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ABSTRACT

This study investigates the extent to which the communicative language teaching (CLT)-oriented English language curricular reforms mandated by the Ministry of Education are instantiated in pre-service teacher education in South Korea. Specifically, it focuses on the extent to which a cohort of four pre-service teachers is able to internalize the concepts embedded in these curricular reforms and enact those concepts in their instructional practices during the practicum experience.

Sociocultural theory (Lantolf & Thorne, 2006; Vygotsky 1978, 1986) and activity theory (Engeström, 1987, 1993, 1999a; Leontiev, 1978, 1981) were adopted as the theoretical framework through which teacher learning was examined. In particular, sociocultural theory allows us to understand and trace these student teachers’ concept development. Activity theory, specifically, the activity system model (Engeström, 1987, 1993, 1999a) was applied to the data in order to identify if and where contradictions emerged that altered the nature of the activity system itself or maintained the status quo. Moreover, this model identified several dimensions of the activity system that appeared to influence their development and finally where and what needs to be changed within this activity system if the outcome of student teachers’ learning is to be the ability to teach in line with the mandated curricular reforms.

Two teams, consisting of a mentor teacher and two student teachers, were shadowed during a four-week practicum at a Korean laboratory middle school. The data consisted of interviews, classroom observations, team conferences, student teachers’ journals, lesson plans, and curricular reform documents. The data were analyzed inductively through a grounded content analysis (Bogdan & Biklin, 1998; Glaser &
Strauss, 1967) within the traditions of ethnographic qualitative research (Hammersley & Atkinson, 1995; Hymes, 1964; Watson-Gegeo, 1988; Wilcox, 1982).

The analyses revealed that each student teacher experienced different degrees of internalization depending on a range of individual, social, and institutional factors. The student teachers’ apprenticeship of observation (Lortie, 2002) grounded in their previous schooling experiences and the everyday concepts with which they entered the teacher education program had a powerful influence how they perceived and enacted the curricular reform concepts during the practicum experience. In addition, the mediational means provided by the mentor teacher and instantiated in the practicum activities worked to socialize these student teachers into the normative ways of teaching English in this institutional context. Moreover, institutional constraints including pupils’ lack of classroom participation and limited L2 abilities, the high-stakes nature of school-based exams, and pressure to complete the immediate practicum teaching requirements were found to constrain these student teachers’ attempts to enact the CLT-oriented curriculum.

Overall, the findings of this study indicate that conceptual, mentoring, and institutional support is critical for pre-service teacher concept development within the context of curricular reform efforts. In particular, the results indicate that broader macro-structures embedded within the activity systems in which these pre-service teachers were learning to teach must change in order for new teachers to fully overcome the contradictions they face in their initial classroom teaching experiences if language teacher education programs are to reorient their teaching conceptions and practices toward the CLT-based curricular reforms. This study has important implications for policy makers, teacher educators, and in-service and pre-service English teachers.
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CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

This study traces student teachers’ concept development during their practicum experience within the context of the CLT-based curricular reforms in South Korea. Specifically, it focuses on how they come to understand and attempt to implement the concepts embedded in the Ministry of Education’s curricular reforms within their four week practicum experience. This introductory chapter describes the historical, social, and contextual background within which this research is situated, presents the purpose of this study, and provides readers with an overview of the dissertation chapters.

1.1. The Context of the Study

In South Korea, English has been the most prominent foreign language at school since the second national curriculum was proclaimed in 1963 (Shim & Baik, 2000; Yoo, 2005). English has been very important as a school subject because it represents a relatively greater portion than other subject areas in the college entrance exam as well as in school-based exams. More recently, as English has become a lingua franca and an essential communication tool with the rest of the world (Crystal, 2003), communicative ability in English has become essential for survival in prominent professions such as business, science, and international politics (Ministry of Education, 1998). In the context of South Korea, having a good command of English has become a powerful means to gain social prestige and personal, professional, and economic success (Collins, 2005; Flattery, 2007; Park & Abelmann, 2004). For example, those who have high English proficiency are more
likely to have the benefits of applying to university, finding a good job, getting a promotion, and making higher income. When people’s abilities are otherwise about the same, those who have a better command of English will be more likely to gain access to greater opportunities (K. Kang, 2008, January 28).

Due to the importance of English proficiency, enormous individual investments into becoming proficient have been made in the private education industry and overseas study/training (Kwon, 2000a; Nunan, 2003). This trend has been a concern not only of the privileged class but also of ordinary families: children attend kindergartens where English is used as the medium of instruction or where English is regularly taught; elementary and secondary school students study abroad in English speaking countries; college students and adults study overseas to improve their English ability; numerous students and adults attend English classes in private language institutes.

The importance of developing English language ability and the realities of related personal investments of time and energy have stimulated and have been stimulated by the policies of the government. In the 1990s, English language education was highlighted by the Segyehwa (globalization) project that the government supported in order to heighten the nation’s economic development and competitiveness in the world (Jung & Norton, 2002; Kaplan & Baldauf, 2003; Park & Abelmann, 2004). More specifically, the Korean Ministry of Education announced national curricular reforms aimed at promoting learners’ communicative competence in English. The 6th national curriculum embraced the communicative approach for the first time and intended to replace the predominant grammar-translation and/or audiolingual methods (Ministry of Education, 1994). When the first generation of English-educated elementary school students began their middle
school years (Kwon, 2000a)\(^1\), the 7\(^{th}\) national curriculum was launched in 2001. This curriculum emphasized task-based instruction and divided classes by students’ proficiency levels for the first time in curricular history. In 2001, along with the launching of the 7\(^{th}\) curriculum, the Ministry of Education proclaimed the Teaching English through English (TETE) policy (Kwon, 2000b). Recently, it was announced that the revised 7\(^{th}\) curriculum (Ministry of Education, 2006) would take effect in 2009. This revised curriculum provides more specified guidance for proficiency level-specific classes without changing the principal directives of the communicative approach.

Other English education policies also have stimulated nation-wide English study efforts. English education in the elementary school has been adopted from the third grade since 1997 (Ministry of Education, 1995), and the Ministry of Education has recently announced that English education at public schools will begin in the first grade (Shin & Choi, 2006). More dramatically, in 2008, the new government made liberal proposals in order to strengthen the public English language education system (H. Kang, 2008; Rho & Y. Kang, 2008), many of which have led to heated debate\(^2\): Weekly class hours in which English is taught through English (TETE) in the elementary school will increase, and the class size will decrease\(^3\); The TETE policy will be reinforced and the number of native speaking teachers in every elementary and secondary school will be increased; A new English proficiency test will be developed to assess all four skills (listening, reading, writing, and speaking) and will be considered as a possible replacement for the English

\(^1\) The 6\(^{th}\) curriculum was designed for the secondary school students who did not receive English education in the elementary school.

\(^2\) Since the data of this study were collected in 2006, this study primarily addresses the 7\(^{th}\) national curriculum and the TETE policy (launched in 2001), not the revised 7\(^{th}\) curriculum (effective from 2009) nor the recent government’s new policies (proposed in 2008).

\(^3\) The new government proposed that weekly class hours for elementary school English increase from one (3\(^{rd}\) to 4\(^{th}\) graders) to two hours (5\(^{th}\) to 6\(^{th}\) graders) into three hours and that the class size decrease from 35 to 23 students per class (H. Kang, 2008).
college entrance exam beginning 2015. The new government even proposed that English immersion programs may be needed in the public education system (Eom, 2008; Y. Kang & K. Lee, 2008), a proposal which has been strongly opposed by the public (Ryu, 2008). Nonetheless, in advance of the official implementations of some of these national policies, most private elementary schools have already initiated teaching English from the first grade. Also, several private elementary and secondary schools have implemented immersion programs (J. Park, 2007).

The implementation of innovations in English language education in Korea has simultaneously brought up issues about necessary investments into teacher education programs (K. Kang, 2008, January 2). In Korea, in-service and pre-service teacher education programs had been criticized for providing mostly theoretical courses in linguistics and literature, with only a few available in ELT methodology and language skills (Kwon, 2000a). In the late 1990s, however, these programs began to increase courses that focused on language skills and ELT methodology, highlighting the importance of developing teachers’ linguistic and pedagogical capability (Kwon, 2000a). This change was largely influenced by the criticism that English teachers’ lack of ability and confidence in English was a major impediment to curricular reform implementation (Kwon, 2000a; Nunan, 2003).

Since the early 2000s, in-service teacher education has received increasing attention: the Ministry of Education reinforced various local and overseas programs designed to improve in-service teachers’ English abilities as well as their teaching skills. Also, the new government launched in 2008 proposed a strengthened plan to assign a large amount of the national budget towards providing teacher education programs and
recruiting capable English speakers (H. Kang, 2008; Rho & Y. Kang, 2008). Under this new plan, 3000 in-service English teachers will participate in teacher education programs in Korea or in English speaking countries every year, with programs lasting for six months to one year. Approximately 23,000 teachers who can conduct English classes in English, namely Teaching English in English (TEE), will be recruited to teach students after six months of attending a teacher education program, and they will be expected to attend teacher education programs at least once every three years in order to stay current with professional trends. Overall, the new government’s proposal supports the CLT-based national curriculum specifically in terms of the principle of teaching English through English and the efforts to enhance current teachers’ language ability and obtain newly qualified teachers based in the TETE principle.

Concerning pre-service teacher education within Colleges of Education, the adoption of a Teacher Employment Test and the evaluation of teacher education institutions greatly affected the curricular changes in English language departments (Kwon, 2000a). In particular, the Teacher Employment Test has been implemented since 1991 in order to replace an automatic employment system that ensured the employment of the national university graduates in public schools regardless of their qualifications. As a result, both the national universities and private universities attempted to alter their curriculum to produce linguistically and pedagogically competent teachers and to prepare them for this test. Such innovation was also prompted by the government’s recommendation of a standard model for the curriculum utilized by institutions focusing on secondary school teacher education (1997) and the evaluation of colleges of Education (1997-1998). The new government has also proposed that the curriculum of English
language education departments should be reformed with more focus on speaking and writing skills.

Overall, in South Korea English language ability has been regarded not only as a *lingua franca* in this globalization era, but also as a marker of personal and professional success in Korean society. In addition to personal investments in the study of English, the importance of English has been reflected in language policies, including national English curricula and increasing concerns about teacher education programs preparing teachers for mandated curricular reforms. It is within this historical context that this study of pre-service English language teachers’ concept development during their practicum experience is situated. With recognition of the historical context now in place regarding these curricular reforms and teacher education programs in South Korea, the purpose and significance of this study are presented in the following section.

1.2. The Purpose of the Study

For the curricular reforms to be successfully implemented, the role of teachers as grass-roots implementers has been cited as most essential by a number of researchers (Choi, 2000; Gorsuch, 2001; Hiramatsu, 2005; Li, 1998; Markee, 1993, 1997). In fact, the CLT-based curricular mandates were rather new concepts for most Korean teachers of English who had been taught and have taught using grammar-translation and/or audiolingual methods. Thus, numerous studies indicated a mismatch between the policy makers’ expectations and the teachers’ enactment of these policies (Choi, 2000; Guilloteaux, 2004; E.-J. Kim, 2008; S.-Y. Kim, 2002; Li, 1998). These studies reported that secondary school teachers’ perceptions of these educational reforms and their
classroom practices remained firmly based in traditional teaching methods due to various factors involving the teachers, students, and their instructional contexts. Consequently, a large body of literature on curricular reform implementation has called for appropriate teacher education programs to prepare teachers for the enactment of these policies (Choi, 2000; Gorsuch, 2001; Hiramatsu, 2005; Li, 1998; Markee, 1993, 1997). The new government’s proposal for English language education looks constructive in terms of including plans for teacher education programs within these innovative policies. However, although these programs appear promising in writing, consideration must be given to determine if they are actually effective in implementing the curricular reforms within schools.

Despite increasing needs for appropriate professional development programs for teachers, little research has examined how such curricular innovations are actually instantiated in teacher education programs. Thus, research is needed into the extent to which teacher education programs help teachers understand the curricular reforms and implement them in their instructional practices. Such research can provide valuable information on the relationships between curricular reform implementation and teacher education programs, and more importantly, has the potential to provide insights into how to improve teachers’ professional development programs in support of curricular reform efforts.

Within the curricular reform efforts in South Korea, pre-service teacher education has the potential to provide the first opportunity to connect theory and practice by applying the concepts that student teachers learn during their coursework to their practicum experience. In fact, the student teaching practicum is believed to be one of the
most significant experiences in the developmental process of learning to teach. Viewed as an important experience, it offers pre-service teachers with actual classroom teaching experiences under the supervision of a more experienced mentor and at the same time socializes them into the teaching profession. One criticism of the ‘apprenticeship model’ of teacher education is that the practicum typically socializes new teachers into the existing norms and culture of teaching that represent the status quo in schools (Maynard & Furlong, 1993; Staton & Hunt, 1992; Wallace, 1991). However, if structured and supported appropriately, the practicum has the potential to enable student teachers to actualize newly acquired concepts of teaching to which they were exposed within their university coursework.

In South Korea, pre-service teacher education has received less attention than in-service teacher education from educational reformers and the Ministry of Education. Nevertheless, the practicum represents a very important site for teacher learning because it is the first entrée into how to actually implement the mandated educational reforms. Thus, research focusing on the practicum experience in this context is essential because this activity has the potential to influence the EFL teacher educational system at the start of new teachers’ careers. Therefore, this study investigates how curricular reforms are conceptualized and instantiated in the activities embedded in the practicum. Since the practicum activities are guided by mentor teachers, the role of mentoring is also explored. Finally, this study examines how the concepts embedded in the curricular reforms are understood by student teachers and the extent to which they become evident in their instructional practices throughout the practicum experience.
This study is noteworthy and important specifically because it addresses a gap in the existent literature regarding curricular reforms and teacher education. Most of all, although a substantial body of research has examined teachers’ perceptions and practices related to the L2 curricular educational innovations, little research has investigated to what extent they are initiated, instantiated and developed within teacher education programs. In addition, the critical role of the context emphasized in both the research addressing implementation of educational policy (Berns, 1990; Hiramatsu, 2005; Holliday, 1994; Krashen & Sullivan, 1996; Markee, 1993; Sullivan, 2000) and teacher learning (Freeman, 2002; Johnson, 2006) has yet to be fully explored. Thus, this study brings together these two issues by examining the specific setting of a pre-service teacher education program in South Korea within CLT-based curricular reform efforts.

Since most of the studies concerning the implementation of the curricular reforms in South Korea have investigated the pre- or initial stages of the reform implementation (Choi, 2000; Li, 1998), or focused on a specific principle of the curricular reform mandates (e.g., teaching English through English; Jeon, 2008; S.-Y. Kim, 2002; Y. Kim, 2002; Liu, Ahn, Baek & Han, 2004), research is needed to develop a more complete understanding of the curriculum implementation process after it has been in effect for several years. This study addresses this gap because it examines the enactment of curricular reform efforts almost five years after they were put into effect.

Finally, most of the previous research conducted regarding the South Korean educational context has provided general descriptions of reform implementation. However, studies are needed to consider particular contextual and historical factors that influence curriculum implementation and the individuals who attempt to enact these
reforms within specific professional communities. Towards this end, the present study focuses on the learning to teach experiences of four student teachers as they collaborate with their mentors and peers in their pre-service teacher education program, and considers various individual, social and contextual factors that mediate their learning to teach processes. Ultimately, by examining how the CLT-based curricular reforms are instantiated in a pre-service teacher education program, this research broadens the scope of the literature on teacher education as it relates to curricular reform, and suggests ways to enhance teacher professional development within the context of such reforms.

In order to recognize the importance of context within which teacher learning occurs, this dissertation represents multiple case studies within the traditions of ethnographic qualitative research (Hammersley & Atkinson, 1995; Hymes, 1964; LeCompte, Preissle, & Tersch, 1993; van Lier, 1988; Watson-Gegeo, 1988; Wilcox, 1982). In the natural setting of the four-week practicum at a Korean laboratory middle school, two teams, consisting of a mentor teacher and two student teachers, were shadowed. A comprehensive dataset was created for each participant, including interviews, classroom observations, stimulated recall sessions, conferences, journals, and lesson plans. The data were analyzed through a grounded content analysis (Bogdan & Biklin, 1998; Glaser & Strauss, 1967), specifically based on the principles of ethnographic semantics in which the meanings that people give to their verbal expressions are the primary focus of investigation (Spradley, 1979; Spradley & McCurdy, 1972). The constant comparative method was also used to develop an understanding of the data (Bogdan & Biklin, 1998; Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Goetz & LeCompte, 1981). In addition, a grounded content analysis of the 7th Middle School Curriculum Manual was
conducted.

Sociocultural theory (SCT) and activity theory (AT) (Engeström, 1987, 1993, 1999a; Leontiev, 1978, 1981) were adopted as the theoretical framework through which teacher learning was examined. Because this theoretical framework views social practices and activities as interconnected with historical, cultural, social, institutional and discursive forces (Lantolf & Thorne, 2006), it has tremendous explanatory power for understanding the processes of teacher learning within the context of curricular reform. In particular, sociocultural theory allows us to understand to what extent student teachers are able to internalize the concepts embedded in the curricular reforms and enact those concepts in their teaching practices. Additionally, activity theory, specifically, the activity system model (Engeström, 1987, 1993, 1999a) enables us to examine components of the activity system in which these teachers were learning to teach and to determine if and where contradictions may emerge that might alter the nature of the activity system itself or maintain its status quo. Finally, the activity system model enables us to reveal both several dimensions and the broader macro-structures that may impede student teachers’ conceptual development and thus can be targeted for change.

This study addresses two research questions and two sub-research questions.

1. How have curricular reform efforts been enacted in the activities student teachers engage in during the practicum?
   A. What mediational means does the practicum provide to help student teachers understand and enact these curricular reforms?

2. How do student teachers come to understand these curricular reforms and how do they enact them in their instructional practices?
A. How do their instructional practices support their pupils’ opportunities for authentic L2 use?

1.3. Chapter Descriptions

Chapter two reviews the existing literature of three areas relevant to this study. First, issues of the implementation of CLT-based curricular reforms are reviewed in terms of the definition of CLT, curricular innovation and the importance of teacher roles as implementers of such reforms. The second area reviews pre-service teacher education studies focusing on the powerful influence of student teachers’ pre-training beliefs and experiences on the processes of learning to teach. The impact of mentoring on student teaching is also reviewed along with several mentoring models and the nature of mentor roles. Finally, the principles of sociocultural theory and activity theory are introduced as the theoretical framework to trace teachers’ concept development followed by a review of various studies that have examined teacher learning from a sociocultural perspective.

Chapter three provides an overview of the methodology of this research, including the research design, the site of the practicum, the participants, and the practicum context within the pre-service teacher education program. Then, the data sources are described, the data-analysis procedures are laid out, and efforts to ensure the trustworthiness of the data are addressed.

