>
<th>Incident Theme</th>
<th>Activity Type</th>
<th>FF or MF</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Skill focus</th>
<th>Grouping</th>
<th>Interaction</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Pronunciation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Confused about what they learned</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes I don’t</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Lyrics in new song</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Instructions for info gap WS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>How to make drill (instructions 101)</td>
<td>Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Grammar ie plural pron, pers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>s’ in TB is different than pron I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Vocabulary (prov, pronounce eg my</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Changing the values on dice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Write p. 124-125</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LE FF CZ W IA</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>TB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade 4</th>
<th>Activity Name</th>
<th>Incident Theme</th>
<th>Activity Type</th>
<th>FF or MF</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Skill focus</th>
<th>Grouping</th>
<th>Interaction</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Read &amp; Write 2, 81</td>
<td></td>
<td>LE MF</td>
<td>Problem solving</td>
<td>V IA</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>TB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Spelling/grammar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Students can’t remember new vocab</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Shared game rules in TB p. 165</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Pronunciation (One vs both) a sound</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Grammar ie She has vs she is</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Air pronunciation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Honey 117</td>
<td></td>
<td>CA MF</td>
<td>IG L</td>
<td>PCA TS TB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Instructions for worksheet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Grammar ie, she is in the bathroom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LE FF</td>
<td>PCA IA</td>
<td>TS TB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Item 5: Most Effective Practice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade 3</th>
<th>Activity Name</th>
<th>Incident Theme</th>
<th>Activity Type</th>
<th>FF or MF</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Skill focus</th>
<th>Grouping</th>
<th>Interaction</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Planning for a vocab quiz</td>
<td></td>
<td>LE FF</td>
<td>CR S</td>
<td>PCA</td>
<td>TS</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Speaking practice</td>
<td></td>
<td>LE FF</td>
<td>SD S</td>
<td>PCA</td>
<td>TS</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td></td>
<td>LE MF</td>
<td>FF IG</td>
<td>PCA</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>TB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Speaking practice PPT</td>
<td></td>
<td>LE FF</td>
<td>LR S</td>
<td>PCA</td>
<td>TS</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Singing weather song</td>
<td></td>
<td>SG -</td>
<td>SG -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>VT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Speaking practice PPT</td>
<td></td>
<td>LE FF</td>
<td>CR LR</td>
<td>PCA</td>
<td>TS</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Speaking practice PPT</td>
<td></td>
<td>LE FF</td>
<td>CR LR</td>
<td>PCA</td>
<td>TS</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Sing a song</td>
<td></td>
<td>LE MF</td>
<td>GM L</td>
<td>PCA</td>
<td>TS</td>
<td>TB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Look &amp; Speak (with quiz)</td>
<td></td>
<td>LE FF</td>
<td>CR S</td>
<td>PCA</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>TS</td>
<td>TB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Alphabet board game</td>
<td></td>
<td>LE FF</td>
<td>GM S</td>
<td>PW</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>TB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade 4</th>
<th>Activity Name</th>
<th>Incident Theme</th>
<th>Activity Type</th>
<th>FF or MF</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Skill focus</th>
<th>Grouping</th>
<th>Interaction</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Planning for a vocab quiz</td>
<td></td>
<td>LE FF</td>
<td>SD S</td>
<td>PCA</td>
<td>TS</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Speaking practice</td>
<td></td>
<td>LE FF</td>
<td>SD S</td>
<td>PCA</td>
<td>TS</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Speaking practice</td>
<td></td>
<td>LE FF</td>
<td>SD S</td>
<td>PCA</td>
<td>TS</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Speaking practice</td>
<td></td>
<td>LE MF</td>
<td>GM S</td>
<td>PW</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>TB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Speaking practice</td>
<td></td>
<td>LE MF</td>
<td>GM S</td>
<td>PW</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>TB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Speaking practice</td>
<td></td>
<td>LE MF</td>
<td>GM S</td>
<td>PW</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>TB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Speaking practice</td>
<td></td>
<td>LE MF</td>
<td>GM S</td>
<td>PW</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>TB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Speaking practice</td>
<td></td>
<td>LE MF</td>
<td>GM S</td>
<td>PW</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>TB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Sing a song</td>
<td></td>
<td>LE FF</td>
<td>CR S</td>
<td>PCA</td>
<td>TS</td>
<td>TB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Speaking practice</td>
<td></td>
<td>LE FF</td>
<td>CR S</td>
<td>PCA</td>
<td>TS</td>
<td>TB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Item 6: Least Effective Practice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade 3</th>
<th>Activity Name</th>
<th>Incident Theme</th>
<th>Activity Type</th>
<th>FF or MF</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Skill focus</th>
<th>Grouping</th>
<th>Interaction</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ready, Action p. 76</td>
<td></td>
<td>LE MF</td>
<td>TRP L</td>
<td>PCA</td>
<td>TS B K</td>
<td>TB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Hello World 83</td>
<td></td>
<td>LE MF</td>
<td>L L</td>
<td>PCA</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>TB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Watching Story p. 88</td>
<td></td>
<td>LE MF</td>
<td>TRP L</td>
<td>PCA</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>TB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I can do it 92</td>
<td></td>
<td>LE MF</td>
<td>MT V</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>TB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Do it yourself p. 101</td>
<td>Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Dice game (weather deck)</td>
<td></td>
<td>LE MF</td>
<td>GM S</td>
<td>PW</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>TB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Watching Story p. 110</td>
<td></td>
<td>LE MF</td>
<td>L L</td>
<td>PCA</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>TB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Look &amp; Read 90</td>
<td></td>
<td>LE MF</td>
<td>FR S</td>
<td>PCA</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>TB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Family Song</td>
<td></td>
<td>SG -</td>
<td>SG -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>YT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Phonics p. 123</td>
<td></td>
<td>LE FF</td>
<td>LR S</td>
<td>PCA</td>
<td>TS</td>
<td>SM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade 4</th>
<th>Activity Name</th>
<th>Incident Theme</th>
<th>Activity Type</th>
<th>FF or MF</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Skill focus</th>
<th>Grouping</th>
<th>Interaction</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Look &amp; Read 2, 85</td>
<td></td>
<td>LE FF</td>
<td>CZ MT</td>
<td>R W</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>TB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Give time to memorize in class</td>
<td></td>
<td>LE FF</td>
<td>- V</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Watch &amp; Read 90</td>
<td></td>
<td>LE FF</td>
<td>CZ MT</td>
<td>R W</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>TB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Word test (vocab quiz 10 words)</td>
<td></td>
<td>LE FF</td>
<td>- V</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>See the Hello World video</td>
<td>Culture lesson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Card game</td>
<td></td>
<td>LE MF</td>
<td>GM S</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>TB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Read and write 122 113</td>
<td></td>
<td>LE FF</td>
<td>CZ R W</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>TB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Look &amp; read 117</td>
<td></td>
<td>LE FF</td>
<td>LR S</td>
<td>PCA</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>TB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Information gap</td>
<td></td>
<td>CA MF</td>
<td>IG S</td>
<td>PCA</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>NEST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Phonics p. 121</td>
<td></td>
<td>LE FF</td>
<td>LR S</td>
<td>PCA</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>TB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Item 7: Most Affirming Incident**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GRADE 3</th>
<th>CIL No.</th>
<th>Activity Name/ Incident Theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Students participation and effort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Students remember well what I taught</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>They remembered well what I taught</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>I heard that English class is fun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>They can speak all the goal sentences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>I can feel that students like my class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Many students wanted to participate in English song contest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>The students, who another teacher said ‘his is always troublemaker’ actively participated in class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Students who go prize in English song contest were proud of it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>When they say English class is over so quickly. When they sing enthusiastically.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GRADE 4</th>
<th>CIL No.</th>
<th>Activity Name/ Incident Theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>SS asked me, ‘why don’t we have English today?’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>They wondered about the next activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Student’s said, ‘let’s do this activity again next time!’ (CIL 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>The do well what I say</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>They said, ‘I can remember all’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Some students said that I like your class more than watching movies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>The students, who another teacher said ‘his is always troublemaker’ actively participated in class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>The students, who another teacher said ‘his is always troublemaker’ actively participated in class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Students who go prize in English song contest were proud of it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>When they say English class is over so quickly. When they sing enthusiastically.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Items 8, 9, 10, 11, and 12: Surprises, Problems, Solutions, Changes, Future Changes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CIL</th>
<th>8 Surprises</th>
<th>9 Problems</th>
<th>10 Solutions</th>
<th>11 Changes</th>
<th>12 Future Changes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Some students wanted to sing the song more</td>
<td>There was a trouble maker. Many students</td>
<td>Talked to them after class</td>
<td>Set up class</td>
<td>Stop singing time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>SS doing was very funny</td>
<td>No NEST / SS hated singing</td>
<td>Sing a song instead</td>
<td>Sing a song</td>
<td>Prepare a worksheet for Human (CA:90)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>SS new vocabulary (or idea) (that she</td>
<td>too much time to color on road p:90</td>
<td>Hold next class to go faster</td>
<td>Hold next class to go faster</td>
<td>Set up class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>—they repeat back to class</td>
<td>Two behavior behind them, didn’t listen</td>
<td>Discourage</td>
<td>M.I.</td>
<td>Talk to them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>They were proud when phonics ended</td>
<td>SS were too noisy during head game</td>
<td>Encouraged them but it didn’t</td>
<td>Encourage</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>They were proud when phonics ended</td>
<td>SS were too noisy during head game</td>
<td>Encouraged them but it didn’t</td>
<td>Encourage</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Students said they learned new</td>
<td>SS were too noisy during head game</td>
<td>Encouraged them but it didn’t</td>
<td>Encourage</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>They were proud when phonics ended</td>
<td>SS were too noisy during head game</td>
<td>Encouraged them but it didn’t</td>
<td>Encourage</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CIL</th>
<th>8 Surprises</th>
<th>9 Problems</th>
<th>10 Solutions</th>
<th>11 Changes</th>
<th>12 Future Changes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Some students wanted to participate in singing contest</td>
<td>No NEST / Class is less than 30 minutes</td>
<td>Called NEST and skipped broken</td>
<td>Give better</td>
<td>Break up the class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Students were engaged in writing game</td>
<td>NEST was not enough</td>
<td>Called NEST and broken</td>
<td>Give better</td>
<td>Break up the class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Students were engaged in writing game</td>
<td>NEST was not enough</td>
<td>Called NEST and broken</td>
<td>Give better</td>
<td>Break up the class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>They can remember all vocabulary</td>
<td>Some SS don’t have enough time</td>
<td>Called NEST and broken</td>
<td>Give better</td>
<td>Break up the class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Students who can remember all vocabulary</td>
<td>Some SS don’t have enough time</td>
<td>Called NEST and broken</td>
<td>Give better</td>
<td>Break up the class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Students who can remember all vocabulary</td>
<td>Some SS don’t have enough time</td>
<td>Called NEST and broken</td>
<td>Give better</td>
<td>Break up the class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Students who can remember all vocabulary</td>
<td>Some SS don’t have enough time</td>
<td>Called NEST and broken</td>
<td>Give better</td>
<td>Break up the class</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CIL</th>
<th>8 Surprises</th>
<th>9 Problems</th>
<th>10 Solutions</th>
<th>11 Changes</th>
<th>12 Future Changes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>They were proud</td>
<td>Some SS needed more time</td>
<td>Asked them to do it quickly</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>They were proud</td>
<td>Some SS needed more time</td>
<td>Asked them to do it quickly</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>They were proud</td>
<td>Some SS needed more time</td>
<td>Asked them to do it quickly</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>They were proud</td>
<td>Some SS needed more time</td>
<td>Asked them to do it quickly</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CIL</th>
<th>8 Surprises</th>
<th>9 Problems</th>
<th>10 Solutions</th>
<th>11 Changes</th>
<th>12 Future Changes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Some students wanted to change seats</td>
<td>Some SS needed more time</td>
<td>Asked them to do it quickly</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>They were proud</td>
<td>Some SS needed more time</td>
<td>Asked them to do it quickly</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>They were proud</td>
<td>Some SS needed more time</td>
<td>Asked them to do it quickly</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Item 1: Most Engaging for Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CIL No.</th>
<th>Activity Name / Incident Theme</th>
<th>Activity Type</th>
<th>FF or MF</th>
<th>Descriptions</th>
<th>Skill Focus</th>
<th>Grouping</th>
<th>Interaction</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Bill MacIntosh</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>FF</td>
<td>GM</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>FCA</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>IS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Kitechi Game</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>FF</td>
<td>GM</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>FCA</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>IS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Act and Play sticker game 131</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>MF</td>
<td>KG</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>PW</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>TB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Rocky Polish</td>
<td>SG</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>FCA</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>YT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Kitechi Game</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>FF</td>
<td>GM</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>FCA</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>IS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Competition with groups</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>MF</td>
<td>Competition</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>FCA</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>IS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Telemancy game</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>MF</td>
<td>GM</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>FCA</td>
<td>TS</td>
<td>CW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Kitechi Game</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>FF</td>
<td>GM</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>FCA</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>IS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Zombie game</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>MF</td>
<td>GM</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>FCA</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>NKT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Movie Clip</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Video</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>FCA</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>YT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Item 2: Most Distancing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CIL No.</th>
<th>Activity Name / Incident Theme</th>
<th>Activity Type</th>
<th>FF or MF</th>
<th>Descriptions</th>
<th>Skill Focus</th>
<th>Grouping</th>
<th>Interaction</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Lecture talk</td>
<td>TT</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Lecture talk</td>
<td>TT</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>V</td>
<td>TB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Look and say dialogue</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>MF</td>
<td>Listening comp</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>FCA</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>TB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Listen &amp; repeat</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>FF</td>
<td>LR</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>FCA</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>TB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>When they couldnt write some words that we had already learned (CIL5) when they couldn’t explain their thinking in E (CIL5) when they couldn’t explain their thinking in E (CIL5) learning new words</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>FF</td>
<td>LR</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>FCA</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>TB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Look and say dialogue</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>MF</td>
<td>Listening comp</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>FCA</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>TB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Memorizing past tense verbs</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Item 3: Most Helpful