Chapter four presents analysis of the 7th Middle School English Curriculum Manual. In this chapter, the rationale of the curricular reforms is introduced along with the principles the Ministry of Education employed in setting policies that are designed to support 1) the development of communicative competence, 2) English as the means of
classroom communication, 3) communicative activities and task-based language learning, and 4) learner-centered language learning.

Chapter five and six contain the data analyses of the two focal practicum teams. Each of the two chapters analyzes the student teachers on one team, illustrating their complex and uneven development in relation to the concepts embedded in the curricular reforms. These chapters investigate the practicum activities of each team including conferences, journals, and classroom observations, specifically centering on how these activities shape student teachers’ perceptions and enactment of the curricular reform efforts. The origins and the nature of the components of the activity systems within which each student teacher functions as subject is presented along with an examination of the inner contradictions that are apparent in these activity systems.

Chapter seven contains a discussion of several issues with regard to the concept development of the four student teachers and a cross-case analysis of both teams throughout the practicum. Individual, social, and contextual factors that mediated the four student teachers’ concept development are examined including their language learning and schooling experiences, their participation in the practicum activities, and the institutional context of the practicum. The connection between everyday and scientific concepts and the challenges of curricular reform implementation by the student teachers are discussed.

Chapter eight, the final chapter of this dissertation, presents the implications, the limitations, and the significance of this study as well as several suggestions for future research.
CHAPTER TWO
LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter reviews research regarding the three areas related to this study of the practicum experiences of student teachers within the English language teaching curricular reform context. Research on curricular reforms, the context of the present study, is introduced first, specifically focusing on the impact of curricular innovations on classroom instruction. Relevant literature regarding pre-service teacher education is examined secondly. The last section introduces sociocultural theory and activity theory as the theoretical framework of this study, followed by studies of teacher learning using these theoretical frameworks.

2.1. CLT-based Curricular Reform

2.1.1. Communicative Language Teaching

Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) has gained considerable attention from researchers and teachers involved with second/foreign language education for more than 30 years. In order to bring innovation to traditional language classrooms, curricular reforms toward communicative language teaching (CLT) have been particularly implemented in many ESL/EFL contexts. Whereas earlier methods viewed language as a set of linguistic systems and focused on learners’ ability to use language correctly, CLT is based on a functional model of language (Halliday, 1973) and a concept of communicative competence (Hymes, 1971) and aims to develop learners’ ability to use language appropriately and meaningfully in the construction of discourse (Ellis, 2003;
communicative competence model specifically provided implications for language teaching, by identifying four dimensions including grammatical, sociolinguistic, discourse, and strategic competence.

While various definitions, principles, or components of CLT have been proposed by many researchers (e.g., Breen & Candlin, 1980; Finocchario & Brumfit, 1983; Howatt, 1984; Littlewood, 1981; Nunan, 2003; Richards & Rogers, 2001; Savignon, 1983; Widdowson, 1978), there seem to be several acknowledged characteristics such as language viewed as communication, focus on communication in genuine and realistic situations, employment of meaningful activities/tasks, and learner-centeredness. For example, Howatt (1984) maintained that the dominant conceptions of CLT “stress the importance of providing learners with opportunities to use their English for communicative purposes and attempt to integrate such activities into a wider program of language teaching” (Howatt, 1984, p. 279). In particular, task-based activities have been viewed as a central element of CLT (Breen, 1987; Ellis, 2003; Lee & VanPatten, 1995; Nunan, 1988). Tasks offer students communicative practices within which they can utilize their linguistic knowledge in a variety of contexts (Ellis, 2003). Although definition of tasks varies, it is generally agreed that tasks are related to communicative language use. For example, Bygate, Skehan, and Swain (2001) defined a task as “an activity which requires learners to use language, with emphasis on meaning, to attain an

---

1 For details about these four competences, refer to section 4.2.1 (Development of Communicative Competence) in Chapter 4 (Analysis of the Curriculum Manual).

2 Howatt (1984) argued that this is the more widely held view, also known as ‘the weak version’. He maintained that a ‘strong version’ claims that “language is acquired through communication, so that it is not merely a question of activating an existing but inert knowledge of the language, but of stimulating the development of the language system itself” (Howatt, 1984, p. 279).
objective” (p.11). Moreover, as “the real purpose of the task is not that learners should arrive at a successful outcome but that they should use language in ways that will promote language learning” (Ellis, 2003, p. 8), learners’ L2 use in tasks is the process as well as the outcome of task-based language teaching (TBLT)\(^3\). In these activities, fluency and accuracy of language use are seen as complementary principles (Brown, 2007). As tasks require learners’ high engagement, researchers stated that learners participate in their learning process more actively (Brown, 2007; Savignon, 2001). In CLT, learner-centered language learning is also an important component. Learners’ needs should be assessed before instruction and teachers should then operate as facilitators to support learners as they achieve their learning goals (Berns, 1990; Nunan, 1988).

Despite sharing a general common objective, namely, to prepare learners for real-life communication and to enhance their communicative competence, CLT “has no monolithic identity, and no single model of CLT is universally accepted as authoratively” (Li, 1998, p.698). In addition, Richards and Rogers (1986) concluded:

Communicative Language Teaching is best considered an approach rather than a method. Thus, although a reasonable degree of theoretical consistency can be discerned at the levels of language and learning theory, at the levels of design and procedure there is much greater room for individual interpretation and variation than most methods permit (p.83).

As such, CLT-based education is not uniform in terms of how it has been interpreted and operationalized in various places around the globe. In fact, it has been observed that views of CLT are not necessarily just the domain of researchers, but that

\(^3\) See Skehan (2003) and Ellis (2003) for comprehensive literature about task-based approach in L2 teaching and learning.
national and state initiatives provide additional views of CLT (Sato & Kleinsasser, 1999). This employment of CLT in language policies is designed to bring about curricular innovation in language teaching. Thus, in order to examine the educational implementation of CLT in various contexts, it is important to examine how CLT is interpreted in governmental and institutional policies and how such policies are actually enacted in L2 classrooms. In this study, in order to uncover the interpretations and operationalizations of CLT by the South Korean government, the manual related to CLT-oriented curricular reform is analyzed in Chapter 4. The four key concepts promoted within the manual include: 1) the development of communicative competence, 2) English as the means of classroom communication, 3) communicative activities and task-based language learning, and 4) learner-centered language learning. Then, this study examines how such mandated curricular reforms are understood and enacted in English classrooms, specifically in pre-service teacher education in Korea.

2.1.2. Implementation of Curricular Reform

Markee (1994) defined curricular innovation as “a phenomenon that involves managing developmental change in the design, implementation, and maintenance of teaching (and/or testing) materials, methodological skills, and pedagogical values that are perceived as new by individuals who comprise a formal (language) education system” (p.1). This definition stresses that curricular innovation should bring about reforms in the planning and enactment process as well as in new materials and teaching methods. Most importantly, it is argued that altering teachers’ teaching values and beliefs are essential for the successful implementation of any curricular innovation.
In the current reform context in South Korea, new materials such as textbooks, teacher guides, and reference books were developed. Also, innovative teaching methods such as learner-centered or task-based instruction were recommended. Along with these changes, Markee (1994) argued that teachers’ educational views must be altered for curricular reforms to be fruitfully enacted. His proposal highlighted the importance of teachers as crucial implementers of educational innovations.

Extensive research on language teaching indicates that teachers are the most critical factor in implementing educational policy and/or determining the results of any implementation, and that policy implementation will not succeed without teachers’ cooperation. Teachers do not just automatically absorb the ideas embedded in new policies and/or particularly make sense of any policy that is mandated to be transformed into reality in their own classrooms (Hiramatsu, 2005). Therefore, inadequate pre-service and in-service teacher education can be impediments to enacting curricular reforms (Choi, 2000; Gorsuch, 2001; Hiramatsu, 2005; Li, 1998). Consequently, Stenhouse (1980) argues that curriculum innovation must ultimately be about teacher professional development.

Widdowson (1993) underscores the importance of considering teachers’ roles in relation to the engagement of other participants in curriculum policy implementation such as policy makers, researchers, material designers, and learners. In particular, he raised questions including what the appropriate role of teachers should be, what actions should be taken to develop teachers in that role, and whether these are related to the macro-level of curriculum planning or to the micro-level of classroom practices.
Researchers have indicated that several stakeholders are involved at different levels in an educational innovation (Fullan, 1982; Fullan & Park, 1981; Fullan & Stiegelbauer, 1991; Tanner & Tanner, 1995), with specifics influenced and framed by the context (Markee, 1993). For example, Kennedy (1988) analyzed the roles of participants involved in reform at a Tunisian university in North Africa and suggested that officials in the ministry of education, deans, and heads of departments were adopters in the implementation of the English curricular reform. Conversely, he viewed teachers as implementers, students as clients, curriculum and materials designers as suppliers, and the expatriate curriculum specialists as entrepreneurs. In general, three major participants in the policy implementation can be identified: policy makers who plan the policy, middle level administrators who interpret the policies and communicate with grass-roots implementers, and the teacher/implementers (Wang, 2006).

Initially, policy makers formulate curriculum policies that are expected to influence teachers’ instruction and enhance student learning. Curriculum policies often include general guidelines, allowing administrators and/or teachers to articulate more concrete ways of executing the curriculum. However, it has been critically noted that policies providing only shadowy guidance for practice lack the concrete models that teachers deserve in order to enact these policies (Matland, 1995). Thus, suggestions have been made that policy makers need to be specific in terms of materials, professional development, guidance, and instructions to allow for the successful enactment of policies (Spillane, Reiser & Reimer, 2002).

Secondly, middle level managers and administrators are to implement national policies in local institutions. They are supposed to first understand and then reinterpret
the national mandates within the context of the implementers’ knowledge, beliefs and classrooms (Honig, 2004). They are then expected to take responsibility for equipping teachers with the abilities, skills, resources, and professional environment to overcome any challenges of the new policy (Gross, Giacquinta & Bernstein, 1971). On the other hand, it has been pointed out that policy initiatives can be distorted as they filter down through various levels of administration (Lefstein, 2004).

Despite this presumed chain of administrative command, teachers as implementers are the key to effective implementation of any educational reform. Research has shown that teachers do not always act as told, nor do they consistently work to achieve the policy goals (Cohen & Ball, 1990; McLaughlin, 1987). The reasons for this are multiple. Most of all, teachers are often resistant to change (McLaughlin, 1987; Smith, 2005) since they hold deeply ingrained beliefs about teaching, and they are unsure of the outcomes of new practices which might be not as effective as the previous ones (Wang & Cheng, 2005). Also, implementers often lack the capability, knowledge, skills, or resources, to embrace new policies (Spillane, Reiser, & Reimer, 2002), partly due to the lack of appropriate support from the middle-level administrators (Gross et al, 1971). Lastly, teachers tend not to buy into reform unless they are involved in the decision-making process (Wang & Cheng, 2005).

Teachers’ essential role in policy making, in addition to policy implementation, has been noted by policy makers, researchers, and other stakeholders (Wang, 2006). As Tanner and Tanner (1995) state, “teachers make important decisions with consequences for students…. No one can control all of the specific decisions that teachers make even during a highly specified instructional episode” (p. 619). Therefore, it has been suggested
that teachers should be involved in the formation of educational policies; otherwise
teachers will be more likely to change, refuse, or disregard curricular mandates in their
classrooms (Wang, 2006; Widdowson, 1993). Therefore, top-down curricular reform
initiatives mandated at a national level frequently result in a disconnect between policy
makers’ intentions, and teachers’ perceptions and implementations in the classroom
(Hiramatsu, 2005; Wang, 2006).

Although research exists regarding educational reform implementation in relation
to different levels of participation, little research has been conducted to examine how
such implementation plays out during pre-service teacher education. In the practicum
context of the present study, the administrative levels include the Ministry of Education
as policy makers, the English department head in the field school together with mentor
teachers as middle level managers, and the student teachers as implementers at the grass-
roots level4. Thus, enactment of the curricular reforms in the practicum teaching context
can be examined, with consideration given to these three levels, through studies regarding
how, and what kinds of concepts are emphasized, guided, developed and finally applied
to classroom instruction. To fully understand the enactment process of the curricular
reform in pre-service teacher education, it is essential to examine how student teachers
interpreted and implemented the major concepts mandated by the policy makers and
facilitated by their mentor teacher(s).

4 Mentor teachers can be both middle-level managers and implementers to some extent. Whereas they
support student teachers who enact the curriculum, they also teach as grass-roots level implementers.
2.1.3. Implementation of CLT-based Curriculum in the EFL Contexts

Extensive research is available concerning the implementation of CLT-based educational reforms in EFL contexts, and the difficulties in the implementation of these reforms have been frequently discussed and/or observed in the EFL settings where the classroom and L2 learning contexts are different from ESL settings (Berns, 1990; Hiramatsu, 2005; Holliday, 1994; Kramsch & Sullivan, 1996; Sullivan, 2000). Holliday (1994) indicates a problem of “technology transfer” between the ESL and EFL settings, specifically a problem that emerges when a new approach developed in Western ESL contexts is adopted or adapted to non-Western EFL contexts. In particular, Holliday claims that western-based methods have limitations in terms of embracing the local context regarding teachers, students and the classroom realities such as class size.

Before investigating studies conducted in South Korea, the context of the current study, it is helpful to examine some representative studies in other Asian EFL contexts where the situation is similar to that of Korea. Hiramatsu (2005), Wang (2006), and Carless (2001) described the implementation of English curricular reforms in Japan, China, and Hong Kong respectively. These studies highlight issues embedded in English curricular reforms in their specific EFL contexts including teachers, administrators, policy makers, and other contextual factors.

Hiramatsu (2005) examined how two reform movements within the Japanese EFL context were enacted at the high school level and how teachers perceived the reforms and

---

implemented them in their instructional practices. These included (1) the Japanese Exchange and Teaching (JET) program, announced in 1987, which was designed to promote team teaching involving Japanese teachers of English (JTEs) and Assistant Language Teachers (ALT) from foreign countries and (2) the revised English curriculum mandated by the Ministry of Education that specifically focused on Oral Communication (OC), also announced in 1987, but actually implemented at the high school level almost a decade later in 1996.

In his study, Hiramatsu collected data from interviews and classroom observations⁶ and identified some changes in Japanese teachers’ understandings and practices. However, he noted numerous factors that discouraged change, including teachers’ insufficient English proficiency, insufficient in-service training, lack of opportunities for building collegiality, and the challenge of meeting university entrance exams. Hiramatsu also reported teachers’ misunderstanding of CLT as a barrier to the innovation. Since Japanese teachers did not fully understand how to enhance learners’ communicative abilities, they predominantly used game-like activities or returned to their traditional teaching routines such as the grammar-translation method. Furthermore, the researcher indicated the ineffectiveness of the reform system maintaining that although the Ministry of Education was concerned about initiating change in a top-down fashion, there was no system to assess the effect resulting from the change or the policy itself. Therefore, the teachers did not consider it necessary to comply with the principles of the mandates of the Ministry of Education. He also argued that the prefecture, the middle-

---

⁶ Interviews were conducted with eight Japanese teachers and one American teacher as well as two education ministry officials, one official of prefectural board of education, and one teachers’ consultant. Also, six oral communication classes taught by four teams of JTE and ALT were observed.
level administration, did not take an active role in adapting the new policy to their particular context.

Hiramatsu’s study reveals that when teachers are not supported in terms of raising their understanding of CLT and improving in-service training, a top-down curricular reform finds teachers maintaining very traditional ways of teaching that they believe are effective and sufficient for their instructional context. Of particular note, this research from Japan also indicates that contextual factors, such as the high-stakes assessment system that promotes traditional practices, prevents new reforms from being successfully implemented.

Wang (2006) examined the implementation of the CLT-based national college English curriculum in the setting of a Chinese university where the curriculum has been enacted since 1988, and revised in 1999 with a focus on learner-centered, topic-based approach, using English as the medium of instruction. Employing interviews and classroom observations\(^7\), the researcher looked at the three groups engaged in policy implementation including policy makers, department administrators, and teachers.

The findings provided evidence of discrepancies between the views of policy makers and of administrators, and between those of policy makers and of teachers. Policy makers stated they supported open-ended and abstract policies to provide colleges and teachers with some flexibility and autonomy. In contrast, administrators emphasized one intended outcome, namely, learners’ high exam scores, which greatly influenced teachers’ perceptions and instruction. In addition, they offered teachers only limited resources to help implement the policy. Extensive class observations and interviews of

\(^7\) Four policy makers and six department administrators were interviewed. 248 teachers participated in the surveys and two teachers were observed while teaching in the classroom and interviewed after the class.
two teachers showed that rather than aligning with the policy makers’ expectations, instruction actually focused on classroom realities, specifically those considering student and departmental factors. Most teachers lacked a thorough awareness of the policy and taught traditionally, resisting the CLT-based policies.

Wang’s study is important in showing the realities of any curriculum implementation by examining involvement at three hierarchical levels. Specifically, it demonstrated the importance of middle level administrators (i.e., department heads) in offering motivation and resources to assist teachers as they implemented the policy. In addition, Wang identified five factors, both external and internal, as important predictors of teachers’ policy implementation: resource support, teaching methods, teaching experiences, language proficiency, and professional development needs. Most informatively, this study demonstrated the importance of providing implementers with appropriate professional development in order for teachers to increase their awareness of the policy and also learn to teach within the reform context.

Unlike the two studies above, Carless (2001) reported a case study in which educational reform efforts had a positive impact on one English teacher’s instructional practices. Announced by the Ministry of Education of Hong Kong in 1994, the reform, identified as Target-Oriented Curriculum (TOC)\textsuperscript{8}, had much in common with CLT, with a specific focus on task-based instruction and students’ individualized learning needs and styles. Using interviews, classroom observation, and an attitudinal scale, Carless found

\textsuperscript{8} According to Carless (2001), TOC is an integrated curriculum framework, proposing the alignment of targets (“a common direction for learning for all schools in Hong Kong”), tasks (“purposeful and contextualized learning activities through which pupils progress towards the targets”), and assessment, and thus linking teaching, learning, and assessment (p. 356). Carless stated that TOC is similar to CLT in that it focuses on task-based and learner-centered instruction and that it posits one of the major fundamental ways of learning as “communicating through receiving and sharing meaning.”
that one teacher’s favorable qualification coupled with appropriate institutional support was key to successful implementation of the reform. The teacher had a high level of English proficiency and professional training\(^9\), and most importantly, positive attitudes towards both teaching and the reform initiative. Furthermore, contextual factors helped her embrace the innovation: the principal allowed for flexibility and autonomy in teaching, and an external teacher educator/researcher encouraged her to implement the innovation.