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CIL No.</th>
<th>Activity Name / Incident Theme</th>
<th>Activity Type</th>
<th>FF or MF</th>
<th>Descriptions</th>
<th>Skill Focus</th>
<th>Grouping</th>
<th>Interaction</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Zombie game</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>MF</td>
<td>GM</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>FCA</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>NKT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Fun during activities, e.g., Kitechi game</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>MF</td>
<td>GM</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>FCA</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Listening without subtitles</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>MF</td>
<td>GM</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>FCA</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>TB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Telemancy game</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>MF</td>
<td>GM</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>FCA</td>
<td>TS</td>
<td>CW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Kitechi Game</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>FF</td>
<td>GM</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>FCA</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>TB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Using Key Expressions in various activities</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>FF</td>
<td>GM</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>FCA</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>TB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>When they are not under pressure practicing during boga game p 159 speaking key expressions during games?</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>MF</td>
<td>GM</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>FCA</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>TB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Memorizing past tense verbs</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Item 4: Most Puzzling

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CIL No.</th>
<th>Activity Name / Incident Theme</th>
<th>Activity Type</th>
<th>FF or MF</th>
<th>Descriptions</th>
<th>Skill Focus</th>
<th>Grouping</th>
<th>Interaction</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>pres. prog.</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>pres. prog.</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Vocabulary while listening to dialogue</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3rd p. sing vs plat</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Vocabulary while listening to dialogue</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>chess of drawers</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>When they couldn’t understand the dialogue</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>when they realized they have to memorize past tense verbs (regular)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>when they realized they have to memorize past tense verbs (irregular)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>irregular past tense verbs</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Item 5: Most Effective Practice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CIL No.</th>
<th>Activity Name / Incident Theme</th>
<th>Activity Type</th>
<th>FF or MF</th>
<th>Descriptions</th>
<th>Skill Focus</th>
<th>Grouping</th>
<th>Interaction</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Zombie game</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>MF</td>
<td>GM</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>FCA</td>
<td>SS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Write &amp; Share 123</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>MF</td>
<td>DE</td>
<td>RP</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>PW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Describing items in a house</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>MF</td>
<td>GM</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>PW</td>
<td>SS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Telemancy game</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>MF</td>
<td>GM</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>FCA</td>
<td>TS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Project 137</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>MF</td>
<td>GM</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>FCA</td>
<td>TS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Picture card game p 143</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>MF</td>
<td>GM</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>PW</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>TB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Who is in house game</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>MF</td>
<td>MT</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>FCA</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>TB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Bingo game 159</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>MF</td>
<td>GM</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>FCA</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>TB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Zombie game</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>MF</td>
<td>GM</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>FCA</td>
<td>SS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Review past tense verbs</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>MF</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>FCA</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>SM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Item 6: Least Effective Practice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CIL No.</th>
<th>Activity Name / Incident Theme</th>
<th>Activity Type</th>
<th>FF or MF</th>
<th>Descriptions</th>
<th>Skill Focus</th>
<th>Grouping</th>
<th>Interaction</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Speak &amp; Read p 118</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>FF</td>
<td>LR</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>IA/FCA</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Read &amp; Think p 120</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>FF</td>
<td>LR</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Read &amp; Think p 130</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>FF</td>
<td>LR</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Read &amp; Think p 131</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>MF</td>
<td>RP</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Speak &amp; Read p 132</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>FF</td>
<td>LR</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>IA/FCA</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Check up p 136</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>FF</td>
<td>MR</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Listen and repeat p 143</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>FF</td>
<td>LR</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Speaking p 150</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>MF</td>
<td>GM</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>FCA</td>
<td>SS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Listen and repeat p 159</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>FF</td>
<td>LR</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>TT exploiting past tense v</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>FCA</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>TB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Item 7: Most Affirming Incident

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CIL No.</th>
<th>Activity Name/Incident Theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>When they can finally make a sentence of present progressive and write it (CIL 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>When they want to play a game more. (CIL 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>When they want to play more even if I have to finish the class (CIL 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>When students can answer to my question, &quot;What did we learned in last class?&quot; (CIL 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>When they have fun with my activity (CIL 6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>When some kids were humming a song we had learned before</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>When I heard that I usually lose track of time in English class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>When I found that some students were remembering what I taught</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Items 8, 9, 10, 11, and 12: Surprises, Problems, Solutions, Changes, Future Changes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CIL</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>Surprise</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>Solution</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>Changes</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>Future Changes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Students were confused how to answer questions during game. That was unexpected.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Some students finished writing and share not only (  )</td>
<td></td>
<td>They had to do more extra exercises.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Vocabulary exercises from 3 to 5x.</td>
<td></td>
<td>I won't do the speak and read in page 110. Its too boring. I'll make my own art that I can teach the present progressive (CIL 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Students dancing well during song. I did the action, I asked what is different between house and home (vocal).</td>
<td></td>
<td>Students finished writing and share too easily. I didn't have the exact answer so I said house has a wider meaning.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Students were doing another activity (CIL 3).</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hold the rule answer next class.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Play zombie game again to give more practice. I spend too much time on book and say so I'll do it added more two pairs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Students asked about unreported vocal.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Students asked about unreported vocal.</td>
<td></td>
<td>They had to do more extra exercises.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Students were doing another activity (CIL 3).</td>
<td></td>
<td>Play zombie game again to give more practice. I spend too much time on book and say so I'll do it added more two pairs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Students made great house. That was more wonderful than I expected.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Students finished project earlier than expected.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Students were doing another activity (CIL 3).</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hold them color the projects.</td>
<td></td>
<td>I want to do the project for the first time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Students wanted to explain more about picture cards that I didn't teach them (CIL 6).</td>
<td></td>
<td>Students wanted to explain more about picture cards that I didn't teach them (CIL 6).</td>
<td></td>
<td>Students were doing another activity (CIL 3).</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hold them color the projects.</td>
<td></td>
<td>I want to do the project for the first time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>Students never thought about the general story planned.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Students never thought about the general story planned.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Students were doing another activity (CIL 3).</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hold them color the projects.</td>
<td></td>
<td>I want to do the project for the first time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>Students liked making more than expected.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Students liked making more than expected.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Students were doing another activity (CIL 3).</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hold them color the projects.</td>
<td></td>
<td>I want to do the project for the first time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>Students liked making more than expected.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Students liked making more than expected.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Students were doing another activity (CIL 3).</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hold them color the projects.</td>
<td></td>
<td>I want to do the project for the first time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>Students couldn't use key expressions at the end of the lesson during the Zombie game.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Students couldn't use key expressions at the end of the lesson during the Zombie game.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Students were doing another activity (CIL 3).</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hold them color the projects.</td>
<td></td>
<td>I want to do the project for the first time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>Students played related to the song Gangnam Style.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Students played related to the song Gangnam Style.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Students were doing another activity (CIL 3).</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hold them color the projects.</td>
<td></td>
<td>I want to do the project for the first time.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Observation Report Data

#### Appendix R: Observation Report Data

(Note: See Appendix P for description of code abbreviations)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Obser. #</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Lesson Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>End of Lesson 2, Class 6-1</td>
<td>4.4.2013</td>
<td>I'll Play The Guitar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Sequences</td>
<td>Activity Type</td>
<td>Focus</td>
<td>Minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>T explains she is sick</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Instructions for activity</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Envelope race activity</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>FF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Extra activities for fast finishers</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>FF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Closing; Homework assigned</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Obser. #</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Lesson Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4th</td>
<td>Middle of Lesson 4, Class 6-5</td>
<td>2.5.2013</td>
<td>When Is Your Birthday?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Sequences</td>
<td>Activity Type</td>
<td>Focus</td>
<td>Minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Lecture about manners, esp. yelling</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>FF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Review; When is your birthday?</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>FF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Instructions for reading activity</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>FF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Rock-scissors-paper reading game</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>FF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Envelope race activity</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>FF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Compliments on hard work</td>
<td>TT (E)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Assigns homework</td>
<td>TT (E)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Obser. #</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Lesson Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6th</td>
<td>Middle of Lesson 7, Class 6-4</td>
<td>6.20.2013</td>
<td>Why Are You So Happy?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Sequences</td>
<td>Activity Type</td>
<td>Focus</td>
<td>Minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ss late ask 'May I come in?' 1 by 1</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>FF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Odd one out activity</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>MF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Read Along p. 102</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>FF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Read &amp; Write p. 103</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>FF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Instructions and demonstration</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>FF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Group prose writing activity</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>MF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obsv. #</td>
<td>Class Sequences</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Middle of Lesson 9</td>
<td>Class 4-2</td>
<td>17.10.2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>ABC Song</td>
<td>SG</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Review PPT: Key expressions</td>
<td>LE FF</td>
<td>4 CETY (K) S FCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>PPT: Conversation practice</td>
<td>LE FF</td>
<td>5 LR/SD S FCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>PPT: Phonics lecture</td>
<td>LE FF</td>
<td>5 TT (K)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Teletype Game</td>
<td>LE FF</td>
<td>10 GM W FCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Writing exercise follow-up</td>
<td>LE FF</td>
<td>10 Spelling W IA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Video: Hello World</td>
<td>LE FF</td>
<td>3 Culture</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Obsv. #</th>
<th>Class Sequences</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Lesson Title</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>End of Lesson 9</td>
<td>Class 4-2</td>
<td>24.10.2013</td>
<td>How Much is it?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Class plan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>TT (K)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Greetings, weather, date</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>TS (KE)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>PPT review: Vocabulary</td>
<td>LE FF</td>
<td>3 CETQ V FCA</td>
<td>TS (E)</td>
<td>Lots of TT in L1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Spelling quiz</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>SS (E and K)</td>
<td>TB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I Can Do It! p. 102</td>
<td>LE FMF</td>
<td>4 MT/CZ V IA</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10 vocab words from Lesson 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Present and practice for Role Play</td>
<td>LE FF</td>
<td>10 LR/SD S FCA</td>
<td>TS (E)</td>
<td>Lots of repetition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Demonstration</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Hokey 3, p. 101. Shopping Role Play</td>
<td>CA MF</td>
<td>12 IG/RP S FCA</td>
<td>SS (E and K)</td>
<td>TB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Obsv. #</th>
<th>Class Sequences</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Lesson Title</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4th</td>
<td>Beginning of Lesson 10</td>
<td>Class 4-2</td>
<td>29.10.2013</td>
<td>He Has Blue Eyes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Greetings</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>TS (KE)</td>
<td>TB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Schema building - Describe a friend</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>TS (K)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Present and practice (PPT)</td>
<td>LE FF</td>
<td>5 LR V/P FCA</td>
<td>TT (KE)</td>
<td>Only 1 S can participate at a time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Passing the ball</td>
<td>LE FF</td>
<td>3 GM S FCA</td>
<td>TS (E)</td>
<td>Done once only, no follow-up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Look and Listen p. 106</td>
<td>LE FF</td>
<td>2 BL L FCA</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Done once only, no follow-up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Listen and Repeat p. 107</td>
<td>LE FF</td>
<td>2 LR S FCA</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Done once only, no follow-up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Listen and Draw (Hokey 1)</td>
<td>CA MF</td>
<td>18 IG L FCA</td>
<td>TS (E)</td>
<td>Drawing monsters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Closing: Spelling quiz next class</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>TT (K)</td>
<td>HW: SS must write 'eyes' and 'hair' 10x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observ. #</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Lesson Title</td>
<td>Class Sequences</td>
<td>Activity Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Middle of Lesson 9</td>
<td>Class 4-2</td>
<td>17.10.2013</td>
<td>How Much Is It?</td>
<td>ABC Song</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Review PPT: Key expressions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PPT: Conversation practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PPT: Phonics lecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Telepathy Game</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Writing exercise follow-up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Video: Hello World</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>End of Lesson 9</td>
<td>Class 4-2</td>
<td>24.10.2013</td>
<td>How Much Is It?</td>
<td>Class plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Greetings, weather, date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PPT review, Vocabulary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spelling quiz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I Can Do It! p. 102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Present and practice for Role Play</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Demonstration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hooray 3, p. 101, Shopping Role Play</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th</td>
<td>Beginning of Lesson 10</td>
<td>Class 4-2</td>
<td>29.10.2013</td>
<td>He Has Blue Eyes</td>
<td>Greetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Schema building - Describe a friend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Present and practice (PPT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Passing the ball</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Look and Listen p. 106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Listen and Repeat p. 107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Listen and Draw (Hooray 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Closing: Spelling quiz next class</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: YT = SS extra, sit and sing along; SM = TT only in Korean; NEST only; YT = SS extra, sit and sing along; SM = TT only in Korean; NEST only; TB = Teachers demonstrate for shopping role play; SF = Teachers demonstrate for shopping role play; TB = Some SS trying E, most only using K; TB = Well organized; all SS participate; TB = Only 1 S can participate at a time; TB = Done once only, no follow-up; TB = Done once only, no follow-up.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observ. #</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Lesson Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Class 5-S</td>
<td>11.10.2013</td>
<td>What Did You Do Last Weekend?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Greetings, date, weather</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Descriptors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Song: Hokey Pokey</td>
<td>SG</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Describing Lesson 1 objectives</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>CETQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Look &amp; Listen p. 156</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>MF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Listen and repeat</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>FF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Vocabulary practice</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>FF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Listen &amp; Do p. 157</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>FF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Preparing for card game</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Review, closing; tomorrow's plan</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>MF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Lesson Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Class 5-S</td>
<td>11.11.2013</td>
<td>What Did You Do Last Weekend?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Greetings, date, weather, plans</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Song: Farmer in the Dell</td>
<td>SG</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Chart: What did you do? p. 160</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>FF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Instructions for game</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Zombie Game</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>FF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Review: CF and closing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Lesson Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th</td>
<td>Class 5-S</td>
<td>15.11.2013</td>
<td>What Did You Do Last Weekend?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Greetings, date, lesson plan</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Sing Along: p. 166</td>
<td>SG</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Check up p. 168</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>FF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Past tense drill</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>FF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Kinetic Game</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>FF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix S: Cross-case Observation Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>Activity Type</th>
<th>LE (Time)</th>
<th>CA (Time)</th>
<th>SG (Time)</th>
<th>TBA (Time)</th>
<th>Other (Time)</th>
<th>Included SS (Time)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experienced</td>
<td>Sami</td>
<td>6 (59)</td>
<td>4 (48)</td>
<td>4 (8)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>5 (5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>Mia</td>
<td>5 (27)</td>
<td>4 (77)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>10 (16)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Novice</td>
<td>Eunjeong</td>
<td>11 (58)</td>
<td>2 (30)</td>
<td>1 (3)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>9 (29)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>Yuna</td>
<td>9 (48)</td>
<td>1 (10)</td>
<td>3 (16)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>3 (46)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groupings</td>
<td>IA (Time)</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
<td>2 (79)</td>
<td>2 (18)</td>
<td>10 (16)</td>
<td>9 (26)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced</td>
<td>Sami</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>1 (5)</td>
<td>2 (38)</td>
<td>10 (78)</td>
<td>7 (7)</td>
<td>4 (48)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>Mia</td>
<td>1 (0-5)*</td>
<td>1 (7)</td>
<td>4 (79)</td>
<td>2 (18)</td>
<td>10 (16)</td>
<td>5 (42)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Novice</td>
<td>Eunjeong</td>
<td>3 (20)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>11 (74)</td>
<td>9 (26)</td>
<td>1 (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>Yuna</td>
<td>3 (16)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>9 (58)</td>
<td>8 (46)</td>
<td>1 (10)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
* For first finishers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>Sources:</th>
<th>TB (Time)</th>
<th>TS (Time)</th>
<th>FH (Time)</th>
<th>SM (Time)</th>
<th>YT (Time)</th>
<th>NBST (Time)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experienced</td>
<td>Sami</td>
<td>4 (40)</td>
<td>2 (25)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>5 (6)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>Mia</td>
<td>3 (12)</td>
<td>1 (7)</td>
<td>4 (77)</td>
<td>1 (7)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Novice</td>
<td>Eunjeong</td>
<td>6 (41)</td>
<td>4 (23)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>5 (32)</td>
<td>1 (3)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>Yuna</td>
<td>6 (47)</td>
<td>1 (7)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>2 (7)</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
<td>2 (13)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>Focus:</th>
<th>FF (Time)</th>
<th>MF (Time)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experienced</td>
<td>Sami</td>
<td>7 (79)</td>
<td>3 (18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>Mia</td>
<td>7 (75)</td>
<td>2 (22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Novice</td>
<td>Eunjeong</td>
<td>11 (58)</td>
<td>2 (30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>Yuna</td>
<td>8 (46)</td>
<td>2 (12)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[The first digit is the number of pedagogic activities of each type observed in the three classes used to make the tables for each teacher; the number in parentheses is the approximate minutes of class time for that activity type in the three classes.]
Appendix T: Excerpts from Class Transcripts for Each Participant

A note on transcription procedures:

I typed the handwritten field notes and observation report information, then re-watched video-recordings of the observations and described the lesson sequences in a new document for each observation. I selectively transcribed excerpts appearing in the case studies, but there were many cut from the final draft. I am including these excerpts below as additional data in support of the case study findings (i.e., audit trail).

Mia was the first participant and I did full transcripts of her first few classes so there are more excerpts from her observations below. I thought it was important to do so at first, and it helped give me a sense of what level of detail was required; however, it was too time consuming to do with all participants. Therefore, there are fewer excerpts below from the other participants' classes.

(Note: Korean excerpts below appear in Hangul with a translation beside (or below) ‘in quote marks’.)

Mia (Experienced Primary Teacher, Novice English Teacher)

Opening Sequences

Mia’s classes usually began with students asking for permission to come in followed by greetings, as shown in Excerpt 1 below. In this class it was also clear that Mia knew her students by name, noticing a missing student right away.