Carless’ research, while limited in scope, is important in that, unlike Hiramatsu (2005) and Wang (2006), it indicates that a government-initiated innovation can be successfully enacted within a teacher’s instructional practices. On the other hand, like Hiramatsu (2005) and Wang (2006), Carless also highlighted the importance of teachers’ attitudes and capabilities as well as contextual support in enacting curricular reforms.

A number of studies about curricular reform implementation in the EFL contexts, including the three projects described above, confirm the critical role of teachers and contextual factors in curricular policy implementation. Specifically, they support the notion that appropriate professional development opportunities are essential to help teachers understand and enact any new curriculum reform effort. Yet little research has been conducted on such teacher education programs; thus, it is necessary to investigate to what extent these programs contribute to transforming teachers’ pedagogical concepts and instructional practices to support such reforms.

---

\(^9\) The teacher graduated B. Ed from a British university and was studying for an M. Ed in Hong Kong.
2.1.4. Implementation of CLT-based Curriculum in South Korea

Research has been conducted on curricular reforms in South Korea in terms of teachers’ perceptions and practices in relation to CLT (Choi, 2000; Guilloteaux, 2004; H.-R. Kim, 2004; Li, 1998), the TETE policy (Jeon, 2008; S.-Y. Kim, 2002; Y. Kim, 2002; Liu et al, 2004; S. O. Park, 1996), and task-based language learning (Jeon & Hahn, 2006). Recently, E.-J. Kim (2008) examined students’ perceptions about the CLT-based curriculum as well as teachers’ understanding and classroom instruction. Seven representative studies are described below.

Li (1998) studied teachers’ perceived difficulties in implementing CLT in South Korea through surveys and interviews with 18 secondary school teachers. Li initially presented a definition of CLT from the literature: “1) a focus on communicative functions; 2) a focus on meaningful tasks rather than on language per se (e.g., grammar or vocabulary study); 3) efforts to make tasks and language relevant to a target group of learners through an analysis of genuine, realistic situations; 4) the use of authentic, from-life materials; 5) the use of group activities; 6) the attempt to create a secure, nonthreatening atmosphere” (p. 679). Then Li reported findings on factors mentioned as barriers to enacting CLT-based lessons. Teacher factors such as inadequate English proficiency and lack of training in CLT were most frequently mentioned as barriers to enacting CLT. Contextual factors were also named as major obstacles to CLT implementation, including large class size, grammar-centered exams, and lack of administrative support and teacher training. Furthermore, students’ low proficiency in English, lack of motivation for developing communicative competence, and resistance to class participation were also reported as additional barriers to embracing CLT. Li (1998)
was the first researcher to examine teachers’ awareness of the difficulties of enacting CLT within the South Korean context. However, rather than analyzing their actual classroom practices, this study merely investigated the preconceptions about CLT at the time the 6th curriculum was announced, but not yet enacted.

Choi (2000) surveyed 97 Korean secondary school teachers to identify their beliefs about CLT and their classroom practices. Unlike Li’s study, the teachers held positive beliefs about CLT. However, teachers reported that their classroom practices actually focused on reading skills, which they believed were effective and essential for test preparation. The findings showed that the discrepancy between beliefs and practices in relation to CLT resulted from their own low English speaking ability together with institutional constraints such as large class size and lack of authentic materials.

Concerning task-based instruction as emphasized in the 7th English curriculum for Korea, Jeon and Hahn (2006) examined teachers’ perceptions and practices by surveying 228 teachers at 38 middle schools and high schools. As with Choi (2000), the findings noted the gap between teachers’ positive perceptions about TBLT and their negative views concerning actual implementation in their classrooms. The teachers stated that they were reluctant to use TBLT due to their inadequate knowledge of concrete teaching methods of TBLT and limited target language proficiency. Additional impediments to conducting TBLT included students who were not familiar with TBLT, textbook materials that lacked resources for implementing TBLT, and large class size. Jeon and Hahn’s study highlights the importance of providing teachers with professional development activities to

---

10 Jeon and Hahn (2006) maintained that the task-based view of language teaching is based on CLT methodology in terms of providing learners with opportunities for communicative language use in meaningful activities and learner-centered educational philosophy. However, in their synthesis of previous studies, they reported that TBLT is content-oriented and consists of particular components such as goal, procedure, and specific outcome.
enhance their knowledge about TBLT, language ability and confidence and help actually implement it.

Implementation of the TETE policy, which is a major principle of the Korean curricular reform, was examined by S.-Y. Kim (2002). By surveying primary and secondary school teachers (14 elementary, 5 middle school, and 34 high school teachers), her study specifically explored anxiety causing variables concerning teaching English through English (i.e., school level, gender, major, teaching experiences, and the frequency of classroom English use), and also the effects of teaching English through English on learners and teachers. The findings indicated that teachers who used English more frequently in their classroom felt less anxious about the TETE policy and perceived that using classroom English had beneficial effects on themselves as well as the learners. In addition, they reported difficulties implementing the policy due to learners’ low motivation and contextual restrictions such as rigorous college entrance exams and large class size. Most importantly, teachers’ own low levels of oral English proficiency and the lack of teacher education programs were revealed as barriers to teaching English through English. Despite the importance of examining the implementation of the TETE policy, as with Choi (2000) and Jeon and Hahn (2006), S.-Y. Kim’s study only utilized surveys and failed to triangulate multiple data sources such as interviews and classroom observations to ensure the findings and gain more insights into teachers’ instruction under the curricular reform efforts.

Liu, Ahn, Baek, and Han (2004) investigated high school teachers’ use of English under the TETE policy. Through observing classes and surveying both the teachers and the students, they analyzed actual classroom discourse in terms of code-switching
practices and the function of teachers’ use of English and Korean. The teachers’ average English use was 32% of the entire teacher talk, which was lower than the amount that both the teachers and the students believed appropriate (about half). Teachers employed Korean to explain grammar and vocabulary, provide background information, and to stress important points. More importantly, the results confirmed that teachers’ beliefs and L2 proficiency levels influenced their use of English. That is, teachers who had higher English proficiency and believed that using L2 promotes students’ learning tended to use English more frequently than those who had lower English language proficiency. Despite the significance of analyzing actual classroom interactions and confirming the impact of teachers’ pedagogical values and English ability on teaching English through English, this study primarily examined the frequency and functions of teachers’ using Korean and English. In addition, it failed to explain other important factors that might influence teachers’ English use and classroom practices such as teachers’ biographies and acknowledgement of the contexts in which they teach.

More recently, E.-J. Kim (2008) explored to what extent a mandated CLT-based curriculum, featuring learner-centered, task-based instruction carried out through English to enhance learners’ communicative competence, was being implemented in South Korea. She specifically focused on secondary English teachers’ perceptions and classroom practices as well as students’ perspectives of their teachers’ classroom teaching. Two middle school English teachers and seven students participated in the study and the data were collected from interviews, classroom observations, and related documents. The two teachers’ implementation styles differed; whereas the more novice teacher sometimes employed communicative activities and held conflicting beliefs about English language
learning (e.g. the importance of learning language use and function vs. mastering grammar as a prerequisite to communication), the veteran teacher consistently taught very traditionally by employing repetition drills.

However, the findings based on the activity theory (Engeström, 1987, 1993, 1999a) indicated that both teachers experienced contradictions between the curricular reform mandated by the Ministry of Education and their implementation of the reform in the classroom; they taught rather traditionally, largely through choral readings and grammar explanation. In particular, their teaching was influenced by their beliefs about language learning and teaching, their apprenticeship of observation, their lack of confidence in their own English language ability, and insufficient understanding of the CLT-based curriculum. For example, both teachers believed that teacher-centered instruction focusing on mastering grammar must precede authentic communication. Furthermore, the exam-oriented institutional and social milieu served to justify their focus on the textbook and traditional instruction. The students also set their main lesson objective as passing school exams, thus regarding the goal of the curricular reform (developing communicative competence) and its main instructional means (communicative activities) as insignificant for their purposes.

This study is valuable in that, by including extensive interviews and classroom observations and focusing on teachers’ and students’ voices, it demonstrated the need for localizing western-based CLT in order for it to be applicable within a local context. Also, it underscores the importance of teacher beliefs in implementing curricular reforms and suggests the need for appropriate teacher education programs in support of enacting implementation.
In contrast with the studies above, H.-R. Kim (2004) modeled lessons of CLT, in which the researcher, herself, demonstrated the teacher’s role as compatible with CLT (provider, communicator, collaborator and facilitator). As a participant researcher, she taught an English conversation class for fourteen students (three 6th, five 7th, and six 8th graders) registered in a special four-week program (twenty 100-minute English lessons total). While half of the lessons were committed to covering a book chapter, the other half focused on poems, picture books, mini-lessons, and dialogue journal writing. The teacher intended to reform her practices and promote learners’ active participation. She provided new class materials that she thought were appropriate and that her students also desired to study. By communicating in English with students inside and outside the classroom through communicative activities and dialogue journals respectively, H.-R. Kim helped her students learn more actively and promoted the process of their English learning.

H.-R. Kim’s study is significant in that it provides a successful case of implementing CLT in the Korean secondary school context. The teacher was knowledgeable of CLT and enthusiastic about implementing CLT through various methods. However, it should be noted that the context of H.-R. Kim’s study was far different from that existent in most secondary schools. This study involved a special conversation class, convened only temporarily, and thus was free from those contextual constraints of most secondary schools such as exams, textbooks, and large class size.\footnote{Numerous studies have indicated that teachers consider a large class size to be one of the crucial contextual constraints to implementing CLT in the classroom context (Choi, 2000; Holliday, 1994; Jeon & Hahn, 2006; S.-Y. Kim, 2002; Li, 1998). H.-R. Kim (2004) conducted a special class that was half the size of usual classes, which may well have been one of the factors that allowed for her communicative teaching success (e.g., easier to manage communicative instructions and give feedback, less noise or distraction).}

The above-mentioned studies, with the exception of H.-R. Kim (2004), reveal that in the face of CLT-based curricular reform, Korean secondary teachers’ beliefs and/or
instructional practices were inconsistent with the principles of mandated curricular reforms that proposed learner-centered and task-based communicative activities conducted in English to develop learners’ communicative competence. These discrepancies were blamed on factors in four areas: (1) teachers’ beliefs about language learning and teaching, their socialization to traditional ways of teaching, their low confidence in their own oral proficiency, and their misunderstandings about CLT, (2) students’ beliefs, socialization, low proficiency in English, lack of motivation for improving communicative competence, and resistance to class participation, (3) institutional constraints such as large class size, and mandated exams that focus on grammar, reading, and listening, and (4) lack of professional development opportunities for learning how to implement CLT. These studies also suggest that Korean teachers’ understanding of CLT is central to the success of this innovation, and its implementation must be gradual and adjusted to the institutional issues embedded in EFL instructional contexts.

Although all of these studies pointed out the importance of teacher education in curricular reform implementation in the South Korean context, little research has been conducted concerning pre- and in-service teacher education programs within this curricular innovation context. Because the practicum allows for the first entree into the actual implementation of mandated educational reforms, it represents a particularly important site for teacher learning within the curricular reform efforts in Korea. Research focusing on the practicum experience is essential because it has the potential to influence the EFL teacher educational process at the start of new teachers’ careers. Thus, this study examines how CLT-based curricular reform is instantiated in the student teachers’ practicum activities and their eventual teaching practices.
2.2. Pre-service Teacher Education

This section describes prior research concerning pre-service teacher education as related to teacher beliefs and mentoring. Then, it reviews studies about teacher preparation programs in South Korea and other EFL contexts.

2.2.1. Teacher Beliefs and Teacher Preparation Programs

Pre-service teacher education generally takes place in two contexts: university coursework and student teaching experience. Ideally, student teachers who have learned theories of language learning and teaching from their coursework apply them to their practicum teaching. However, student teachers’ experiences and beliefs that they held prior to entering pre-service teacher education have been reported to greatly impact teacher learning and instructional practices (Borg, 2005; Johnson, 1992, 1994; Lortie, 2002; Street, 1999). This section reviews the formation of teacher beliefs and the impact of those beliefs on teaching practices.

Prior to formal teacher education, teachers experience an apprenticeship of observation (Lortie, 2002) from the perspective of students: they observe what their teachers do and say, and become socialized into daily routines and teaching rituals that represent normative ways of acting and interacting in schools. The apprenticeship of observation tends to create a view of teaching that is uneven in quality and incomplete. As Lortie (2002) stated, “what students learn about teaching, then, is intuitive and imitative rather than explicit and analytical; it is based on individual personalities rather than pedagogical principles” (p.62). Nevertheless, these early socializing experiences continue throughout teachers’ careers and provide a continuing impact over teachers’ pedagogical
perspectives, beliefs and practices (Schempp & Graber, 1992).

In addition to the apprenticeship of observation, personal experiences are also known to have a major impact on the construction of beliefs and preconceptions about teaching and learning that pre-service teachers bring with them to their training (Almarza, 1996; Borg, 2005, Connelly & Clandinin, 1994; Richardson, 1996). Such personal experiences include informal learning experiences (e.g., language learning experiences) and life experiences (e.g., previous work experiences and their own unique cultural backgrounds). Furthermore, interest in and knowledge of the subject has been found to influence the formation of student teachers’ beliefs (Borg, 2005; Virta, 2002).

Research on teacher beliefs has suggested that these beliefs operate as a filter through which all aspects of instructional thoughts, judgments, and decisions are made (Johnson, 1994; Nespor, 1987; Nisbett & Ross, 1980; Pajares, 1992). In fact, Johnson (1994) found that, “teacher’s beliefs are inextricably complex, grounded in emotionally laden episodic memories from prior experiences, relatively stable and resistant to change, yet instrumental in shaping how teachers interpret what goes on in their classrooms and how they will react and respond to it” (p.5). In the case of student teachers, their beliefs serve as filters for understanding program content and the teaching context, and guide their initial teaching (Feimen-Nemser & Buchmann, 1986, 1989; Hollingsworth, 1989; Staton & Hunt, 1992).

Pajares (1992) and Richards (1998) pointed out the context-specific nature of teacher beliefs and argued that it is crucial to examine the context where they learned, and where they teach as well. Johnson (1994) found evidence of the importance of context in that the ESL teachers’ previous language learning experiences, particularly in formal
language classroom settings, significantly influenced their beliefs concerning second
language learning and teaching, and teaching practices. Four student teachers in an MA
TESOL program in the U.S. appeared to acknowledge the limitations of the teacher-
centered didactic models that they had experienced as learners. However, when they taught,
they returned to those models due to a lack of alternative models available in the teaching
context.

Because of student teachers’ apprenticeship of observation and their beliefs, they
often have difficulty transferring what they have learned from the coursework into their
classroom practices (Hodges, 1982; Hollingsworth, 1989; Richards & Crookes, 1988;
Ross, 1987, 1988; Staton & Hunt, 1992). Furthermore, several studies, based on self
reports of student teachers and teachers regarding the impact of coursework on their
teaching, found little influence from their university coursework (Clark, smith, Newby &
Student teachers tend to find discrepancies between theory and practice, considering
knowledge learned from their coursework too theoretical and not applicable to actual
classroom teaching. Also, they often regard alternative models of teaching as peripheral
(John, 1996) and therefore easily depended on teaching as they had been taught.

The participating student teachers in this study already held their own beliefs,
experiences, and learned theories regarding L2 learning and teaching, and concepts of
educational innovation. Identifying how these student teachers understand and then
implement the curricular reforms within the curricular innovation context may help to
show the link between their beliefs and practices.
2.2.2. Mentoring

Teacher mentoring plays an important role in student teachers’ learning during the practicum, interacting with their pre-existing beliefs, and thus affecting their instruction. This research is interested in the impact of mentoring on student teachers’ concept development during the events of the practicum experience where teams of mentor teacher and student teachers are engaged in practicum activities. Thus, it is useful to review the literature on the definition of teacher mentoring, models of mentoring, mentor roles and the influence of mentoring on the student-teaching experience.

Research has long indicated that mentor teachers or cooperating teachers greatly impact student teachers’ attitudes and teaching practices (Bunting, 1988; Funk & Long, 1982; McIntrye & Morris, 1980; Staton & Hunt, 1992; Staton-Spicer & Darling, 1986). Mentoring in teacher education has been identified as a relationship in which an experienced teacher supports and guides the development of a new teacher (Sorcinelli & Yun, 2007). Ideally, mentoring is expected to introduce student teachers into the ‘community of practice’ of the teaching profession (Wenger, 1998) in a supportive and considerate way (Kwan & Lopez-Real, 2005). In a narrow sense, mentoring is a means to help novice members develop professional skills (Lucas, 2001). More broadly, it is viewed as going “beyond the mere transfer of knowledge and skill, to include technical, organizational and career/personal life issues” (Clawson, 1996, p.9). Finally, mentoring aims to facilitate mentees’ self-directedness and autonomy to help them work independently through learning from the mentor (Chovanec, 1998). This perspective centers on developing mentees as reflective practitioners rather than merely training them to acquire new skills.
Wallace (1991) proposes three models on which teacher education has been based and organized, and thus would provide insights into mentoring models for language teachers12: (1) the *craft model*, in which a mentor functions as a role model and the master teacher is to be emulated by his/her mentee as the apprentice; (2) the *applied science model*, where teacher learners are expected to learn to teach through attaining theoretical knowledge based on the findings of scientific research and then put the findings into practice; (3) the *reflective model*, which enables teacher learners to gain their professional ability through a cycle of practice and reflection regarding their knowledge, beliefs, and instruction.

Wallace notes problems with the craft and applied science models. The craft model demonstrates a typical view of mentoring as top-down and has been frequently utilized in teacher education programs. However, this model primarily assumes teacher learners as passive, and mentor teachers as socializing agents for their student teachers’ passage into the existing teaching profession which would then reflect the status quo of the educational system. Educators also have criticized that the craft model failed to promote student teachers’ self-directed professional development (Stones & Morris, 1972; Zeichner & Liston, 1987). Concerning the applied science model, Wallace pointed out the gap between research and practice which fails to solve practical issues that teachers confront in their classroom. Therefore, Wallace suggested a reflective model as a solution to second and foreign language education. In this particular model, rather than passively receiving knowledge provided in their coursework and by mentor teachers,
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12 Wallace’s models are similar to Maynard and Furlong (1993)’s three mentoring models in general education (apprenticeship, competence, and reflective model).
student teachers are expected to critically reflect their own teaching concepts and beliefs, and teaching practices.