Excerpt 1. MO6, Sequence 1

((Students are lined up outside of class and after the bell rings they enter asking Mia one-by-one, “May I come in, please?” ))

T: How are you? -

((She walks around and asks some SS to sit down. She waits until everyone is sitting and calm before starting.))

T: Where’s [S10]?

S1: 안 왔어요.

‘(She) didn’t come.’

T: Okay. - - - ((makes a note))
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So. How’s it going everybody? ((Reinforced by prompt on portable white board, students give various answers which the teacher confirms by repeating them.))

S2: I’m fine.
S3: I’m tired
T: Fine. - Tired. ((Acknowledges S2 and S3 and gestures for more responses with hand))
S4: Sleepy.
T: Sleepy.
S5: 그레이트((Koreanized pronunciation of ‘great’))
T: Great. - Not 그레이트
S5: Great.
S6: So-so.
T: So-so.
S7: Not bad.
T: Not bad.
S8: Great!
T: Yes. – 그레이트 아니고 - great.

‘Not 그레이트- great’

((T claps hands three times on 그레이트 geu-rae-i-teu and once on great to represent the syllables))
S9: Great. ((claps))
T: Great. ((claps)) Yeah, good.

((A student enters about two minutes late))
T: Could you? ((points to a sign on the wall))
S10: ((reading sign)) I’m - sorry for - be - being late.
T: Okay.

((She acknowledges a student is missing, but continues with her plan. Making eye contact, she elicits responses from students confirming their answers and corrected the Koreanized pronunciation of “great.” When the late student enters, she paused class making Subin apologize for being late in L2. ))
Introducing Activities

The first activity in MO6 (i.e. odd one out) provided an example of schema building. Unit objectives were to describe and give reasons for feelings. Students were given time to think about the differences and use their own ideas to answer. Five different students contributed their ideas in the first round, asking to use L1 before giving their explanations.

Excerpt 2. MO6 Sequence 2

T:   One - ready. ((draws attention to blackboard))
SS:  apple - carrot - banana - strawberry
T:   [apple - carrot - banana - strawberry]
T:   There is one word - strange.
S1:  banana
S2:  carrot
S1:  because -
T:   because?
S1:  다른 색‘another color’ - Can I speak Korean?
T:   Sure.

((S1 explains the differences in color shades between the four. The next student notices one is a vegetable and the other are fruits, the third student describes the different shapes, and the fourth colors again. Then Mia gives her idea.))

T:   Oh, that’s possible. Can I try? - Can I try?
SS:  Yes.
T:   I think - because banana is from hot countries -
SS:  Aaah.
T:   Apple, carrot, strawberry, ah, in Korea we can grow. I think banana only in hot countries so I think banana is different. Good. What about. - Okay, one more. Minseong?
S6:  Because a - Can I speak Korean?
T:   Yes.
S6: 당근이 밑에 토속에 ‘carrots - are under - underground’ ((Mimes picking a carrot))

T: Oh. - That’s very good. Strawberry, apple, banana you have to pick - but carrots we have to pull because they live under the ground. - That’s a good one. -

What about - these ones? - sad - unhappy - excited - angry. There is one word strange. - Hyojung?

S7: because I think - can I speak Korean?

Although students needed to use L1 to explain, this activity seemed effective for getting them to think about giving reasons for their opinions. Moreover, students first used TL, asking permission to use L1 before giving their examples which Mia translated into English.

Instructions were generally given in English and Excerpt 3 and 4 exemplified this process. In this class she was sick and asked for student volunteers to start. Two higher-level students helped translate and explain the instructions in L1, then helped her hand out worksheets. The worksheets had extra activities for fast finishers and instructions were on a later slide displayed once the activity was winding down. Before starting, checked for confirmation multiple times, code-switching to L1 once when it was clear many students did not understand.

Excerpt 3. MO2 Sequence 2: Instructions for envelope race activity.

T: Could you close the door, please? Thank you. - So I need a volunteer. Who can help me? - It’s okay. 괜찮아요 ‘it’s okay’ ((a few students raise their hands))

You and you. ((points to two students)) -

Please stand up. -

They’re gonna help me today because I can’t talk. ((She looks at a few students still talking and waits for them to quiet down. The two volunteers come to the front. Mia had instructions written on a Powerpoint slide above her desk that they translate.))

Please, please. - Could you explain to them?

((One volunteer explains the activity to her peers in L1 then both volunteers hand out worksheets. Students were instructed to write the numbers 1-10 in their notebooks))

Excerpt 4. MO2 Sequence 2: Confirming instructions.
T: ((walks around and speaks raspingly)) Could you write down the numbers, 1-10?

S1: Teacher, 1, 2, 3, 4...?

T: Yes.

((goes back to front and holds up an envelope))

T: Do you see this? An envelope.

S2: Envelope?

T: ((points to classroom English poster))

Some SS: What does that mean?

T: 봉투 bongtu

‘envelope’

SS: ahhh.

T: ((opens one)) there are word cards here - but I cut them

S3: 잘라졌다고

‘(She said she) had cut them.’

T: Could you stand up? Each group - Number 3 come and get these cards. - Wait - and then go back and make a sentence. Do you understand? -

Good -

and then you will have to write in your notebook. Example, number 5. Do you understand?

((students are guessing what she means, some are talking))

T: 만약에 다섯 번 받으면 그 번 옆에 적어요

‘If you get (envelope) number five, write (the sentence) next to that number.’

T: Do you understand?

SS: Yes.

((Some students are explaining the instructions to each other in L1 and the teacher confirms the instructions))

T: Yes. - When you finish. Number 3 come back to me and ask me this ((holds up sign with “Can I have number —?”))
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SS:  ((the third student from each group reads)) Can I have number - ?

T:  Yes. Group 2 - Take an envelope, unscramble, write it down. Do you understand?

SS:  Yes.

T:  Good. And go - finish - go back - finish - come - go back. Who will come?

SS:  Number 3.

T:  ((clicks Powerpoint for next page of instructions)) Could you read this?

SS:  please - help - each - other

T:  This is not a test. Not a 시험‘test’. Help, help each other. 모르면‘if (you) don’t know’ please, please help each other. Okay? - Okay - How many sentences?

SS:  ten

T:  What do you do?

S4:  Write the sentences.

T:  And then please, please - yes, thank you - don’t lose the cards. Keep it in the envelope ((puts words back in while speaking slowly and clearly))

((a student is taking a pencil from her group mate))

T:  Na-young, Na-young?

S5:  Can I ‘b’ -

T:  What do you say?

S5:  Can I borrow a pencil?

((Motions for the third member of each group to come forward. Six students gather around the table but one is late.))

S:  삼 번 빨리 가라–

‘Number 3 get up there!’ –

T:  ((a student grabs an envelope)) No, no, no. You must ask.

S6:  Can I have number 3?

T:  Yes.

((The student takes the envelope back to the group. They open it, unscramble the sentence together, then write it in their notebooks. All groups do the same.))

(MCT4: 4-45)
Good Manners as Instructional Aim

Mia focused on behavior imploring students to have good manners. For example, in Excerpt 5 Mia waits until the students are ready for the activity, imploring them to have “manners”.

Excerpt 5: Focusing on manners.

T: Could you open your book - page 102, please? … ((Checks on SS))
We are going to read something, read along together.
First, look at the TV. -
Jieun, where’s your manners? -
Yes, please, Jieun, could you open your book? 102.
Jiseok? - Okay
((Goes to computer and starts animation))
We are going to read together after CD. (MCT8: 103)

Classroom English and Student TL use

Students frequently used English as a metalanguage (e.g. Excerpt 1, 2, and 4). In Excerpt 6, four students ask how to spell target vocabulary and Mia elicited answers from the class in L2.