It has been pointed out that language teachers need to develop professional knowledge and expertise through reflection (Celce-Murcia & Olshtain, 2000; Freeman, 1998; Johnson, 1999; Kamhi-Stein & Galván, 1997). Dewey (1933) defined reflection as “active, persistent and careful consideration of any belief or supposed form of knowledge in the light of the grounds that support it and the further conclusions to which it tends” (p. 9). Schön (1983, 1987) extended Dewey’s notion of reflection with the concept of reflection-on-action (reflection before or after a lesson) and reflection-in-action (reflection during the lesson). In addition, Flowerdew (1998) viewed reflection as fundamental to the L2 teacher education program, stating that, “a reflective approach toward teacher education encourages teachers to take responsibility for and ownership of their own professional growth and autonomy” (p.529) Furthermore, Zeichner and Liston (1987) indicated that reflection empowers teachers to develop autonomous teaching and take part in policy-making as well as understanding their instruction and instructional context.

In the process of critical reflection within the practicum, the mentor acts as a ‘critical friend’ to the mentees, helping them reflect on their practices in a meaningful and critical way (Schön, 1987). Both mentor and mentee operate as reflective practitioners (Braund, 2001) to critically assess pupils’ learning and to plan subsequent instruction (Kwan & Lopez-Real, 2005). As such, the reflective model enables student teachers to broaden their teaching perspectives and try out new ideas, and to set somewhat reciprocal relationships with the mentor teacher.
Numerous effective mentor roles have been proposed, including mentors as critical friends and reflective practitioners. Hopper (2001) depicts a mentor as an ‘equal partner’ working with the student teacher, not only as an ‘observer’ of student teaching. An equal partner is one who can share a variety of strategies in a specific teaching context such as shared practice, cooperative instruction and co-analysis of lessons with the mentees. In order to play successful mentor roles, Hopper further argues, “mentors need to support and encourage their trainees, listen to them, empathize, evaluate and reflect with them, organize, be flexible and approachable, and offer time and commitment to trainees” (p.216). To this end, Hopper suggests that mentors need to play other roles such as a counselor, a role model, an adviser, a quality controller and an assessor. Overall, research about effective mentors has shown that mentors ideally should both support and challenge student teachers (Elliot & Calderhead, 1993).

On the other hand, as Staton and Hunt (1992) summarized, mentor teachers are different in terms of their perception about their roles (Griffin, 1989), their willingness to give feedback (Richardson-Koehler, 1988), and their readiness to turn the ownership of their classroom over to the student teacher (Goodman, 1988; Griffin, 1989; Hollingsworth, 1989). In fact, Richards and Crookes (1988) noted, “classroom teachers are usually not well prepared for the task of supervising a student teacher” (p. 23). For example, some mentor teachers may be unwilling or unable to analyze their own or their student teachers’ instruction and give limited feedback that centers on activities immediately enacted in the classroom (Griffin, 1989; Livingston & Borko, 1989; Richardson-Koehler, 1988). Also, student teachers may feel frustrated by a lack of commitment on the part of mentor teachers to help them overcome problematic aspects of
their teaching (Key, 1998). This lack of mentor teachers’ appropriate guidance can have a negative influence on student teachers’ reflective practice (Borko & Mayfield, 1995).

As illustrated above, mentors function as role models and greatly impact student teachers’ learning during the practicum. These influences interact with the student teachers’ biographies as well as the professional and socio-political contexts where mentors and mentees work together. Specifically, the EFL curricular reform context in South Korea where this study is situated will most certainly influence the ways in which student teachers learn to teach with assistance from their mentors. Considering that little research has been conducted on this topic, one of the foci of this dissertation is on the role of the mentor teachers in helping EFL student teachers understand and enact curricular reform efforts.

### 2.2.3. Pre-service Teacher Education in EFL contexts

Research on pre-service teacher education in the EFL contexts such as China, Taiwan, Hong Kong, and Japan has generally focused on the planning processes of teacher preparation programs (Z. Wu, 2005), student teachers’ perceptions of pre-service teacher education programs (Pennington & Urmston, 1998), or the evaluation of teacher education programs (Luo, 2003; S.-H. Wu, 2007). More relevant to the present dissertation are studies on teacher development in terms of identity formation (Sakamoto, 2004) and teacher beliefs (Mak, 2004), thus these will be reviewed below.

Sakamoto (2004) investigated pre-service teachers’ personal and professional development in terms of language ability and identity formation. 28 student teachers enrolled in a high school English teacher education program at a Japanese women’s
completed questionnaires, took English proficiency tests, participated in interviews, and completed portfolios. Using social learning theory (Wenger, 1998), Sakamoto traced these student teachers’ growth during their coursework and teaching practicum. University courses stressed theories of learning such as social participation and identity formation as well as teaching methodologies. Also, activities such as journal writing, reflective reports, and student-teacher conferences enabled the student teachers to reconsider their learning experiences and to develop a deeper understanding of themselves as individuals and social beings. In so doing, student teachers realized multiple identities as members of communities of learners, L2 users, and teachers. In the practicum, they identified useful strategies and resources to resolve problems they had confronted. Through learning and teaching activities in the coursework and the practicum, these student teachers were able to gain confidence and more actively participate in their envisioned community of practice.

This study provided evidence of how student teachers can make efforts to become more competent L2 users and teaching professionals within communities of practice. Specifically, however, Sakamoto described the process in which three representative student teacher groups made enormous investments into learning English, thus assuming that improvement in student teachers’ own English ability was considered to be the most important component of being a good teacher of English.

Mak (2004) explored the development of Hong Kong pre-service teachers’ beliefs about CLT and classroom language choices. Five student teachers in a one-year postgraduate diploma program in education (PDGE) were interviewed, engaged in

\[13\] The researcher stated that the university is somewhat low-ranked in Japan.
informal conversations, took a belief-inventory questionnaire, and were observed and completed stimulated recall sessions.

The findings revealed that practicum activities, including micro-teaching activities, role plays, and post-teaching conferences with the course instructor, played an important role in altering their beliefs. In addition, the complex relationship between the student teachers’ beliefs about CLT and classroom practices was also revealed. While their pre-existing beliefs, based on their learning experiences and cultural backgrounds, were influential in shaping their perceptions of CLT, their beliefs either facilitated or obstructed the implementation of CLT. For example, two teachers’ personal experiences in traditional teacher-fronted classrooms during their secondary education facilitated their willingness to adopt CLT because they regarded CLT as more interesting than the traditional approach that they had experienced as learners. Other student teachers failed to implement CLT and instead gradually returned to teacher-centered teaching, indicating that their concern about surviving in the classroom outweighed their beliefs regarding CLT.

Most of the student teachers viewed their mentors as role models and their instructional practices as evidence to reinforce their existing beliefs. For example, observing mentor teachers whose lessons were not very communicative solidified their beliefs about teacher-fronted classes. Finally, while the student teachers agreed that English should be the language of instruction, most used Chinese during English lessons by the end of the teacher education program. Specifically, they thought that Chinese instruction was beneficial for weak learners. Mak (2004) argued that culturally based
beliefs in the importance of acquiring accurate knowledge of abstract rules in L2 learning justified these student teachers’ preference of Chinese as a medium of instruction.\textsuperscript{14}

Mak’s study is noteworthy in its in-depth and longitudinal observation of participating student teachers’ experiences over a whole year program composed of coursework and practicum.\textsuperscript{15} This study demonstrates how student teachers’ beliefs about CLT, and language choices, resulted from their prior experiences and cultural background, and influenced their instructional practices. The findings also show the importance of critical reflection on the development of participants’ beliefs and of providing mentor teachers with professional development opportunities prior to actually mentoring student teachers.

\textbf{2.2.4. Pre-service Teacher Education in South Korea}

For the past decade, studies of pre-service English teacher education in Korea have been increasingly focused on the university curricula including coursework and practicum. Several studies examined perceptions of professors, in-service teachers, pre-service teachers, and pupils concerning the curricula, mostly utilizing surveys (Chang, Jung, & Choi, 2008; Y. Kim, 1997; Woo, 2000). In addition, student teachers’ practicum experiences have been studied qualitatively (Koh, 2003; S. Lee, 2007). Furthermore, pre-service teacher education curricula were critically and/or historically reviewed (Kwon, 1997; Kwon, 2000a; H.-S. Lee, 1999). Among these, five representative studies are presented below.

\textsuperscript{14} The student teachers also felt more comfortable using Chinese for making jokes and rapport-building.

\textsuperscript{15} In more detail, the program was comprised of 7-week methodology course, 4-week practicum, 14-week methodology course, and 4-week practicum, followed by 6-week English immersion program.
Kwon (2000a) reported changes in the education of pre-service EFL teachers since the late 1990s, and also commented on the social and pedagogical environment that brought about the changes. He criticized the traditional curriculum due to the relative dominance of courses offered in the area of linguistics and literature (61.2%), compared with the relative small number of courses in ELT pedagogy and language skills (38.8%). He also pointed out that professors in literature (46%) and linguistics (29%) dominated the departments, with a smaller percentage of teachers from the discipline of ELT (25%).

Kwon contended that the changing social and educational needs, such as CLT-based English curricula and communicatively capable English learners, motivated changes in Korea’s EFL teacher training toward developing linguistically and pedagogically competent teachers. Kwon noted that in 1996, the Ministry of Education asked experts in ELT to produce a new curriculum for pre-service teachers, resulting in more focus on ELT pedagogy and English skills (66.7%) than on linguistics and literature (33.3%). In 1997, the Ministry recommended that colleges of Education employ the new curriculum, and the survey conducted in 1999 revealed that the recommended curriculum was implemented to some degree as changes were made in universities’ pre-service teacher education curricula (ELT pedagogy and English skills took 50.3% and linguistics and literature 49.7%). He maintained that more change was required in the quantity and quality of ELT faculty, as well as the curriculum of pre-service teacher education.

Chang, Jung, and Choi (2008) examined perceptions that professors and student teachers hold about the pre-service teacher education curriculum, specifically focusing on developing teachers with the linguistic ability to teach English through English. Both professors and student teachers agreed on the importance of practicing teaching,
including micro-teaching and practicum, and suggested extended time for student teaching. On the other hand, discrepancies were found in terms of student teachers’ needs for professors’ more active engagement in feedback about their micro-teaching, and more practicum supervision such as supporting classroom materials and resources. In order to enhance student teachers’ abilities in English and to teach English through English, the participants suggested increasing courses which promoted language skills. Also, they suggested that some university courses should be conducted in English.

Using surveys, Y. Kim (1997) investigated the perceptions of student teachers about their classroom observation/micro-teaching activity, as well as those of their middle school pupils. The student teachers were positive about the activity in terms of effectiveness for pupils’ learning, confidence in teaching, and understanding the teaching profession and pupils’ behavior. Most of the pupils also reported that the micro-teaching helped them practice speaking English more, although some pupils pointed out that they had problems with classroom management. This study provided quantitative evidence of the effectiveness of the observation/teaching activity, which in fact was then adopted into pre-service teacher education in the late 1990s and in early 2000s. However, like Chang, Jung, and Choi’s study (2008), this quantitative study, using surveys exclusively, provided collective portraits of the perceptions about the pre-service teacher education program rather than focusing on the individual student teachers’ learning and the specific context in which such learning occurs.

---

16 This specific activity was planned for student teachers a year or two before they actually participated in the practicum. The activity was experimentally planned to be conducted for five weeks each year (two hours a week), during the two consecutive years. Each student teacher observed the English teachers’ lessons, and then, for about five to ten minutes per class hour, the student teachers taught the speaking sections of the textbook to groups of five to six pupils.
Qualitative research about English pre-service teachers’ perceptions of their practicum experiences was conducted by S. Lee (2007) who specifically focused on their learning and challenges. The participants were 43 English student teachers (13 male and 30 female) who taught in secondary schools (27 in nine middle schools and 16 in twenty high schools) during their four-week internship. Analysis of interviews and reflective journal entries revealed student teachers’ overall satisfaction with their practicum experiences. Specifically, they appeared successful in developing pupil rapport and engagement in class, and received positive reactions from their pupils about their teaching. However, these student teachers reported difficulties in classroom management, time management, and with teaching various levels of pupils. Most of the participants (84%) felt satisfied with their mentor teachers’ support, whereas others stated they experienced a lack of appropriate feedback and guidance from unengaged mentor teachers.

Although S. Lee did not specifically focus on the implementation of the curricular mandates, aspects related to the policy (e.g., CLT, TETE) are evident in the findings. The student teachers reported that they learned about the realities of classroom instruction and thus modified their idealistic views of teaching into more practical ones. For example, three participants doubted the effectiveness of CLT in their teaching of multi-level large classes. Moreover, whereas three participants reported their instructional successes in teaching English through English (TETE), most of the participants perceived that the TETE policy might not be realistic due to pupils’ low English proficiency levels. Some journal entries revealed that mentor teachers’ traditional teaching methods and comments
against the TETE policy reinforced some student teachers’ beliefs about L2 learning and teaching, and impacted their instructional practices.

S. Lee’s study is noteworthy since it describes various aspects of student teachers’ practicum experiences, including what they learned and where the challenges were. However, she only examined student teachers’ self-reports about their perceptions and experiences, without actually observing interactions of student teachers with pupils and with mentor teachers, which would have provided in-depth evidence of individual student teachers’ experiences as situated in their instructional context.

Koh (2003) conducted a case study about pre-service teacher education specifically focusing on the EFL curricular reform context in Korea. This study illustrated a student teacher’s effort to realize the learner-centered classroom mandated in the 7th national curriculum, particularly centering on teacher role. As both a student teacher and a researcher, she conducted action research while teaching, observing mentor teachers’ instructional practices and examining their students’ reactions. Koh demonstrated the possibilities of implementing learner-centered class in one of her lessons. She conducted small group activities in which students cooperated to perform four tasks. Then she analyzed the classroom discourse by teacher roles such as a guide, helper, and/or facilitator. Although the students had not experienced much group work, their survey response about the lesson indicated overall positive reactions toward the small group collaborative lesson. In this lesson, group members helped each other carry out the tasks, despite problems regarding noise level, difficult tasks, and some members’ ineffective and partial participation in the tasks.
This study suggests that the student teacher had positive beliefs about learner-centered instruction and attempted to realize her concept of learner-centered instruction in her classroom instruction. However, one limitation is that the study focuses on a single lesson. Thus, it is impossible to infer whether this lesson is representative of her teaching or only a one time special effort to create a learner-centered classroom. Furthermore, the study did not examine activities outside the classroom, or the mentor teachers, peers, and other contextual factors that may have influenced her teaching.

This brief review of the research concerning pre-service teacher education in Korea suggests that changes in coursework and the practicum are desired in order to improve both student teachers’ ability to teach English through English and their instructional skills. Studies of the practicum experiences indicate that efforts are made only temporarily to implement the mandated curriculum at an individual level. However, none of this research examined the influence of student teachers’ biographies, the nature of the practicum activities, or the professional and social contexts within which the practicum took place. To fill the research gap, this dissertation investigates how individual student teachers develop particular teaching concepts and practices in the course of the practicum, specifically under the current curricular reform efforts.

2.3. Teacher Learning Based on Sociocultural Theory and Activity Theory

This section defines the sociocultural theoretical framework that informs this dissertation and reviews studies that have examined teacher learning and conceptual development from a sociocultural perspective. In this section, sociocultural theory (SCT) and the notion of concept development are presented first, followed by related studies.
Then, activity theory (AT), specifically the activity system model (Engeström, 1987, 1993, 1999a) and the notion of inner contradictions within the activity system are introduced.

2.3.1. Theory of Learning and Concept Development

SCT is based on the writings of the Russian psychologist, Lev Semenovich Vygotsky (1978, 1986) which have been further developed by numerous scholars such as Luria (1973, 1976, 1979, 1982), Wertsch (1985, 1991, 1998, 2000), and Lantolf (1994, 2000, 2001, 2004). SCT views all human action as mediated by tools; that is, people participate in cultural practices through their use of tools or mediational means. These tools include cultural artifacts, activities and concepts (Lantolf & Thorne, 2006) exemplified in the case of teacher learning by journals, reflection, and learner-centered instruction. The theory also proposes that the function of these tools is not intrinsic, but culturally and historically developed through repeated use towards a specific goal (Lantolf & Thorne, 2006). For example, the function of journaling in teacher education programs has developed differently depending upon cultural context, and historically constructed through continual usage.

SCT stresses the role of human mediation in learning. More specifically, it explains that the role of more knowledgeable members is to assist novices, so that the novices can develop their ability through the guidance of the knowledgeable members. For example, when mediated by mentor teachers and more capable peers, student teachers will move dialogically from guided or collaborative action by objects (e.g., lesson plans, textbooks) or others (e.g., mentor teachers, peer student teachers, other self)
to independent action. This development, from object-, and/or other-, to self-regulation over their learning, takes place in their Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD), which is defined as, “the distance between the actual developmental level as determined by independent problem solving and the level of potential development as determined through problem solving under adult guidance, or in collaboration with more capable peers” (Vygotsky, 1978, p. 86). Providing assistance within student teachers’ ZPD may help them value and externalize their practical knowledge, which teachers develop, not only through the learning of abstract and theoretical knowledge, but also through their lived experiences (Freeman & Johnson, 1998; Johnson, 2006; Johnson & Golombek, 2003).

Furthermore, SCT views cognitive development as moving from the external, social, and interpersonal levels to the internal, individual, and intrapersonal levels of activities. This is characterized by the notion of internalization (Vygotsky, 1978), which is a complicated, dialogic process of transformation of self and activity, rather than the simplistic acceptance of or replacement of skills or information from the outside in (Valsineer & Van der Veer, 2002). As internalization occurs, it transforms teachers’ understanding of their teaching and is manifest in their actual classroom practices (Johnson & Golombek, 2003).

Throughout the internalization process, human language or speech plays an important role. According to Vygotsky (1978, 1986), a word reflects consciousness, and a word or human speech is believed to be one of the most essential mediational means for gaining self-regulation and development of higher mental cognition. For example, as teachers learn about teaching, they verbalize their thoughts in speech, which can be a
measuring device for emerging control over their learning and/or their development as teachers. Thus, in order to examine the participating student teachers’ development, this study analyzes student teachers’ language, including their interactional discourse with mentors, peers, and pupils.

Since this dissertation examines how student teachers internalize the central concepts of CLT as articulated in the Ministry of Education’s curricular reforms, understanding the Vygotskian notion of concept development is essential. Concepts are an important mediational means (in addition to artifacts and activities) in the relationship between people and the world (Lantolf & Thorne, 2006). The content of such concepts shapes our mental activity (Lantolf & Johnson, 2007) and helps us interconnect abstract and theoretical principles with worldly experience (Smagorinsky, Cook & Johnson, 2003). Thus, teaching concepts are presumed to mediate teacher learning by linking educational theory and classroom practices. For example, the participating student teachers were expected to learn to teach L2 using communicative tasks mediated by the concept of task-based instruction. That is, they were introduced to the concept of task-based instruction in their coursework and then were expected to apply this concept in their practicum teaching.

Vygotsky (1986) distinguished between everyday and scientific concepts. Everyday concepts are further divided into two categories—spontaneous and nonspontaneous (Lantolf & Johnson, 2007). Spontaneous concepts are those created during concrete practical experiences, and knowledge related to these concepts is often incoherent, incomplete, and inaccurate. The other form of everyday concepts is nonspontaneous, when concepts are grounded in the directly observable empirical characteristics of an object or action (Kozulin, 1995). Although nonspontaneous concepts
are deliberately taught and consciously learned, they are not always complete or coherent. Since both spontaneous and nonspontaneous concepts are tied to a specific context, they are not easily transferred to new situations. On the other hand, scientific or academic concepts are learned through formal education, and since they are based on theoretical investigation, they are presumed to be coherent, systematic and generalizable to new contexts. Thus, scientific concepts enable learners to function appropriately in a range of situations without the constraints that are typically created by everyday concepts (Lantolf & Johnson, 2007).

For instance, the scientific concept of task-based instruction can be defined as teaching L2 using tasks “where the target language is used by the learners for a communicative purpose in order to achieve an outcome” (Willis, 1996, p.53 as cited in Ministry of Education, 1998). This concept will most likely encompass all possible task-based language learning and teaching. However, some teachers may conceptualize task-based instruction as games, small group activities, and/or letting pupils do work on their own as opposed to listening to teachers’ lectures exclusively. Such everyday concepts may be learned informally through practical activity and everyday social interactions (spontaneous concepts) or intentionally taught, but not as deep knowledge of the underlying principles (non-spontaneous).

Vygotsky (1986) proposed that there is a dynamic and interdependent relationship between everyday concepts and scientific concepts. He argued that

[Spontaneous concepts] create a series of structures necessary for the evolution of a concept’s more primitive, elementary aspects, which give it body and vitality.

Scientific concepts, in turn, supply structures for the upward development of the
child’s spontaneous concepts toward consciousness and deliberate use. Scientific
concepts grow down through spontaneous concepts and spontaneous concepts
grow up through scientific concepts (Vygotsky, 1986, p.194)

Through such a dialectic perspective on the two concepts, everyday concepts,
based on daily experiences, generate the potential for the development of scientific
concepts in more formal school contexts, and scientific concepts in turn offer general
principles to strengthen everyday concepts. Vygotsky (1986) further maintained that
scientific concepts should be presented to students, specifically in ways that connect the
concepts to both the everyday knowledge and the practical activities of learners. Robbins
(2003) also argued that the extent to which instruction relates everyday concepts to
scientific concepts is important to learners’ internalization and thus essential to their
concept development. Therefore, optimal learning environments allow for the dynamic
process in which both everyday concepts and scientific concepts are taken into
consideration and interconnected, resulting in emergence of ‘true concepts’ and
transformation of learners’ thinking and practices. In the case of teacher education
programs, student teachers are expected to learn scientific teaching concepts (e.g., task-
based instruction) while specifically connecting them to their everyday concepts, with the
ultimate goal of the development of ‘true concepts’ as evidenced in their classroom
practices.

Vygotsky (1987) further identified two types of generalizations that do not gain
theoretical unity–complexes and pseudoconcepts. Complexes refer to individual
components that are linked to each other, but are not unified according to the same theme.
For instance, a teacher may learn about task-based instruction and label any activities
task-based instruction even if students neither do an actual task nor learn. Pseudoconcepts are when the individual components appear unified but are internally inconsistent. A teacher may label any group activities task-based even if some essential components such as meaningful negotiation between learners and use of L2 in solving the given tasks are not present.

Based on Vygotsky’s proposal concerning concept development in learning, Karpov (2003) made explicit what it means to learn a concept. He maintained that, “scientific concepts play such a mediational role only if they are supported by students’ mastery of relevant procedures” (p. 68). Thus learners should be explicitly told what the concept is and how to use it. Karpov also argued that procedural knowledge and conceptual knowledge need to be incorporated, so that learners are able to master the concept, transfer it to other situations, and use it intentionally. He also proposed effective ways to teach concepts. Teachers go through, “selecting the essential characteristics of objects or events of a certain class and presenting these characteristics in the form of symbolic and graphic models” (p. 71). After teachers teach methods of scientific analysis, learners use these methods and internalize them. As a result, the methods function as cognitive tools to mediate learners’ further problem solving. Karpov’s (2003) suggestions are useful in teacher education programs; teacher learners need to be provided with core features of specific concepts together with appropriate and practical examples and teaching models. Consequently, they should be able to employ these concepts in their classroom, internalize them, and apply them to new situations.

Concerning concept development in language teachers’ learning, Lantolf and Johnson (2007) contend that although most education programs for language teachers
provide the latest research and theories on second language teaching and learning, they often fail to overcome the inertia of teachers’ everyday concepts. Thus, teacher education programs should be able to present teachers with scientific concepts regarding language, language learning and teaching, yet at the same time relate these concepts to the teachers’ everyday concepts that they bring to the programs. For instance, if a teacher education program intends to enhance teachers’ understandings and practices related to task-based instruction, the concepts of task-based language learning and teaching must be taught explicitly, connecting it to the everyday concepts that teachers hold about language learning and teaching. Only then can we expect that the scientific concepts acquired by teachers will be evident in teachers’ classroom practices.

Overall, a sociocultural theoretical framework is useful for this study in that it allows us to more fully comprehend to what extent the concepts embedded in the curricular reform efforts have been internalized by the participating student teachers and actually enacted in their teaching practices. Moreover, it also articulates the ways in which concept development emerges in the processes of learning to teach.

2.3.2. Studies on Teacher Learning and Concept Development

The following studies view teacher learning from a sociocultural theoretical perspective and reveal how and to what extent teachers’ instructional concepts have developed during their learning to teach experiences. Specifically, these studies demonstrate that teacher learning is social in nature and interconnected with historical and contextual forces, while simultaneously individual factors contribute to teacher development. Moreover, all of these studies indicate that different mediational means are
employed to foster teacher development, and reflection (externalization) plays an important role in promoting teacher learning.

Au (1990) analyzed a novice teacher’s development in learning about a particular approach to teaching reading comprehension to children of Polynesian descent. The teacher taught 20-minute lessons to six third graders almost every week, 24 lessons in total over the six months. During the 45 minutes following each lesson she conferred with a researcher working in tandem with her, in order to help her understand issues that occurred from her lessons and to plan strategies to implement this approach to reading comprehension. Thus, the meetings helped the teacher externalize her ideas and find solutions to issues in her teaching. At the completion of the project, the teacher was able to reshape her teaching concepts as mediated by her own verbalization of her thoughts and through dialogic interaction with the researcher.

Most importantly, Au’s study highlights the crucial aspect of human mediation in the teacher learning. Au mentions that through the more systematic assistance from the expert/researcher, and the teacher’s willingness to follow the expert’s guidance, the teacher was able to master the concepts of teaching reading in only a quarter of the time other teachers might usually require. Furthermore, this study indicates the important role human language plays in the internalization process. The novice teacher articulated her ideas while externalizing her concepts through language, revealing her emerging control over her own development. Such externalization enabled this teacher to link scientific concepts with everyday concepts and finally to develop true concepts for reading instruction. In essence, Au’s work traces how human mediation and human speech play essential roles in a novice teacher’s concept development.
Verity (2000) investigated her personal experience of loss of self-regulation and gradual recovery of her teaching expertise. Although she had been an experienced and confident ESL teacher, a new instructional environment in Japan which was characterized by passive students, large class size, and different cultural norms and institutional factors left her feeling like a novice. She recalled that although she believed she had ‘the cognition of an expert’, she had ‘the emotions of a novice’ (p.183). Reflective journaling created a mediational space in which she was able to externalize her thoughts and feelings and internalize what she externalized within her own teaching context. In addition, her ‘other’ self as an expert helped her to reconceptualize what she already knew about teaching and to redevelop her professional identity as an expert EFL teacher. Eventually she was able to transform herself to regain a sense of control over her teaching activities.

Verity’s study is noteworthy in demonstrating the importance of reflection through narratives for creating an internal ZPD (Vygotsky, 1978) where her expert-self assisted her novice-self in recontextualizing her knowledge about L2 teaching. Thus, her journal writing and her analysis of that journal function as powerful mediational means to foster her development. In addition, Verity showed that the emergence and resolution of teachers’ cognitive and affective dissonance play an important role in restructuring and recontextualizing her teaching conceptions and practices, specifically in a new instructional context. Finally, this research demonstrated that contextual factors can inhibit teachers from teaching with the expertise previously demonstrated in other contexts, and, in the process of developing strategies to overcome those contextual constraints, teachers can develop a new sense of professional expertise.
Like Verity (2000), Golombek and Johnson’s (2004) study argue that teacher authored narrative inquiry can function as a mediational space for teachers’ professional development. They examined three language teachers teaching in three different instructional contexts\(^\text{17}\). These participant narratives indicated that different mediational means for learning were utilized. While Jenn used a private journal that provided a mediational space for her, Michael engaged in verbal reflective discourse with a colleague and observed his own videotaped lessons as a form of mediation. Lynne experienced mediation from a colleague cooperating while co-teaching a new course. In addition to these different mediational tools, the three teachers’ learning was also mediated by both expert knowledge (scientific concepts) they acquired through professional readings about teaching from their MA TESOL program and experiential knowledge (everyday concepts) they obtained from teaching.

This study provides a prominent example of the extent to which each teacher internalized their teaching concepts and transformed their instructional practices. For Jenn, idealized teaching conceptualizations had only begun to emerge, but were not actually connected with her classroom instruction. Michael was able to align his teaching practices with the conceptualizations he acknowledged. Finally, Lynne revealed the most complete degree of internalization as she carried new conceptualizations and teaching practices from one instructional context to another. In this process of internalization, like Verity (2000), Golombek and Johnson’s study shows the catalytic role of emotions: affective conflicts stimulated the recognition of cognitive conflicts and contradictions in their teaching. Obviously, teacher authored narratives facilitated their development by

---

\(^{17}\) The contexts are university-level composition, elementary-level science, and secondary-level language arts.
enabling these teacher to externalize conflicts and contradictions and reinternalize them in their own ways. This study also highlighted the importance of the recursive process of critical reflection and teaching activities in teachers’ development within any given instructional context.

Ball (2000) investigated the professional development experiences of pre-service and beginning teachers, specifically focusing on the case studies of four participants, within the context of university-based coursework designed to improve teacher learners’ conceptions of literacy instruction for poor, marginalized, and diverse students. This coursework created several mediational means for teacher learning: teacher-produced literacy autobiographies, journal entries, written reflections, theoretical readings, and classroom discussions. Ball, as the teacher educator, selected course readings that provided the teachers with scientific concepts to enhance their reconceptualizations of literacy and diversity. Through oral and written discourse practices and reflections, the teachers were found to have internalized alternative conceptions of literacy.

However, examination of the four focal teacher learners indicated differences in the degree of their internalization of the concept of literacy instruction for diverse students. Ball found that those who actively engaged with the information and in the activities created in the teacher education program were more likely to transform their conceptions about literacy and teaching diverse students, and eventually develop more fully their levels of commitment. Although Ball primarily focused on the teacher education program’s activities in order to understand the origins of the teacher learners’ differences, it became evident that their individual biographies, such as learning experiences and beliefs prior to the teacher education programs as well as contextual
constraints, also played an essential role in highlighting these differences. For example, Chris (U.S.) had preconceptions about literacy and diversity which were resistant to change, and he participated in teacher education activities on a limited basis, resulting in inadequate development and commitment. Melanie (South Africa) had positive literacy learning experiences, but lacked active participation in the teacher learning activities; she even decided to leave the teaching profession due to her frustration with the strict curriculum which gave teachers little flexibility and with her perception that insufficient pre-service preparation created tremendous challenges when teaching diverse students.

On the other hand, two other teacher learners who actively engaged in the teacher education program activities had very positive literacy experiences. During the professional development activities, Niko (U.S.) challenged her preconceptions about teaching diverse students and transformed her related perceptions. Moreover, Irene (South Africa), a beginning teacher from a family of teachers, had very positive attitudes towards being a teacher. Despite experiencing the similar, unfavorable educational system that frustrated Melanie, Irene came to strengthen the realization that it was her responsibility to assist diverse and underachieving students.

Although this study may lack strong evidence to indicate how teacher learning from the professional development programs was evident in these teachers’ actual instructional practices, it does highlight the importance of the systematic approach in teacher education programs to prepare teacher learners for specific, challenging, or emerging issues in the teaching profession, specifically through critical reflections that help connect theory with practice. In addition, for some student teachers, preconceptions prior to the teacher education program and contextual constraints were influential in their
learning. Finally, Ball demonstrated that human agency, that is, individual teacher learners’ willingness to change, is essential in the internalization process.

In contrast to the studies reviewed above, Martin (1993) illustrated unsuccessful attempts to support teacher learning in three separate teacher education projects. In the first two studies, although the teachers were provided with new instructional skills and conceptualizations, their work environments did not support these innovations, resulting in little teacher learning or changes in teaching practices. Martin argues that teacher change largely depends on teachers’ working conditions and their interactions with colleagues. In addition, teacher training programs and schools where teachers work do not provide the sort of time and opportunities to reflect on instruction in order to develop true concepts in teaching. Finally, teachers’ willingness to participate in any innovation is critical to teacher learning. Martin claims that although a teacher education program may be designed to create mediational means to support teacher learning, teachers may be unwilling to participate and thus not change or learn. Clearly, as also illustrated in Ball (2000), human agency plays an important role in learning and a sociocultural perspective recognizes that all learning is contingent on the agency that humans have over what and how they learn. Specifically, Martin maintained that the contextual factors and individual teachers’ agency were influential in their lack of transformation. Obviously, the mediational means embedded in any teacher education program must create conditions in which teachers can externalize their thinking, so that thinking can be influenced by expert others, and then be exposed to new concepts that can become the tools through which teachers re-see, re-think, and re-enact their teaching.
These five studies indicated successful (Au, 1990; Verity, 2000) and unsuccessful cases (Martin, 1993) of teacher learning and/or different stages of teachers’ internalization (Ball, 2000; Martin, 1993). From the stance of sociocultural theory, these studies demonstrated that teacher learning is socially, historically, and contextually constructed. Teachers learned through interactions with others, as well as through positioning themselves as the other (Golombek & Johnson, 2004; Verity, 2000). Whereas the histories of individual teacher learners’ prior learning and teaching experiences influenced their development, contextual factors also affected the internalization process. Also, these studies indicate that, although teachers are found to have access to and/or use different mediational means to support their learning, teachers’ willingness to change is most critical for their development. Moreover, teachers’ reflections on their conceptions and practices, and externalization of their thoughts and emotions were essential in order to make significant and worthwhile changes in these teachers’ conceptions of teaching and their instructional practices. These studies use a sociocultural theory of learning to examine how human agency, human speech, human and artifact mediation, and the contexts in which teacher learning occurs, play essential roles in teachers’ concept development.

Smagorinsky, Cook, and Johnson (2003) have published the most detailed studies of teachers’ concept development within the context of their professional development and first-year teaching experiences. Based on the Vygotskian notion of concept development as outlined above, the researchers analyzed several studies of teachers’ conceptual development that tracked novice teachers of language arts throughout university coursework, student teaching, and the first year of full-time teaching. Three
types of teachers emerged, based on the concepts learned, the nature of that learning, and how their concept development became evident in their instructional practices in specific learning and teaching contexts.

The first type of teacher experienced conceptual inconsistency within their university program and did not gain solid scientific concepts, resulting in accommodating to the institutionalized concepts found within their instructional settings and/or their apprenticeship of observation. For instance, although Tracy\(^{18}\) learned about constructivism in her teacher education program, her student teaching and work as a full time teacher revealed that she had developed pseudoconcepts rather than true concepts for constructive teaching. On the surface, she created a constructivist classroom with its interdisciplinary instruction and physical decentering (e.g., group seating arrangement). However, such integrations were not triggered by learners’ choice, and the physical arrangement did not socially decentralize classroom authority. The researchers concluded that her development of a pseudoconcept resulted in part from the lack of consistency in definition and practice among the program faculty. In fact, like several other student teachers, Tracy exhibited difficulty in articulating a concept for constructivist teaching, although she seemed to understand that the Piagetian approach espoused in her teacher education program emphasized individual’s capability to construct a personal understanding of the world through varied experiences. Also, Tracy felt the inconsistency between constructivist teaching as supported by the program faculty and the traditional test format employed by some professors (e.g., memorizing and writing specific content of the textbook). Thus she remained confused, unsure, and at times sarcastic concerning the concept of constructivism. Furthermore, no theoretical reinforcement of the concept

\(^{18}\) For the in-depth study of Tracy, refer to Cook, Smagorinsky, Fry, Konopak, and Moore (2002).
followed once she was away from the formal teacher education program at the university. Under these circumstances, her practices tended to follow the norms of instruction that were already institutionalized in the school setting where she worked.

Leigh\textsuperscript{19}, like Tracy, experienced a structurally fragmented university program (e.g., absence of a student cohort, dispersal of courses around the university) and was left without overarching teaching concepts for her instructional decision-making. In the practicum, her mentor teacher apprenticed her to consider writing as a formal, rule-bound, and lockstep process, which was in opposition to the school’s stated philosophy (i.e., free movement and expression, open class philosophy). When Leigh, as a full-time teacher, taught at a school where the curriculum emphasized preparation for the state writing test, she drew from her engrained beliefs that were largely formed in her apprenticeship of observation (spontaneous concepts) as models to institute writing five-paragraph themes by which she, herself, had achieved success as a learner.

The second type of teacher emerged with a good grasp of scientific concepts stressed by the university program which then conflicted with the conceptions of teaching held by the mentor teachers, resulting in redirection by the mentors’ conception. While Sharon\textsuperscript{20} learned about constructivist teaching in her teacher education program, her mentor teacher’s beliefs about teaching accurate forms in language and mimetic approach to mentoring discouraged her from practicing constructivism in her own instructional practices. In the case of Natalie\textsuperscript{21}, the mentor teacher described her teaching as student-centered, when it was in fact teacher-and-text-centered. Natalie experienced conflicts between what she learned about teacher-centered instruction from the university and what

\textsuperscript{19} For the in-depth study of Leigh, refer to Johnson, Smagorinsky, Thompson, and Fry (2003).
\textsuperscript{20} Smagorinsky, Cook, Moore, Jackson, and Fry (2004) investigate Sharon’s case in detail.
\textsuperscript{21} The case of Natalie is from Smagorinsky, Gibson, Bickmore, Moore, and Cook (2004).
she learned as an apprentice from the mentor teacher, finally complying with the mentor’s understanding of student-centered instruction.