Excerpt 6: Students using classroom English

127. T: Good. So everybody has a picture? Could you show me? - Good - Good.
128. S1: Small.
129. T: That’s okay. -
((she checks the pictures of other students))
Good. -
Good. -
Nice.
So - I’ll give you - four minutes. You answer your picture in your notebook. Do you understand?
130. SS: Yes.
131. T:  Ready? Go.
((Starts timer on the screen, walks around the class and helps students write the answers. A student raises his hand))
133. S2:  Teacher, can I speak Korean?
134. T:  Yes.
135. S2:  이거 뭐예요?
‘what’s this?’
136. T:  This? This is a jacket.
((She continues walking around helping and monitoring))
139. S3:  Teacher, how do you spell classroom?
140. T:  ((to class)) How do you spell classroom?
141. SS:  c-l-a-s-s-r-o-o-m
142. T:  Could you say that again everybody?
143. SS:  c-l-a-s-s-r-o-o-m
144. T:  Okay. Group 2, any questions?
((She goes from group to group checking answers. The online timer rings.))
146. S4:  Please, one minute.
149. T:  ((to class)) How do you spell jacket?
150. SS:  j-a-c-k-e-t
151. S6:  How do you spell t-shirt?
(MCT7: 127-151)

Above Student 4 asked for more time to finish. Mia often adapted her plans allowing more time for activities to finish. In Excerpt 7, two more students ask for more time.

Excerpt 7: Asking for more time.
((plays the video for the second time))
207. T:  Are you finished?
208. S1:  Can you play it again?
209. S2:  [Can you play it again?]
210.  T:  This is the last time. Last time. Okay. - Are you ready?
((she plays the video for the third time))

213.  T:  Okay. That was the end. So will check the answers together.
((T is standing at front with a portable whiteboard on which she writes the answers one by one.))

Number one. That looks -

214.  SS:  fun

215.  T:  fun. - 재밌겠다 '(That) looks fun'. What about number two?

(MCT7: 204-215)

Excerpt 8. Classroom English and rapport.

T:  because - ((points at S1))
S1:  I cleaned my house.
T:  He cleaned his house.
T:  What does that mean, clean?
S2:  청소하다 cheongsohada 'clean'
T:  Yes. 청소하다. cheongsohada. 'clean' Very good. And then we finish here. - - -
Let’s make six groups everybody.

((Students calmly move their desks into groups of four.))

T:  Wonderful. Then we are going to finish. Page 103 together. Help each other please. - I will give you -
S2:  Two minutes.
T:  Two minutes or three minutes?
some SS:  Three minutes.
some SS:  [Two minutes.]
T:  Three minutes. Here we go. ((Sets online timer to three minutes and starts it.))

((T walks around helping students. Compared to prior observations SS seemed focused on the task. I observed each group helping each other and using TL during the activity. The timer beeps and the T looks around and sees a few students need more time.))

T:  I’ll give you one minute more. ((She sets timer to 1 minute.))
T:  - Is it correct? Ask me. It’s okay.
((She walks around monitoring and helping))
(MCT8: 122-137)

Excerpt 9: Student helping student.
T: What about -
SS: I was sad.
CD: I was sad.
T: But, Minseok, you put a different one, didn’t you?
S1: I was nervous.
S2: How about - I was nervous?
T: Minseok?
S1: How about I was nervous?
T: That’s correct. - Nervous here.
(MCT8: 156-163)

Excerpt 10: Rewarding points at the end of class.
281. T: everybody speak English - very good. - Manners? no, I don’t think so.
You were so noisy. 너무 시끄러웠어요 ‘it was too noisy.’ Good luck tomorrow. Desks and chairs 맞추고요 machu jugo-yo ‘put (them) back please’ good luck everybody. See you.
282. S2: Good bye, teacher.
283. T: Good bye. Good luck. ((students have a test the next day))
284. ((SS exit the class))
(MCT7: 294-342)
Sami (Experienced Primary Teacher, Experienced English Teacher)

Excerpt 1: Coupon reward ceremony (SO3)

T: You know, we have a ceremony for the super students.
((applause from class))

Yeah, it is the first time. First time, so, listen. - Yeah, we have two super students. The first, Yoon-jae, come here please.

((applause))

And please bring your textbook.

And Kyung-min, please bring your textbook. Come.

It’s okay.
((two students approach the front))

How many coupons?

SS: Ten.

T: He has 10 coupons. Wow. Congratulations.

SS: ((applause))

Kyung-min, it’s okay. Come. - I believe in you.

Yoon-jae has 10 coupons. - Here. - Do you see the sticker here?

SS: ooooh.

T: May I?

((puts sticker in student’s textbook and reads))

Super student award awarded to Yoon-jae, today’s date, awarded by teacher Sami. Yeah!

((applause))

T: You can choose. ((She presents a selection of stationary materials.))

SS: Wow!

T: Choose anything you want.

((applause))
T: Wow, good job, Yoon-jae!

(SCT3: 22-42)

**Excerpt 2: Sami entertaining students.**

Once Sami stood on a chair wearing an apron with flashcards attached to the front. She joked around with students for a minute, then began an activity. Students were to memorize the words on the apron, close their eyes as she removed a word, and guess which one was missing:

T: No. ((points to student)) Close your eyes. Good. Beautiful students. Let me see.

((removes a card))

Okay open your eyes.

What is missing?

Some Ss: Swimming

T: Shhhh. It is top secret. Raise your hand. - Jaemin?

S: Swimming.

T: Swimming. Do you think so? Please make a sentence, 1-2-3 -

Most SS: Are you interested in swimming?


((removes another card)) (ST3, 180-190)

The activity continued until all eight cards were removed. Following this, students interviewed three classmates about their interests. Sami transformed this preparatory LE into something engaging for the class.

**Excerpt 3: Quiz Bomb Game in SO2.**
The Quiz Bomb Game is quite popular in Korean primary schools. This version has an elaborate animation sequence and interesting sound effects. The game is really limits TL use, however. There are a few choral responses during the game such as in the excerpt below.

T: Everybody. 1-2-3 -
SS: What’s your favorite class?
T: Try again.
SS: What’s his favorite class?
S1: His favorite class is PE.
T: Everybody, together, one, two, three.
SS: His favorite class is PE.
T: His favorite class is PE. Right. (SCT2: 162-168)
Eunjeong (Novice Primary Teacher, First-year English Teacher)

Introducing and Demonstrating Activities
These excerpts show Eunjeong beginning to use English in class.

Excerpt 1: The shopping role play in EO2.

Eunjeong and Mike greeting the students. (Note: M is Mike; EJ is Eunjeong)

M: Hello! Good morning. ((as students enter)
Sit down everyone.

Eunjeong explains that they will do lesson 9 in Korea and tells them about the role play. She asks them to look at the back where she has set up desks for the shopkeeper roleplay.

Asks in Korean, then English

EJ: 오늘 날씨 어때? ‘how’s the weather today?’
   How’s the weather today? ((code-switch))

S: It’s sunny.

EJ: Is it sunny today?

SS: Yes.

EJ: Is it rainy today?

SS: No.

EJ: -it isn’t. ((gestures))
   Is it snowing?

SS: No, it isn’t.

EJ: 그리고 geureomyeon ‘then’ is it cloudy?

SS: No, it isn’t.

EJ: 구름이 있는 것 같은데‘it seems like it’s cloudy’ Is it cloudy?
SS: Yes, it is.

EJ: 그려면 ‘then’ What day is it today?

S: It’s Thursday.

EJ: ((she elicits the day of the week)) 시작 ‘start’

SS: Sunday, Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, Thursday, Friday, Saturday, Sunday once again.

EJ: 그럼 ‘so’ Sunday Monday Tuesday Wednesday - What day is it today?

SS: Thursday

Starts PPT (2:35)

Powerpoint of words in Korean for the unit, eg, bag, ball, glove, etc (p. 103)

She elicits the translations and spellings of the words.
Code-switches in English and Korean.
M helps a little by repeating answers and pointing at the slides.

EO2: Preparing for the Shopping Role Play
11:35

EJ: 잘 듣고 – ‘listen carefully’ – listen carefully

M: carefully ((So far M has stood at the front and spoken only a few words))

((Recording: What do you want?
I want a dog. How much is it?
It’s 900 won. ))

Evidently using the PPP method. In the next sequence they practice the dialog for the role play a few times.

Eunjeong leads as mark practices the conversation with the class using prompts on the ppt. For example a picture of a watch comes up.
M: May I help you?
SS: Yes, please.
M: What do you want?
SS: I want a watch. How much is it?
M: It’s 900 won.