Finally, a third type evolved when some teachers did develop robust scientific concepts in their university programs, but had difficulty implementing them in their classroom due to constraints caused by the prescribed curriculum. Andrea 22 started her coursework as a traditionalist, but obtained a solid understanding of the student-centered instruction emphasized by her university professors. In her student teaching and first-year teaching, she experienced dissonance between the ideals of the university program and the daily pragmatic concerns of actual teaching. In her first school venue, working as a full time teacher, she was required to follow a very centralized and scripted curriculum that underscored students’ academic achievement specifically as measured in standardized county-wide tests. Although she wanted to resist the curriculum and use writing workshops and student-centered activities, she acquiesced to the required curriculum, adjusting her personal beliefs to the premises of the curriculum. In Penny’s example 23, although she learned about the principles of constructivist teaching and process-based instruction in her coursework, the school curriculum emphasized knowledge of correct form and efficient time management, and discouraged her from implementing these principles in her instructional practices. In addition, although her mentor teacher was aware of the benefits of constructivist teaching and the limitation of the strict school curriculum, the mentor also complied with the school curriculum, thus reinforcing Penny’s submission to the institutionalized teaching practices.

22 Smagorinsky, Lakly, and Johnson (2002) examined the case of Andrea in detail.
23 For detailed research about Penny, refer to Smagorinsky (1999).
These different patterns of teacher development indicated that teachers’ concepts were not always successfully developed and/or actualized in their classroom practices. They stress the importance of presenting consistent concepts in teacher education programs but also the need for sustained support of these concepts by mentor teachers, and within the institutions in which teachers work if their instructional practices are to be transformed.

Unlike the studies of the nature of teacher development that emerged by examining both university and institutional settings, Grossman, Thompson, and Valencia (2001) investigated teacher concept development from the perspective of a larger context, namely, school districts under mandates of state-wide curricular innovations. The researchers present examples of both successful and unsuccessful districts in their attempts to enable teachers to both fully understand the curricular innovations and implement them in their daily instructional practices. Because the university programs preparing these beginning teachers did not have a focal pedagogical approach, the teachers depended on the norms and practices of their workplace as framed by the school districts. Under the state-wide reforms, the two districts involved varied in terms of their own curriculum policies, professional development and mentoring systems, which affected teachers’ concepts and practices in terms of what they learned about teaching language arts.

The mentoring and teacher training programs in one district only engaged the teachers (Nancy and Frank) in discussions of a generic curriculum rather than addressing specific issues embedded in the subject matter. Consequently, the teachers had vague

24 The researchers did not specify the focal concepts in the university programs of the teachers and briefly mentioned the teachers’ experiences in designating their majors in teaching language arts and their interests in English writing and student centered instruction.
understandings of the curriculum (i.e., a set of textbooks) and could not incorporate the curriculum into their teaching practice in effective ways. In contrast, the other district focused on helping teachers become familiar with state and district curriculum frameworks through various professional development opportunities. For example, Allison, a teacher from this district, came to understand the reforms more clearly and was able to incorporate them into her teaching. This was due in large part because of her own efforts to come to terms with them but also because of the consistent and in-depth support that she received from her mentor about the subject matter and from the school administration.

In sum, these studies clearly indicate that conceptual, mentoring, and institutional support is critical in teacher concept development. More specifically, these studies indicate that novice teachers began their teacher education programs with spontaneous (everyday) concepts, and then were exposed to scientific concepts (e.g., constructivism, learner-centered). However, unless they were exposed to explicit and consistent scientific concepts from these programs, and mentoring that reinforced these scientific concepts, they never really internalized them, but instead relied on their everyday concepts, which were found to be institutionalized in the school settings where they taught. Ultimately, these studies indicate that scientific concepts must be presented consistently and then reinforced by allowing teachers multiple opportunities to connect new concepts with their classroom practices.
2.3.3. Activity Theory and Teacher Learning

Based on a sociocultural theory of human learning, this study employs activity theory as an analytical framework since this theory is most appropriate to more completely understand individual student teachers’ conceptual development within the curricular reform context. An activity theory analytical framework proposes that human cognition and behavior are interdependent in their development and should be considered in the contexts in which they are socially and historically constructed and reconstructed (Leontiev, 1978; Rohrer-Murphy, 1999). Thus, this analytical framework enables us to consider the broader social, historical and cultural contexts of student teachers’ learning within the activity system where student teachers operate as the subjects. Moreover, Engeström’s human activity system model (1987, 1993, 1999a) allows us to identify locations where contradictions may occur and thus change the nature of student teachers’ perceptions and actions. Finally, this analytical framework reveals to what extent individual student teachers developed true concepts of the curricular reforms, what elements support and/or restrict their development, and what kind of macro-structures may need to be altered for student teachers to be able to more completely embrace the mandated curricular reforms.

As such, activity theory complements this study’s context of curricular reform and supports the goals of this study, since “the goal of activity theory is to define and analyze a given activity system, to diagnose possible problems, and to provide a framework for implementing innovations” (Thorne, 2004, p.65). Thus, this perspective offers insights into the complexities of student teachers’ learning and teaching experiences in the face of
the curricular reforms, detects difficulties implementing the reforms, and suggests ways to address any difficulties.

Engeström’s (1987, 1993, 1999a) activity system model, as adopted by this study, is based on the basic premises of activity theory (Engeström, 1987, 1993, 1999a; Leontiev, 1978, 1981), which is a theoretical and cross-disciplinary framework drawn from SCT in that it views all human actions as goal-oriented and artifact-mediated; thus, as people seek to reach their goals by using various artifacts, their cognition and actions develop. In addition, activity theory also stresses the importance of human mediation and the social and collaborative nature of human activities. Human beings do not function individually, but they mediate and are mediated by other human beings who are socially related. Thus, activity theory enables us to understand important aspects of the student teachers’ practicum experiences: their teaching conceptions and practices develop, as they pursue goals mediated by the practicum activities, artifacts, and more importantly their mentor teachers as well as their peers and pupils.

More specifically, the activity system model provides a framework for “mapping and transforming the complexities of social practice in educational settings” (Thorne, 2004, p. 57) by identifying the participants and processes of an activity system as subject, artifacts (tools), object, outcome, community, rules, and division of labor. To frame these relationships, Engeström (1987, 1993, 1999a) proposed the following model.
In the upper triangle, the *subject* and his/her goal-directed activity is mediated by *artifacts, tools, or concepts*; the *subject* is an individual or subgroup whose agency is the focus of the analysis, and the *object* indicates the orientation of the activity, which is transformed into *outcomes* with the help of *tools*. For instance, in teacher education programs, individual teacher learners function as subjects in the activity system. The object may be to complete the program requirements, resulting in outcomes such as passing the program with good grades. The mediational means in this system may include program activities (methodology courses, micro-teaching, and discussions) and artifacts (journals and lesson plans).

The base area of the diagram (*community, rules, and division of labor*) is added to the basic triadic representations of Vygotsky’s artifact mediation and human actions, and represents the incorporation of local human activity and larger social, cultural, historical structures. *Community* refers to the participants who share the same general object. *Division of labor* describes both a horizontal and vertical division of power and status among community members. *Division of labor* within the system is controlled by *rules*. *Rules* afford or constrain behavior, defined as “the explicit and implicit regulations,
norms and conventions that constrain actions and interactions within the activity system” (Center for Activity Theory and Developmental Work Research, 1998). For example, in teacher education programs, teachers interact and collaborate with community members such as peers and teacher educators, having more or less parallel or hierarchical relationships. In the case of top-down teacher education programs, teacher learners may be controlled by the rules of the activity system such as listening passively to what teacher educators say. However, such a rule is incompatible with the principles of alternative teacher education programs where more active reflection and participation on the part of teacher learners are stressed.

The multidirectional arrows in the model above indicate that each component is interconnected, influencing each other directly and/or indirectly. For example, if the nature of mediational means (such as teacher education program activities) changes from apprenticeship to a reflective model, the rules (from passive to active participation) and division of labor (from hierarchical to more horizontal) may change within the community. Furthermore, these mutual influences emerge among different activity systems, as Thorne (2004) contends, “Multiple activity systems are always at work and will have varying influences on the local or focus activity system at hand” (p. 58). In the case of English curricular reforms in Korea, the Ministry of Education (one activity system) expects these reforms to be embraced in teacher education programs (another activity system) as well as in English language classrooms (a third activity system). Thus, one activity system (related to the curricular mandates) influences other activity systems (teacher education programs, English language classrooms). Also, the activity systems of teacher education programs and English language classrooms influence each other.
Engeström (1999b) proposes that situated activity systems be considered the units of analysis. Examining any situated activity system helps with investigation of certain phenomena in more integrated ways. This is accomplished by considering the broader context in which the subject is situated. Whereas contexts are more fully considered through examining the complex relationships among components of the activity system, human agency as the subject of the system is taken into consideration in terms of individual contributions to the formation and transformation of the context and the activity system. In this study, for instance, the instructional activity systems where student teachers function as subjects in the practicum are examined as the unit of analysis. Consideration will be taken to the broader context such as traditional classroom norms, students’ socialization patterns, and the evaluation systems as well as the nature of each component of the activity system and the relationships among them. Also, the roles of student teachers’ human agency as subjects of the activity system in transforming the system are investigated. Moreover, the notion of history is important for understanding the current activity system since the current system has been influenced by previous activity systems. In this study, both the student teachers’ personal history regarding language learning and teaching, and the history of English curricular policies in Korea, were taken into account since they are necessary to understand the current activity system wherein the student teachers function as subjects.

In particular, the notion of inner contradictions, defined as the “clash between individual actions and the total activity system” (Engeström, 1987, p.39), is a very important notion in activity theory. Activity systems are characterized as continuous transformation and reconstruction, which is fueled by contradictions within the activity
system or in relation to other activity systems (Engeström, 1993, 1999b). The importance of exploring inner contradictions has been stressed in several points. Leontiev (1981) considers contradictions as a precondition for the study of activity, since they are inevitable to everyday human experiences. In addition, as Ilyenkov (1982) mentions, “a phenomenon which later becomes universal originally emerges as an individual, particular, specific phenomenon, as an exception from the rule”, a certain deviation from previously accepted norms in the present activity system may become a new universal norm in the future. Therefore, contradictions may reveal the norms of present activity systems, and also envisage those of future activity systems.

Furthermore, Engeström states that the unstable and unpredictable nature of human behavior naturally leads to inner contradictions (Engeström, 1999a). Also, he states that tracing contradictions historically at the ‘concrete’ level of the activity is important to understand development and transitions, since it provides ‘multivoicedness’ and dissonance which an idealized, context-free activity may remove (Engeström, 1993, p.71-72). Moreover, since activity theory employs a dialectical method, contradictions, dilemmas, disturbances and paradoxes are the driving forces of transformation and development (Ilyenkov, 1977). Thus, identifying and comprehending the origins of contradictions is essential to strategies for transformation. That is, while making resolution to any contradictions, the activity system has the potential to be transformed. In the case of the curricular reforms in Korea, teachers may experience inner contradictions between how they are expected to teach by the government and how they are teaching. The activity system will be transformed only when the curricular reforms
create particular contradictions within the system and the teachers make effort to resolve such contradictions.

More specifically, Engeström (1987, 1993) proposes four levels of contradictions: primary, secondary, tertiary, and quaternary. Primary contradictions arise within and can consistently exist in each component of an activity system. For instance, under the CLT-based curricular reforms, an L2 teacher as the subject of the activity system may have conflicts within herself between her roles in the classroom as a knowledge transmitter who gives lectures to enhance students’ exam scores and a facilitator who promotes interactions with students and among them through various tasks.25

When “a strong novel factor” is injected into any constituents of the activity system and acquires a new quality, secondary contradictions can emerge between that component and some other components of the system (Engeström, 1993, p.72). Of secondary contradictions, Engeström (1993) states:

These secondary contradictions of the activity are the moving force behind disturbances and innovations, and eventually behind the change and development of the system. They cannot be eliminated or fixed with simple remedies. They get aggravated over time and eventually tend to lead to an overall crisis of the activity system (p. 72-73).

Thus, the activity system can be transformed into a new quality in the process of resolving these secondary contradictions in the system. Therefore, secondary contradictions are essential to understanding a specific activity system.

25 The causes for this contradiction may be multiple such as rules (e.g., students’ socialization as passive receivers of knowledge, covering the textbook for high-stakes grammar-based testing) and artifacts (tests, task-based instruction).
Tertiary contradictions can be found between the current activity system and a “culturally more advanced”\textsuperscript{26} (Engeström, 1987, Chapter 2, p.43) activity system such as governmental curricular reforms that impose a new goal as “a novel factor”. Due to the tertiary contradiction, this goal can be rejected by or subordinated into the existing forms of the activity (Engeström, 1987). Thus, unless the novel factor brings secondary contradictions and transforms the activity system, tertiary contradictions may arise between the two systems.

Quaternary contradictions appear between a central activity system and its neighbor activities. For instance, if a teacher resists his/her pre- and/or in-service teacher education program, a quaternary contradiction occurs between the central activity system where the teacher is the subject and subject-producing activity system, that is the pre- and/or in-service teacher education program.

Under the curricular reform context, the four levels of inner contradictions can be employed as a useful analytical and explanatory tool for teacher learning. When educational reform is mandated, the activity system in which teachers operate as subjects evolves into a new structure only if the curricular reforms cause secondary contradictions within the system and the teachers make efforts to resolve such contradictions. Conversely, if the new policy does not raise any secondary contradictions or any attempts to resolve them, the educational reform will remain at the layer of a tertiary contradiction, resulting in resistance or superficial change that actually results in retaining the old form.

To sum up, activity theory is compatible with the purpose and the context of this

\textsuperscript{26} CLT may not be culturally more advanced ‘scientific thinking’ \textit{per se}. Instead, those in power such as, Ministries of Education and English language professionals globally involved with TESOL, Applied Linguistics, and Language Methodologies, etc., assume that CLT is more advanced. Related issues are discussed in the Discussion Chapter, section 7.3 (The Challenges of Curricular Reform Implementation during Teacher Education).
dissertation research in that this theory allows us to examine the learning of the individual participating student teachers in South Korea, within the activity system where they are the subjects and to seek locations where inner contradictions may occur and thus disrupt, alter, or change the nature of the goal-directed activity of these student teachers (e.g., teacher learning) and actually subvert that activity into a novel form. Furthermore, activity theory enables us to see the individuals operating in the broader social, historical and cultural contexts of their activity and see why goal-directed activity is accomplished or not. Through this process, this model provides useful explanatory framework to trace these student teachers’ concept development within their practicum experiences.
CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

This chapter describes the research design including the site, the context, and the participants. The procedures for data collection and analysis are described and the issues of trustworthiness of the data are discussed.

3.1. Research Design

The present study adopts qualitative research methods, specifically case study methodology. Since this study focuses on participating student teachers’ development in the course of the practicum experiences, it fits well within the definition of a case study. According to Merriam (1998), a case is a “thing, a single entity, a unit around which there are boundaries” (p.27) and a case study is “a means of investigating complex social units consisting of multiple variables of potential importance in understanding the phenomenon” (p. 41). In addition, case study methodology is most suitable when the phenomena and variables are inseparable from the context (Yin, 2003) and “thick description, experiential understanding and multiple realities” (Stake, 1995, p.43) are expected. As such, the present study provides in-depth descriptions about the student teachers’ diverse learning and teaching experiences, and fully considers the teaching context.

In particular, since four student teachers are the focus of this research, it represents a multiple case design (Yin, 2003). According to Yin, multiple-case studies can expect either similarities or contrasts for predictable reasons. In the present study, the
four student teachers who completed their practicum in the same lab school showed both similarities and differences in their experiences. Through cross-case analyses, this study offers diverse and detailed portraits of the student teachers’ practicum experiences within the context of curricular reform.

3.1.1. Site

The data for this study were collected in May and June in 2006 in a national university middle school (NUMS) located in the northern part of Seoul, Korea. As one of the four laboratory schools affiliated with the College of Education of a national university (NU), NUMS was presumed to have a more developed practicum system and full implementation of the educational reform policies. Like other national lab schools, NUMS is in charge of supporting pre-service teacher education through both classroom observation and the practicum, whereas most secondary schools may only occasionally have student teachers. According to the practicum guide issued by the lab school, at the time of this study, the school had 161 student teachers (59 males and 102 females) in ten subject areas. An independent division of the school was in charge of arranging the classroom observations and the practicum. Furthermore, these schools are responsible for enacting educational policies in an advanced and systematic manner. For example, before a new curriculum is implemented, these schools often adopt new textbooks and teaching systems according to the curriculum and give feedback to Ministry of Education (Mrs. Ma, personal communication, May 12, 2006). As such, since the school was expected to

---

1 The four laboratory schools are NUMS, NUGMS (Girls’ Middle School), NUHS (High School), and NUES (Elementary School). NUGMS was observed by the researcher in a pilot study conducted in the year prior to the current study.

2 The ten subjects were Korean, English, ethics, social studies, math, science, home economics, physical education, music, and Hanmun (i.e., Chinese characters and literature). There were 38 mentor teachers.
show the best possible implementation of how the ELT curricular reforms are understood and embraced in pre-service teacher education, it was chosen as the site of this study.

Whereas students in the 7th grade studied in mixed-level classes, those in the 8th and 9th grades were taught through a tracked system. The pupils in these two grades are divided into five different levels of classes depending on their exam scores in English: advanced (called “Spring”), high intermediate (“Summer”), intermediate (“Autumn”), beginner (“Winter”), and very beginner (“Sky”). Each level had two different classes with approximately thirty students, respectively (except the very beginner classes (“Sky”) with about fifteen students per class). These classes were re-arranged twice a semester after the mid-term and the final exams, respectively. In this sense, the proficiency levels were flexible, allowing students to be placed in different levels according to their test results.

Including English, the students were taking ten mandatory subjects: Korean, English, ethics, social studies, math, science, home economics, physical education, music, and art. English classes were conducted three times a week for the eighth graders and four times a week for the ninth graders.

---

3 When the student teachers for this study started teaching, each class was newly organized according to the scores of the mid-term exam they had taken.
3.1.2. Context of the Practicum

The pre-service teacher education program provided by the department consisted of three parts: (1) university coursework; (2) class observations; (3) the practicum held in the lab schools\(^4\).

The coursework consisted of general education, ELT, and English linguistics and literature and other courses\(^5\). In particular, ELT courses that all the student teachers had taken included: *Theories in TEFL, Methods of TEFL*, and *Teaching Materials in English Language Education (ELE)*. All English student teachers were taking *Teaching Materials in ELE* together during the semester of the practicum. The general education courses included theoretical and practical topics and both mandatory and elective classes. For example, classes included: *Philosophy of Education, Guidance and Counseling, Introduction to the Study of Education*, and *Teaching Methods and Educational Technology*\(^6\).

In addition, student teachers observed classes in an actual secondary school. The student teachers observed English and other classes during two weeks in October and/or November of their second year. 

Finally, in the practicum, student teachers were able to observe and actually teach classes\(^7\) in May (about 20 days in total). Every day in the first week of the practicum, 

---

\(^4\) Student teachers indicated their top-choice school (among the three lab schools) for the observations and the practicum and the department administration selects a specific school for each of the student teachers. So, the schools for the observations and the practicum for each student teacher can be the same or different.

\(^5\) Out of a total of 130 credits required for English education major students to graduate, the credits for each course area were as follows: general education (at least 15 credits), ELT (at least 9 credits), and English linguistics and literature (at least 42 credits).

\(^6\) Other courses include *Educational Administration and School Management, Sociology of Education, History of Educational Thought, Curriculum and Educational Evaluation, and Educational Psychology*.

\(^7\) English student teachers were supposed to teach or observe 3 classes on average every day. Although student teachers are supposed to mainly observe English lessons (especially taught by mentor teacher and peer student teachers in their own team), they can observe classrooms for other subject matter if they want.
they observed at least three different classes. Then, from the second to the fourth week, student teachers in each team were supposed to submit lesson plans, teach the mentor teacher’s classes, and have daily conferences with their mentor teacher. In addition, they were also expected to submit a daily journal every morning and at the end of the practicum, student teachers were required to submit a formative test composed of twenty questions based on what they had been taught.

The evaluation for student teachers was based on three major areas: subject matter teaching (60%; composed of journal 5%, teacher qualification 10%, class preparation 20%, and classroom teaching 25%), homeroom student teaching (20%)\(^8\), and overall participation in the practicum (20%).

3.1.3. Participants

In the lab school, four English mentor teachers and thirteen student teachers were organized into four teams, each consisting of one mentor teacher and three to four student teachers. Since the researcher was interested in tracing several particular practicum groups of student teachers, purpose sampling (Creswell, 1998) was used to select the focal participants. The groups were chosen based on their teaching assignments and the individuals based on their backgrounds. In order to examine the instruction under the tracking system, which is one of the most important premises of the curricular reform, the focal participants were selected among the teachers of eighth and ninth graders\(^9\). Also,

---

\(^8\) Each student teacher works with two different mentor teachers, who are related to his/her subject matter and homeroom class, respectively. However, student teachers work most with their subject matter mentor teacher and they spend less time in their homeroom class. Thus, the focus of this study is student teaching in subject-matter (English). Also, since homeroom student teaching was with another mentor teacher, it was not tracked in this study.

\(^9\) The tracking system was not applied to the 7th graders at the time of study.
student teachers were chosen based on their diverse educational background and experiences. Thus, among the volunteers, two mentor teachers (Mrs. Ma and Mr. Baek) and two student teachers from each of their teams (Sora, Yuna, Bohee and Jubin) were the focus of this study. The following table provides a summary of the focal participants of this study.

Table 3.1. Focal Participants of the Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mentor Teachers (MTs)</th>
<th>Student Teachers (STs)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Team A</td>
<td>Mrs. Ma</td>
<td>Sora, Yuna</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team B</td>
<td>Mr. Baek</td>
<td>Bohee, Jubin</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.1.3.1. Mentor Teachers

The two focal mentor teachers, Mrs. Ma and Mr. Baek, were in their mid thirties. They are Korean nationals and nonnative speakers of English, who learned English primarily through the public school system in Korea. They majored in English language education at a Korean national university. Mrs. Ma also completed the MA program, whereas Mr. Baek was a graduate student at the time of study. Table 3.2 summarizes the profiles of the two mentor teachers.

---

10 The four mentor teachers were in their mid thirties to early forties. All of them majored in English language Education and had earned at least a BA and in some cases an MA. Two other teachers, an English native speaking teacher and a substitute teacher, did not mentor student teachers.
Table 3.2. Information of the Participating Mentor Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Gender/ Age</th>
<th>Educational Background/English Learning Experience/Professional Development</th>
<th>Teaching Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Ma (Team A)</td>
<td>F Mid 30s</td>
<td>• Received BA and MA in English Language Education (ELE) in Korea</td>
<td>• Taught secondary school students for 12 years (6th year in the lab school)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Received in-service teacher education in Korea &amp; abroad (e.g., First-level teacher certificate training; English speaking &amp; writing)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Baek (Team B)</td>
<td>M Mid 30s</td>
<td>• Received BA in ELE and was studying in the MA program in ELE</td>
<td>• Taught secondary school students for 2 years (1 year in the lab school)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Received in-service teacher education in Korea (e.g., novice teacher training)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mrs. Ma is an experienced teacher who has been teaching English to secondary school students for twelve years in total and for six years at NUMS at the time of this study. Not only has she acted as the director of the English division at NUMS, her students, peers, and the administration have also recognized her as a capable teacher.

She has taken part in various in-service teacher education programs (INSET) which the Korean Ministry of Education supports such as the First-level Teacher Certificate Training Program (180 hours), and an EFL teacher training program in New Zealand for one month (in her tenth year of teaching), as well as other programs to enhance her English conversation or composition skills approximately once or twice in every academic year (60 or 90 hours per program). She also participated as a Korean assistant coordinator or a guide in month-long ESL (English as a second language) programs for Korean elementary and secondary school students in the United States (three times) and the United Kingdom (one time).

Mr. Baek is a novice teacher who has less than 2 years of teaching experience in secondary school classroom settings. He just started teaching in the field school at NUMS.
Although he had limited teaching experience, he was considered to be a creative and active young teacher at the lab school.

### 3.1.3.2. Student Teachers

All the student teachers were seniors in college majoring in English language education. Their experiences in living and/or studying abroad and also in English language learning and teaching varied.

The two student teachers in team A (Sora and Yuna) stayed or lived in the U.S. less than a year and attended secondary school or college. On the other hand, the team B student teachers (Bohee and Jubin) lived abroad for ten to twelve years, attended elementary and/or secondary schools in which English was used as a medium of instruction and both speak English very fluently. The level of comfort with speaking Korean and English differed among these student teachers. Team A student teachers felt less comfortable using English than the team B student teachers. Bohee felt relatively more comfortable with English, while Jubin felt almost equally comfortable using both the languages.

In terms of teaching experiences, whereas Sora and Yuna had only limited tutoring experience, Bohee and Jubin had experiences teaching in private institutes and English learning camps. Table 3.3 indicates the background information about the student teachers in the study.

---

11 For more detailed information about each participant, refer to the first part of each student teacher’s section in Chapters 5 and 6.
### Table 3.3. Information of the Focal Student Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Gender/Age</th>
<th>Educational Background/English Learning Experience/Professional Development</th>
<th>Teaching Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Sora (Team A)  | F Early 20s Senior | • Studied for 1 year (8th grade) in a U.S. mainstream school  
• Learned English at home, private institutes (since 4th grade) and public school (since 7th grade) in Korea | • Tutored students |
| Yuna (Team A)  | F Early 20s Senior | • Stayed in the U.S. for 1 year (during college) for language course  
• Learned English at home, private institutes (since 5th grade) and public school (since 7th grade) in Korea | • Tutored students |
| Bohee (Team B) | F Early 20s Senior | • Immigrated to Saipan (U.S. Commonwealth) in 1st grade, remained there for 12 years  
• Educated in English medium elementary/secondary schools | • Tutored students  
• Taught at English camps and private institutes |
| Jubin (Team B) | F Early 20s Senior | • Immigrated to Indonesia in 3rd grade and remained there for 10 years  
• Educated in English medium elementary/secondary schools | • Tutored students  
• Taught at English camps and private institutes |

### 3.2. Data Collection

Various data were collected in order to answer the research questions addressed in this study. To reiterate, the research questions of this study include:

1. How have curricular reform efforts been enacted in the activities student teachers engage in during the practicum?
   A. What mediational means does the practicum provide to help student teachers understand and enact these curricular reforms?
2. How do student teachers come to understand these curricular reforms and how do they enact them in their instructional practices?
   B. How do their instructional practices support their pupils’ opportunities for authentic L2 use?
The data included interviews and stimulated recall sessions, conferences, classroom observation, lesson plans, and journals. In addition, related documents and reference materials were collected including the curriculum manual, practicum guide, textbooks and teacher’s guide (Table 3.4). It is hoped that triangulating these various sources, views, and methods of data collection would improve the trustworthiness of the findings (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

Table 3.4. Data Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Teachers</th>
<th>Mentor Teachers</th>
<th>Documents/ reference materials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Lessons (3-9 sessions)</td>
<td>• Lessons (1-2 sessions)</td>
<td>• Curriculum manual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Interviews/stimulated recall (1-3 times)</td>
<td>• Interviews (1-2 times)</td>
<td>• Practicum guide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Conference transcripts/notes (17-21 sessions)</td>
<td>• Handouts</td>
<td>• Textbook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Daily journals (20 days)</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Teacher’s guide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Lesson plans (6 plans)</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Reference books</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Handouts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the student teachers, their three to nine teaching sessions were observed, and their lesson plans and class materials were collected. In addition, the student teachers’ daily journal, and university coursework materials (e.g., syllabi, textbooks) were collected. For the mentor teachers, one to two class sessions were observed, and handouts for teaching their pupils and mentoring their student teachers were collected. Furthermore, although the quantity varied depending on participants, interviews and stimulated recalls were conducted. The following table shows an overview of data collected from each participant.

---

12 Data were collected from nine pupils including one group interview (two pupils in the 8th low level, two in the 8th high level, three in the 9th high level, and two in the 9th low level) and the survey about their English learning experiences inside an outside school. Due to lack of sufficient data such as classroom participation, they were not specifically analyzed in this study.
Table 3.5. Details of Data from Student and Mentor Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Interviews (Stimulated Recalls)</th>
<th>Class Observation (total class sessions)</th>
<th>Lesson Plans</th>
<th>Journal (days)</th>
<th>Conferences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Within Teams</td>
<td>Across Teams</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team A</td>
<td>Mrs. Ma</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>16 (Team)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sora</td>
<td>3 (2)</td>
<td>9 (11)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3 (Eng Div)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yuna</td>
<td>3 (2)</td>
<td>8 (11)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2 (STs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team B</td>
<td>Mr. Baek</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>12 (Team)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bohee</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
<td>3 (11)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jubin</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
<td>3 (10)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The class sessions, conferences, stimulated recall sessions, and interviews were audio and/or video-taped. Moreover, depending on the participants, some of the class sessions and conferences were reviewed through the student teachers’ journals. In addition to these data, the researcher took field notes during the classroom observations.

3.2.1. Documents and Reference Materials

In order to examine the social, historical, and institutional background of the curricular reform, a variety of documents were collected. The main document was the middle school English manual of the 7th curriculum issued by Ministry of Education in that it shows not only the principles and guidelines of the curriculum, but also gives the theoretical background and rationale for the curricular reform. Also, the researcher collected the English textbooks and teacher’s guides that were published based on the curriculum and used by the participating teachers. Additional reference books provided by the mentor teachers or used by the student teachers were also collected. In order to investigate the background and the system of practicum activities and teaching, the practicum manual was examined.
3.2.2. Interviews and Stimulated Recall Interviews

The interviews were semi structured, thus, the researcher asked participants spontaneous and related questions in addition to prepared questions (see Appendix A and B for the interview questions). The interview included questions about: English learning and teaching experiences, their own self-image as teachers, as well as their opinions about ELT, the practicum activities, and the curricular reform. Interviews were conducted twice for the team A teachers (at the beginning and the end of the practicum). Team B teachers were interviewed intensively only once at the end of the practicum.

Stimulated recall interviews were conducted\textsuperscript{13} to examine the participating student teachers’ decision making process and thoughts (Gass & Mackey, 2000; Shavelson & Stern, 1981) while teaching. As the teachers and the researcher watched the teachers’ video-taped lesson, the teachers commented about their lessons and answered the researchers’ questions. Team A student teachers (Sora and Yuna) had stimulated recall sessions for each of their two class sessions (one in week 3 and the other in week 4). One recall session was a meeting dedicated to that purpose while the other was included in the interview at the end of the practicum. Team B student teachers’ stimulated recall for their fifth lesson plan class (one class in week 4) was conducted during their interview.

Concerning the other lessons, each student teacher and the researcher reviewed the lesson plans together in the end-of-the-practicum interview. While looking over their lesson plans, these student teachers commented about their own lessons and/or answered the researcher’s questions.

Since most of the mentor and student teachers felt most comfortable speaking Korean, the interviews were conducted in Korean. All of the interviews were audiotaped.

\textsuperscript{13} Refer to table 3.6 for the classes about which stimulated recall sessions were conducted.
and transcribed verbatim; the portions used in this dissertation were translated into English.

3.2.3. Conferences

At the end of almost every day, a team, composed of a mentor teacher and three to four of his/her student teachers, meets for an hour-long conference. Three kinds of conferences were observed and/or reviewed through the student teachers’ journals: (1) a discussion of the classes that student teachers have taught and future classes they will teach (twelve to sixteen times), (2) a meeting between all of the mentor teachers and the student teachers in the English division (three times). More specifically, a meeting of all of the mentors and all of the student teachers included an orientation meeting and two meetings after observing the model class. (3) In addition, all the student teachers met twice to plan the representative student teacher’s model class.

In the conferences, each student teacher reflected upon and gave comments on their own teaching and the peer teacher gave additional feedback. Then, the mentor teacher gave feedback about the student teachers’ classes. In addition, the mentor teacher gave comments on the student teachers’ lesson plans. Also, they talked about some issues that came up while teaching their own class and observing others.

The conferences of team A were observed and audio-taped by the researcher (except one time) and then transcribed and translated into English. The conferences of team B were reviewed through the student teachers’ daily journals. The reason for using the student teachers’ written records instead of oral data is that team meetings were usually held simultaneously and therefore it was not possible to observe and record the
two teams’ conferences at the same time. The written record of conferences reported the contents of the conference, a mixture of what the mentor teacher said, what the mentor teacher and his student teacher discussed, and what the student teachers reflected on their conferences. Since the notes about the conferences of team A were similar across the student teachers and consistent with the oral data, team B student teachers’ memos about their conferences were considered valid data. Furthermore, the written record is important since it shows which issues the student teachers focused and reflected on more among those discussed in their team.

Concerning the conferences in the English division, whereas the first one was reviewed through the student teachers’ journals, the second and third conferences were audiotaped. The two all student teacher conferences were reviewed through the journals.

3.2.4. Classroom Observations

The researcher observed classes taught by the mentors and the student teachers. Since the teachers were accustomed to being observed by their mentors or mentees, peers, and administrators, they seemed not to be distracted by the presence of the researcher. Since they felt more comfortable with being audiotaped, only one to two lessons used for the stimulated recall interviews were video-recorded and the other observed lessons were audio-recorded.

Table 3.6 shows the summary of the class sessions of each focal student teacher. Each student teacher taught five to six different lesson plans to two classes, that is, they actually taught ten to eleven class sessions. Each lesson lasted forty-five minutes. The

---

14 Student teachers’ descriptions and reflections on class observations are also recorded in their journals, specifically in the section of comments on class observation and teaching.
researcher observed three to nine lessons for each teacher. During the observation, field notes were taken by the researcher. All the class sessions observed by the researcher were transcribed verbatim and, if needed, translated into English.

Table 3.6. The Class Sessions of the Focal Student Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STs</th>
<th>Lesson Plans</th>
<th>Dates of Lessons **</th>
<th>Grade (Level) ***</th>
<th>Textbook Section/Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sora</td>
<td>LP1</td>
<td>5/11 (J); 5/11 (A)</td>
<td>9th (HIn)</td>
<td>Words &amp; expressions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LP2</td>
<td>5/15 (A); 5/17 (V)*</td>
<td>8th (Beg)</td>
<td>Study Points 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LP3</td>
<td>5/18 (A); 5/22 (J)</td>
<td>9th (HIn)</td>
<td>Reading 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LP4</td>
<td>5/19 (A); 5/24 (J)</td>
<td>9th (HIn)</td>
<td>Reading 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LP5</td>
<td>5/23 (A); 5/25 (V)*</td>
<td>9th (HIn)</td>
<td>On your own, Writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LP6</td>
<td>5/26 (A)</td>
<td>9th (HIn)</td>
<td>Special Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuna</td>
<td>LP1</td>
<td>5/09 (J); 5/10 (A)</td>
<td>9th (HIn)</td>
<td>Warm-up, Listening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LP2</td>
<td>5/11 (A); 5/12 (A)</td>
<td>8th (Beg)</td>
<td>Speaking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LP3</td>
<td>5/16 (A); 5/18 (V)*</td>
<td>9th (HIn)</td>
<td>Reading 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LP4</td>
<td>5/19 (A); 5/22 (J)</td>
<td>8th (Beg)</td>
<td>Reading 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LP5</td>
<td>5/23 (A); 5/25 (V)*</td>
<td>8th (Beg)</td>
<td>Special Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LP6</td>
<td>5/26 (A)</td>
<td>9th (HIn)</td>
<td>Special Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bohee</td>
<td>LP1</td>
<td>5/09 (J); 5/10 (J)</td>
<td>8th (Adv)</td>
<td>Warm-up; Listening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LP2</td>
<td>5/16 (A); 5/16 (J)</td>
<td>9th (Beg)</td>
<td>Reading 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LP3</td>
<td>5/17 (J); 5/19 (J)</td>
<td>9th (Beg)</td>
<td>Reading 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LP4</td>
<td>5/18 (J); 5/22 (A)</td>
<td>9th (Beg)</td>
<td>Reading 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LP5</td>
<td>5/22 (J); 5/25 (V)</td>
<td>8th (Adv)</td>
<td>Writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LP6</td>
<td>5/23 (J)</td>
<td>8th (Adv)</td>
<td>Special Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jubin</td>
<td>LP1</td>
<td>5/11 (J); 5/12 (J)</td>
<td>8th (Adv)</td>
<td>Speaking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LP2</td>
<td>5/11 (J); 5/15 (A)</td>
<td>9th (Beg)</td>
<td>Study Points 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LP3</td>
<td>5/19 (J); 5/22 (J)</td>
<td>8th (Adv)</td>
<td>Reading 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LP4</td>
<td>5/20 (J); 5/24 (A)</td>
<td>8th (Adv)</td>
<td>Reading 2; Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LP5</td>
<td>5/23 (V); 5/23 (J)</td>
<td>9th (Beg)</td>
<td>On your own, Writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LP6</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>8th (Adv)</td>
<td>Special Activity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Stimulated recall sessions conducted
** (A) Audiotaped; (V) Videotaped; (J) only written in Journal
*** (Adv) Advanced; (HIn) High Intermediate; (Int) Intermediate; (Beg) Beginner

3.2.5. Lesson Plans

Five to six different lesson plans that each student teacher produced were collected. A lesson plan was to be submitted to the mentor teacher before each lesson and
revised depending on the mentor teacher’s advice. Two detailed lesson plans include the planned scripts whereas the others are just brief outlines. At the end of the practicum, student teachers were expected to hand in a clean copy of each lesson plan.