Then Eunjeong leads them in some stretches - rolling the shoulders. Then they continue switching roles.

SS: May I help you?
M: Yes, please.
SS: What do you want?
M: I want an eraser. How much is it?
SS: It’s 500 won.

Mark begins to lead the class
M: look look look at me
SS: look look look at you
M: ok. we are going to play a shopping game. First we have one two….ten pictures so we have -
First, write a price between 100 and 900 won. Second, take out the 10 cards.
EJ: 카드를 오리세요 ‘cut out the cards’
M: So first write the prices, then take out 10 cards. We’ll give you three minutes. If you need help, put your hand up and we’ll be there for you.

M & EJ walk around helping.
Yuna (First-year Primary Teacher, First-year English Teacher)

Excerpt 1 Sequence 3 of YOR1

From Lesson 11: What Did You Do Last Weekend?

T: Okay. Let’s read the title. What did you do last weekend? - Do you know what this sentence means?

((A student replies (in L1) that it is about activities from the previous weekend))

T: Can you guess what we’re going to learn?

((A few students raise their hands. Yuna points to another student who explains (in L1) that they will talk about weekend activities. She confirms and repeats the student’s answer, then elicits the meaning of each word in title. She calls on one student to confirm the meaning of ‘last’.)

Student 1: 마지막 majimak ‘last’

T: That’s right. Very good.

((Then Yuna instructs the students to read the objectives for Lesson 11 (written in Korean). They read it together, then she draws their attention to the screen to begin the first activity: Look & Listen.))

T: We are going to listen to the dialog - and I will ask you what we hear. - Listen to the dialog.

(YO1: 34-42)

Excerpt 2: Beginning of YO2:

((Yuna’s opening routine. Also this excerpt shows her personality coming through in class))

T: Hello everyone.

SS: Hello, Teacher!

T: How are you today?

SS: I’m fine. And you? ((in unison))
T: I’m very, very good. ((gives two thumbs up)) Because today is Friday. ((She does a little dance))

SS: Yeah! ((students cheering))

T: - Let’s have some time for greeting. Ask your partner, ‘How are you?’

((Students greet each other (noisily) for a few seconds. Then the teacher continues.))

T: Do you know what the date today is?

SS: Today is November 8th ((most students in unison but some say, “Friday”, and some say, “Friday, November 8”))

T: Do you know what day it is today? Who wants to write on the board?

((A few students raise their hands))

T: ((Gestures towards a girl)) - Euna.

((The student comes to the front and is given chalk))

T: ((To class)) How do you spell November?

SS: N - O - V - E - M - B - E - R

(YCT2: 14-31)

Excerpt 2: Reward system in practice in YO2.

T: Okay. Open your notebook. Did you bring your notebook textbook and file?

((She gestures towards the magnets on the board that are keeping scores for group points))

SS: 예 Ye! ((in unison))

‘Yes’

T: - Okay. - Open your notebook’s, please

S1: 조용해라 joyonghyera! ‘be quiet!’ ((a girl yells to her group mate, aware they may lose a point))

(YCT2: 25-28)

Excerpt 3: Closing class and the ‘cookie’ reward in YO1.

((After singing ‘Hokey Pokey’))
T: Okay. That’s enough for today.
   I’ll give you one more cookie. You sang very good. You have 28 cookies [now].
   And open your book. Page 160. -
   If you have two more cookies you can move up the board. -
   Listen to the chant first. -
   Look. -
   Listen carefully.

((Yuna mimes and mouths the words for the chant on page 160. Students watch the animation and sing along.)) (YCT2: 44-46)

Instructions

Instructions for activities were usually in TL, although she code-switched to L1 to reinforce meaning or used Korean for more complicated instructions or vocabulary. She was animated, using gestures frequently.

Excerpt 4: Giving instructions in English.

T: Do you remember the Zombie Game?
SS: Yes!
T: We’ve already played this game before. - I will explain the rules one more time.

((She makes eye contact with the students and draws attention to instructions on the screen.))

I’ll explain the rules. -
Everyone - first - put your heads on your desk. - Close your eyes. - ((gestures the actions))
Then, I will choose - I will choose one zombie ((gestures with a feather and holds up one finger)) - -
And five doctors. ((holds up the opposite hand with fingers open))

S1: 의사들이 - 다섯 usaduel-i dasot ‘five doctors’
T: Yes. One zombie ((holds up one finger on the left hand)) and five doctors ((raises her right hand with all fingers open))
S2: 근데, 근데 geundae, geundae… ‘but, but…’

T: ((raises hand to lips)) shhh. - if you have any questions then -

S3: 끝나고 geutnago ‘after (the activity)’

T: yes - after I finish. -

One zombie and five doctors. And the rest of you, 나머지는 nameoji-neun ‘as for the rest of you’, you will be human. 인간들 ingandeul ‘humans’ -

So, zombie, doctors, humans. ((counts to three on fingers))

(YO2, 76-80)

((Instructions continue for nearly 10 minutes and some students make noise.))

T: Okay. Look at the TV now. 너무 - 시끄러워요. ‘it’s too noisy’ - you have to whisper.

Ready go! (YO2, 111)

Excerpt 5: Closing class in YO2.

T: Okay. - That’s it for today. You did a very good job today.

((She gives two thumbs up and claps))

We are - next week I think you can go up the board.

올릴 수 있어요 ‘You can go up.’

Have a nice weekend!

(YCT2: 139-140)
Appendix U: Example Code System from Study 2

[From Sami’s Case Study]
Appendix V: Screenshot of Data Analysis in MAXQDA 11
Appendix W: Example Interpretation Outline Tool

This tool was adapted from Bloomberg and Volpe (2012, p. 174), but I expanded it and used the following outline:

**Category**

*Theme/significant findings*

- Why?
- So what?
- Recommendations?
- Links to prior studies
- Gap addressed
- How trustworthiness was addressed
- Limitations

These tools helped organize the discussion chapter. Notes for addressing RQ1 appear below. These are used only for illustrative purposes; please do not cite these excerpts.

**RQ1: Why do people become English language teachers in Korea?**

To answer this question it is necessary to discuss three interrelated categories: (1) reasons for becoming teachers, (2) language learning experience necessary for teaching English, then (3) how PS teachers became full-time English teachers.

**Category 1. Reasons for becoming teachers.**

*Legal status and working conditions more influential than interest in teaching.*

(i.e., Continuance commitments more dominant than affective commitments)

Why?

Education was a priority during Korea’s development. In order to attract people to the field, the legal status and working conditions were improved and became guaranteed (see Chapter 2).

Teaching offers attractive working conditions compared to other careers, for example, guaranteed employment to retirement, shorter work weeks, long vacations, and maternity leave.
Especially for women, teaching is a sought after career because of guaranteed working conditions. Job market is extremely competitive in Korea and procedures for hiring teachers is a relatively fair process. 

Parents most influential people (16 of 22 in NF1) largely because of status and working conditions.

Across cases, continuance and normative commitments were dominant themes in critical incidents for becoming teachers, and there was little evidence of affective commitments as reasons for entering education. Affective commitments developed later; for example, Sami, Yuna, and Eunjeong in teacher’s college and Mia through HRT experience.

Normative influences
- Parental pressure (Mia, Eunjeong)
- Socialization from community members (Mia)

Continuance influences
- Exam results limiting more desirable options (Mia, Yuna)
- CSAT results suggesting suitability with teaching (Eunjeong)
- Financial constraints for post-secondary education (Mia, Sami)

Why?
- Confucian values: filial piety instills sense of duty to follow wishes of parents and elders.
- Participants had few to no viable options for equitable career tracks, especially as female students.
  - NUEs have subsidized tuition.
  - University entrance procedures require students to choose career paths in high school.
- CSAT results primary criterion for choosing a career track.

So what?
- Pre-service teachers choosing education for status and working conditions may be lacking the affective commitments necessary to fulfill potential for developing as teachers.
- Normative commitments due to filial duty meant participants were encouraged (and pressured) to enter education, regardless of interest.
- May lead to teacher attrition or teachers not committed to professional development.
- The 8 of 22 NF participants having interest in education as reasons to teach tended to have positive influences as students. This reflects the importance of teachers in affecting students’ positive perceptions of education (cf. Lortie, 1975).
- Affective commitments are prevalent in the processes of development and change in LTC and practices (see below).

Recommendations
- Pre-service teachers need to critically reflect on reasons for entering the field early on.
- Teacher educators could use reflective writing to encourage more affective commitments to teaching.
Look for ways to include potential teachers who are interested in education. Reconsider criterion for entrance to NUEs.

**Links to prior studies**

Confirms prior studies (i.e., E.-g. Kim, 2011 on teacher retention).
Meyer & Herscovitch, 2001 on commitment theory
Lim, 2011 concept mapping
Moodie & Nam, 2016
(Also need to address how Moodie & Feryok (2015) was adapted)
Nias, 1981; 1989
Huberman, 1989
Troman & Roggl, 2008 on PS teachers
Choi & Tang, 2009 review of teacher commitments
Lortie, 1975

**Gap addressed**

Provides a theoretical basis for confirmed findings (i.e., commitments)
(Also see Moodie & Nam)

**Differences between female and male teachers**.

For females, the *status and working conditions* were predominant factors for entering the profession, whereas 4 of 5 males became teachers because other *employment prospects* did not turn out.

**Why?**
For females, teaching offers equal employment opportunities, stable salaries, maternity leave, and guaranteed employment until retirement (cf., E.-g. Kim, 2011).
For males teaching was a fallback career plan.

**So what?**
Different commitments for choosing education (cf., Meyer & Herscovitch, 2001). Females reflected predominantly normative and affective commitments to teaching, whereas men tended to have more continuance commitment, that is, they chose education because other (higher status) careers did not work out.
Feminization of workforce reflects changing educational culture in Korea. In the past, teaching was dominated by males, now PS females make up the vast majority of PS teaching cohorts (see Chapter 2).
Important to investigate the outcomes of a changing workforce.

**Recommendations**

Important to have more women in administrative positions.
Also important to ensure male teachers are not marginalized in the workplace, although that is unlikely considering the influence of Confucism.
Look for ways to attract males passionate about education, and for English, language teaching. Researchers could investigate links between initial affective commitments (e.g., desire to teach) and development as pre- and in-service teachers, and perhaps recommend changes to NUE entrance requirements.
Gap
Male PS teachers

Prior research
E.-g. Kim, 2009; 2011
Meyer & Herscovitch, 2001

Category 2. Reasons for successful language learning

Motivation in spite of negative public school experiences
In NF2, motivation was the dominant theme behind participants successful language learning. Nearly all were critical of public school English classes and their stories suggested that they were successful in spite of public school education, not because of it.
Critical incidents from case studies revealed deeper insights to the learning experiences of the four participants. All participants began learning English as children, with the older developing motivation through socialization of community members and being recognized as successful English learners. However, both had powerful experiences as adults leading to developing communicative competence, for example, Mia interacting with native speakers “opened her eyes” to “how people communicate”; for Sami learning English became a source of self-actualization in overcoming a personal crisis and provided opportunities for discourse unavailable as in L1. For the younger participants, positive experiences with private teachers stimulated their interest in English. The younger participants began after implementation the new curriculum, being enrolled in hagwon by parents.

Why?
English fever: English learning is a national obsession.
Identity: Socialization, that is, being known as “good” language learners in their communities provided motivation, for example, Mia “somehow” becoming “the English expert in the neighborhood”. Also knowing English brings status.
Competition: Being known as top English students in school motivated them to stay on top.
Interest: All participants enjoyed studying and developed strong intrinsic motivation.
    Opportunity: Knowing English opened up new opportunities, for example, world travel (Eunjeong and Mia), or providing different opportunities for discourse (Sami).
    Necessity: They could not teach English without L2 competency. For the younger two, they could not have been teachers without it.

So what?
    Language learning experiences influenced participants’ approach to ELT (see below)
Reflection on language learning experiences could foster better understanding of how it influences teaching approaches.
Teachers need to consider their influence on the language learning experiences of their students and how their practices may be motivating (or demotivating) students.
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English competency is a criterion for entering teacher’s college and for the employment exam. Students lacking English competency cannot enter education.

**Recommendations**

Important to better educate teachers about language learning and SLA. One particular area worth addressing appears to be motivation.

Reflections on language learning experiences important for pre- and in-service teachers.

This could readily be adapted by existing programs through journals or guided writing (e.g. narrative frames)

Reconsider the role of English for entrance to NUE and employment exams.

Prior studies

- Hiver, 2013
- Lim, 2011
- Moodie & Nam

**Limitations**

Commitments were an emerging but unplanned theme; therefore, data may be insufficient for conclusive analysis.

- Priming may be evident in NF responses (see notes on NF2 for example)
- NFs induce storied accounts of experience thereby simplifying complex phenomena.
- Space.

**Category 3. Reasons to teach English.**

*Administrator decision-making more dominant than interest in English or wanting to teach it.*

(i.e. normative commitments more dominant than affective commitments for new PS KETs)

In Study 1 the dominant theme for 9 of 20 participants was that they were *delegated by the principal* and only 6 expressed *interest in English* as a reason for teaching it.

Why?

- Principals ultimately decide who teaches English.
- Younger teachers assigned to teach if no one volunteers.
- Younger teachers perceived as more proficient L2 users.
- Confucian values: Juniors expected to follow requests of seniors.
- Point system determining teacher rank for requested grades/subjects.
- Longer-tenured teachers have more agency over teaching assignments (within a school).
- New and transferred teachers have less agency over teaching assignments.

How trustworthiness was addressed?

- Constant comparative method
Member-checking confirming NF responses during data collection, some with follow-up emails.
Ongoing member-checking with case study participants.

Notes on researcher positionality
Inevitably etic interpretations in places.
Appendix X: Critical Incident Checklist for Changes in Cognitions and Practices

Mia’s critical incident: Discovering collaborative activity while sick
Sami’s critical incident: Adapting a coupon reward system for ELT
Eunjeong’s critical incident: Beginning to teach in English
Yuna’s critical incident: Deciding to recycle Zombie and Kimchi Games

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process Stages</th>
<th>Mia</th>
<th>Sami</th>
<th>Eunjeong</th>
<th>Yuna</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Personal experience with practice</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Tension/Cognitive dissonance</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Incident initiating change</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No*</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Commitment to change practice</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Heuristic decision-making</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No**</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Applying new practice</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Positive evaluation</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Consciousness-raising</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Committed action to change practice</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Expanding professional knowledge base</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Did the CI follow the general order? | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |

*It was a process of experiencing tensions as opposed to a specific incident for Sami.

**Eunjeong was aligning practices to established policy more than she was problem solving.
Appendix Y: Data Management

I used cloud computing for storing and managing data. In Study 1, the narrative frames were attached to emails. After receiving responses, data were stored on Google Drive, then printed for manual coding. Demographic data were stored on an online spreadsheet. This was automatically created from the survey responses making the organization of participant information quite efficient.

For Study 2, observations were video-recorded with audio backups. Interviews were audio-recorded. Electronic files were in many formats including audio (.mp3), video (.mpeg), spreadsheets (Google Sheets), and documents (Google Docs). Data were stored online and backed up on USB memory sticks and the hard drive. Observation reports and field-notes were also typed up and stored online. Data were printed for manual coding.

Qualitative data analysis software (MAXQDA 11) was used extensively for analysis in both studies. In Study 1, participant stories were uploaded into document folders and a coding system was developed for each story (see Appendix H). In Study 2, files for each participant were uploaded to and analyzed as individual cases initially (e.g., Appendix U).
Appendix Z: Electronics and Software Used in Thesis

Laptops with auxiliary screens
Digital video camera
Digital camera
Digital audio recorder
Smartphone
Skype
MP3 Skype Recorder
gmail
Google Drive, Docs, Sheets, and Forms
Lucidchart
Dragon Naturally Speaking 11
Scrivener
Endnote X6
MAXQDA 11
MS Word 2013