3.2.6. Journals

Student teachers’ daily journals were collected. The journals were submitted at the beginning of the day, and each student teacher’s mentor teacher(s) read the journal, gave feedback, and returned the journal to each student teacher at the end of the day. After the mentor teachers wrote their comments, the researcher photocopied the journals twice, in the middle and at the end of the practicum.

In this study, out of the seven sections of the form for the teachers to fill in every day, three sections related to the student teacher’s department (i.e., English). The researcher analyzed the student teacher’s comments on class observation and teaching, conferences, and reflections. In the class observation and teaching section, student teachers remarked upon the classes they observed and taught and what they learned. Almost everyday there was a conference and student teachers wrote in the conference section about what was discussed during the meeting. Then for the reflections section, they described their experiences and feelings about the practicum activities and teaching on that day.

---

15 The other four sections include: notices for student teachers, homeroom student teaching, and observation notes on homeroom class students.
3.3. Data Analysis

In order to investigate the Ministry of Education’s views of the curricular reform, the 7th curriculum manual was analyzed using the principles of grounded content analysis (Bogdan & Biklin, 1998; Glaser & Strauss, 1967), an open-coding technique defined as, “the naming and categorizing of phenomena through the close examination of data” (Strauss & Corbin, 1990, p.62). The manual was read both carefully and repeatedly and the contents regarding the communicative approach were highlighted and then categorized into themes. These themes include the rationale of the curricular mandates and the essential premises of the curricular reform including 1) the development of communicative competence, 2) English as the means of classroom communication, 3) communicative activities and task-based language learning, and 4) learner-centered language learning. These four themes functioned as the central concepts that the student teachers were expected to develop in their university coursework, during their practicum experiences and be able to enact in their practicum teaching.

A dataset for each participant included: team conferences, journals, stimulated recall sessions, interviews, classroom interactions, and field notes. Each dataset was read thoroughly and analyzed based on the principles of ethnographic semantics in which the meanings that people give to their verbal expressions are the primary focus of investigation (Spradley, 1979; Spradley & McCurdy, 1972). The constant comparative method that “combines inductive category coding with a simultaneous comparison of all social incidents observed” (Goetz & LeCompte, 1981, p.58) was used to develop an understanding of the data (Bogdan & Biklin, 1998; Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Goetz & LeCompte, 1981). Based on a grounded content analysis (Bogdan & Biklin, 1998), the

---

16 The details of the curriculum manual are shown in Chapter 4.
data were examined to uncover the participating student teachers’ understandings and instructional practices as they understood/experienced them within the contexts in which they were situated.

Thus, the datasets for each participant were reviewed carefully and repeatedly, specifically coded into the instances related to the curricular reform concepts, especially with regard to the mentoring and the practicum activities of teams and individual student teachers’ practicum teaching. Specifically, the data underwent repeated and cyclical processes of analysis that progressed from more general to more specific observations (Creswell, 1998; Glaser & Strauss, 1967). As data were conceptually coded, salient and recurring patterns and themes were identified and then relationships among these patterns were investigated in order to create tentative conceptual categories (Bogdan & Biklin, 1998). Final themes emerged from further iterative and refining processes of data reduction, verification, and further data analysis (Miles & Huberman, 1994). The validity of the data coding and theme finding process were discussed and verified by a peer debriefer, a researcher in applied linguistics. Then these themes were mapped along a sociocultural theoretical framework of human learning.

For example, from the data set of Sora, one of the student teachers, “teachers’ choice of language as the medium of instruction” was one of the macro-themes that emerged. Coding of all of her data such as her journals, classroom interactions, interviews including stimulated recall sessions, and conference talks proceeded from general into more specific categories with consideration of Sora’s changes in this macro-theme over time. Thus, her journal entries coded as “teachers’ choice of language as the medium of instruction” were more specifically coded such as “understanding the benefits
of teaching English through English” (Journal–May 2, Data Excerpt 5.12; Journal–May 9, Data Excerpt 5.8) on the one hand and “negative beliefs about teachers’ English use that may constrain pupils’ understanding” (Journal–May 9, Data Excerpt 5.8) on the other hand. Her interviews were also coded in a similar manner such as, “benefits of teachers’ English use as L2 input” (Interview–May 9) and “pupils’ negative response about teachers’ English use” (Interview–June, 8; Data Excerpt 5.13). Her classroom interactions were also coded over time from “use of English for instruction” (Class–May 11, Classroom Excerpt 5.3) into “teaching English through Korean” (Class–May 15, 18, 23, 26; Classroom Excerpt 5.4-6). Moreover, conference talks between the mentor teacher and Sora and her peers were also coded as “success of teaching English through English” (Conference–May 4) and “benefits of using Korean for grammar sections and for the low level pupils” (Conference–May 12). These recurring patterns across the data sets were further coded into tentative categories and then finally refined as an overarching theme of “Switching the Medium of Instruction from English to Korean.” This data analysis process revealed the inner contradictions that began to emerge out of the activity system from Sora’s perspectives and how they were resolved. In particular, coding and analyzing Sora’s data over time helped to trace her development of the concepts of teaching English through English initiated by the curricular reforms and also to reveal various individual, social, and contextual factors influential to her development.

The themes that emerged through the grounded analysis as shown above largely represented two areas that were compatible with the two research questions of this study: (1) the nature of the practicum activities and the mentoring that the student teachers experienced and how these supported the student teachers’ development of curricular
reform concepts; (2) the extent to which these student teachers came to understand these
concepts and actually attempted to implement them in their instructional practices.

The first theme provides a comprehensive understanding of the practicum activity
systems for team A and B. Various practicum activities in each team (team conferences,
observations and journals) were found to represent mediational means toward enacting
the curricular reforms. In particular, the role of the mentor teacher in mediating the
curricular reforms was investigated by looking at his/her interactions with student
teachers in the practicum activities and with pupils in classroom teaching. The following
table indicates the themes that emerged concerning the nature of the practicum activities
and the mentoring specifically related to the curricular reform efforts.

Table 3.7. Characteristics of Practicum Activities and Mentoring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team</th>
<th>Themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Team A</td>
<td>· Apprenticing student teachers into the mentor’s styles of teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· Suggesting a model for teachers’ mixed use of English and Korean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· Encouraging activities focusing on effective management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· Providing conflicting ideas about learner-centered instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· Prioritizing L2 knowledge for exams over L2 use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· Reinforcing the gap between vision and reality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team B</td>
<td>· Encouraging attempts at new ideas, but providing insufficient support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· Allowing making choices about the use of English and Korean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· Emphasizing motivating pupils and managing them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· Exposing teaching practices and allowing critiques</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· Providing feasible teaching objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· Revealing contextual constraints</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The themes above revealed different mentoring styles across teams and to what
extent the curricular reform concepts were focused on through these mentoring and
various practicum activities.
The second theme illuminates the characterization of the instructional activity system from each student teacher’s perspective in order to investigate their understanding and implementation of the curricular reforms in their own classroom practices. The table below shows the themes related to the student teachers’ practicum teaching in terms of perceptions and enactment of concepts promoted in CLT-based curricular reform.

Table 3.8. Student Teachers’ Perceptions and Enactment of the Curricular Reforms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Teachers</th>
<th>Themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sora (Team A)</strong></td>
<td>Switching the Medium of Instruction from English to Korean&lt;br&gt;Learners as passive recipients&lt;br&gt;Valuing accuracy in activities&lt;br&gt;Vision and reality in using authentic materials&lt;br&gt;Traditional methods as essential&lt;br&gt;Primary focus on grammatical competence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yuna (Team A)</strong></td>
<td>Teachers’ Use of English as the medium of instruction&lt;br&gt;Optimistic about instructional activities but lacking resources&lt;br&gt;Encouraging pupils’ L2 use in communicative activities&lt;br&gt;Teacher-controlled activities&lt;br&gt;Conflicting beliefs about traditional approaches&lt;br&gt;Uneven attention to components of communicative competence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bohee (Team B)</strong></td>
<td>Teachers’ maximal use of English&lt;br&gt;The teacher’s role as facilitator&lt;br&gt;Supporting pupils’ engagement in communicative activities&lt;br&gt;Attempting to support pupils’ L2 use&lt;br&gt;The model class: situated perceptions of the curricular reform&lt;br&gt;Extensive attempts to develop communicative competence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Jubin (Team B)</strong></td>
<td>Teachers’ flexible use of English and Korean&lt;br&gt;Extensive use of communicative activities&lt;br&gt;Stimulating pupils’ L2 use&lt;br&gt;Focusing on fluency in using English&lt;br&gt;Helping pupils learn and construct meaning&lt;br&gt;Consistent efforts to improve communicative competence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Many of these themes included the inertia and/or the process of transformation in these student teachers’ perceptions and classroom practices related to the curricular
reform concepts as a result of the resolution of the emerging inner contradictions within the activity system where these student teachers functioned as the subjects.

These themes were then analyzed within Engeström’s activity system model (1987, 1993, 1999a) in order to expose the activity systems of student teachers’ practicum experiences as being interwoven with individual, social, and other contextual factors. This allowed the researcher to not only identify important components of the activity systems from each student teacher’s perspective, but also it illuminates the origins and the complex nature of each component. Additionally, it enabled the researcher to investigate how inner contradictions emerged, not only within each component and/or between different components within an activity system, but also between different activity systems. Moreover, this helped to explicate how inner contradictions were resolved within the activity system and what those resolution processes imply in terms of the implementation of the curricular reforms. Finally, the data analyses make visible how learning processes were dialectically interconnected with other components in these student teachers’ practicum and teaching experiences and shows the nature and resolution of inner contradictions within the activity system while illuminating their concept development as it relates to the curricular reform efforts.

3.4. Ensuring Trustworthiness

In order to enhance the trustworthiness, authenticity, or credibility of the study (Creswell & Miller, 2000), as frequently presented in the literature (Creswell, 2003; Lincoln & Guba, 1985), the researcher strove to implement triangulation, rich and thick description, member checking, peer debriefing, and translation verification.
First, triangulating multiple data sources helped ensure the findings of the study. Various perspectives about and/or implementation of the curricular reforms were reviewed through the documents from the Ministry of Education and the school administration, and the datasets from the participants including oral data (interviews, conferences, and classroom interactions) and written data (journals, and lesson plans).

Secondly, to increase the accuracy of the qualitative findings, the researcher gives rich and thick description about the participating teachers’ experiences and the related context. This helps examine the activity system where the participants are the subject and their inner contradictions and finally their concept development as teachers.

Next, member-checking was also used to verify the interpretations of the data. The researcher recorded the classroom interactions and transcribed them verbatim. She discussed her interpretations of the classroom data with the participants during the interviews. During the discussion, the participants were also asked to give feedback about the researcher’s interpretation of their written data (journals, lesson plans).

Then, the researcher used peer debriefing to improve the validity of the coding process, the emerging themes, and the interpretations of the data. A peer debriefer who was trained as a researcher in applied linguistics and understands the context of the current study was selected. As a doctoral student focusing on ELT with several years of teaching experience in an Asian country, the debriefer gave feedback concerning the researcher’s data analysis, asked probing questions about the study, including querying the researcher on her assumptions.

Lastly, as for the datasets spoken and/or written in Korean, the researcher did the analysis in the original writing and translated them into English for display. A person
fluent bilingual in both English and Korean was asked to determine the accuracy of the translation.
CHAPTER FOUR
ANALYSIS OF THE CURRICULUM MANUAL

This chapter provides a grounded content analysis of the 7th Middle School English Curriculum Manual issued by South Korean Ministry of Education (1998). The manual, which outlines the curriculum reform for textbook developers, course designers, and teachers, consists of three sections: 1) a historical overview of the curricula in South Korea and a brief comparison of the 7th curriculum to the 6th national curriculum; 2) the background, focus, characteristics and objectives of the 7th curriculum; 3) detailed guidelines of how to implement the curriculum including the contents, teaching and learning methods, and evaluations.

The curriculum proposes that Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) be adapted in Korean English classrooms. However, since “CLT is not a monolithic and uniform approach” (Ellis, 2003, p. 2003) and is not universal in terms of how it becomes interpreted and operationalized (Li, 1998; Richards & Rogers, 1986), this chapter helps uncover how the Ministry of Education defines and interprets CLT and how they expect teachers to implement the curriculum in Korean classroom settings.

The following section describes the results of the grounded content analysis of the curriculum manual, the rationale of the curricular mandates, and the key premises of the 7th curriculum. The key premises include: 1) the development of communicative

---

1 The content section describes: 1) the model of the 7th curriculum (refer to Figure 4.1), 2) the standards in content areas (i.e., language functions, communicative activities, and language resources), and 3) the achievement criteria for students in each grade and semester with related sample tests. The evaluations section indicates the goals, methods and types of assessment, and suggests that more integrated, process-based and performance-based assessment be made in order to evaluate students’ communicative competence.
competence, 2) English as the means of classroom communication, 3) communicative activities and task-based language learning, and 4) learner-centered language learning. The four premises also function as concepts which have been investigated in theory and research in the field of L2 teaching and learning and the Ministry of Education expects teachers to understand and enact (i.e., internalize) in their instructional practices.

4.1. Rationale of the Curricular Reform

The curriculum manual emphasizes the status of English as lingua franca and the need to develop students’ communication abilities in English so that the students can compete in various areas such as business, science, and international politics. Consequently, the curriculum frequently criticizes grammar-translation and audiolingual methods because it assumes that these traditional methods undermine students’ communicative competence in English. As is clear below, the current policy stresses that English should be treated as a means of communication to meet society’s needs for English. In addition, it maintains that only the communicative approach can develop learners’ ability to communicate in English.


Introducing the communicative approach to English education is a practical reaction to the past English education in which students experienced difficulty in appropriate communication in spite of their good grammatical knowledge. This also reflects social demands for English education for developing communication capability rather than...

\(^2\) In this chapter, original Korean statements appear first and then English translations follow. The contents in brackets add information which was clear from the context, but is not explained in the excerpt. Statements are bolded to focus the readers’ attention.
for enhancing general knowledge (without an emphasis on practical application). Communicative competence can be improved only through communicative activities (Savignon, 1972), but not through grammatical analysis, mechanical drills and memorization (Guntermann & Phillips, 1982).

Moreover, the curriculum explains that teachers’ own lack of oral communication in English inhibited the development of the students’ oral proficiency.

Data Excerpt 4.2. The 7th Curriculum (Ministry of Education, 1998, p.7)
그 동안 우리 영어 교육은 영어를 먼저 말로 가르치지 못하고 초보 단계부터 문자를 통하여 영어에 관한 지식을 가르치는 데 너무 많은 시간을 소모해 왔다. 또 다른 우리 영어 교육의 취약점은 교사의 구어 능력이 부족하여 교수·학습 시간에 영어로 가르치지 못하고 있는 점으로, 이를 극복하는 일이 우리 영어 교육의 당면 과제이기도 하다.

To date, our English education has spent too much time on teaching knowledge about the English language from the beginning level specifically through written language, but not enough time teaching English through spoken language. Another shortcoming of our English education is teachers’ lack of ability in spoken English. As a result, they are not able to teach English through English, and thus, our English education should overcome these shortcomings very soon.

In sum, the critique given in the 7th curriculum is that typical classrooms focusing on grammatical knowledge and mechanical drills as well as teachers’ low oral proficiency produces incompetent English communicators. Thus, the communicative approach to English language teaching aims to develop learners’ communicative competence through activities in which students speak English and students’ proficiency levels and interests are taken into consideration.
4.2. Key Premises of the 7th Curriculum

4.2.1. Development of Communicative Competence

Developing learners’ communicative competence is proposed as the utmost learning goal of the 7th curriculum\(^3\). This objective of the curriculum is represented in Figure 4.1 with other important components of the curriculum.

Figure 4.1. The Model of the 7th English Curriculum (Ministry of Education, 1998)

---

\(^3\) The other stated goal of the curriculum is the development of learners’ cultural awareness: “하나는 학생들의 의사소통 능력을 기르는 것이며, 다른 하나는 외국 문화를 올바르게 수용하여 우리 문화를 발전시키고, 외국에 소개할 수 있는 능력을 기르는 것이다 (One goal is to develop learners’ communicative competence, and the other is to accept foreign culture properly, develop our own culture and improve the capability to introduce our culture to other countries).” The curriculum interconnects the two aims by arguing that in order to communicate with people from other cultures appropriately, one should understand their culture. In this sense, the second objective can be included in the first one.
Since communicative activities are represented right next to the lesson goal, they are characterized as essential to achieve that goal. In addition, the curriculum indicates written and spoken languages are equally crucial to enhance learners’ communicative competence, thus proposing a balance among the four language skills. The model also shows that both language functions and linguistic forms should be taken into consideration in order to enhance learners’ communicative competence.

The curriculum adopts the concept of communicative competence proposed by Canale and Swain (1980) and Bachman (1990), emphasizing that language learning is more complex and extensive than learning simple linguistic features (Ministry of Education, 1998, p.13). Thus, it is maintained that learners should also be taught to develop various competencies related to communication such as sociolinguistic competence, discourse competence, and strategic competence. In particular, the manual introduces the definition of the four competences:

Data Excerpt 4.3. The 7th Curriculum (Ministry of Education, 1998, p.13)
• **문법적 능력 (Grammatical competence):**
언어적 부호의 파악, 어휘, 단어 조어의 규칙, 문장 구성, 문자적 의미, 발음, 철자에 대한 지식 등 (understanding of linguistic features and knowledge about vocabulary, word structure, sentence structure, meanings, pronunciation, and word spelling)

• **사회 언어학적 능력 (Sociolinguistic competence):**
여러 상황에 따라 적절하게 언어를 사용할 줄 아는 능력 (ability to use language appropriately depending on various contexts)

• **담화적 능력 (Discourse competence):**
여러 언어 전달 매체에 따라 어떻게 의미와 형태를 배합해서 사용할지를 아는 능력 (ability to combine meaning and form depending on different genres)

• **책략적 능력 (Strategic competence):**
능력 부족이나 언어 수행상의 제약 때문에 일어나는 의사 소통 장애를 보상하고 의사 소통 효과를 높이기 위하여 언어적, 비언어적 책략을 사용할 줄 아는 능력 (ability to use verbal and non-verbal communication strategies to compensate for communication

---

4 Although the curriculum presents the concepts of both Canale and Swain (1980) and Bachman (1990), the content of the curriculum explains more about the components proposed by the former (e.g., sociolinguistic and discourse competence) than the latter (e.g., psychophysiological mechanisms).
breakdowns resulting from incompetence in communication and constraints in performing communications)

The curriculum states that learning a foreign language demands knowing how language is actually used in specific situations by native speakers. To develop this, the current policy employs Brooks’ (1975) definition of culture, and maintains that sociolinguistic and discourse competence can be developed through learning ‘little c’ culture which is related to behavior, language, attitudes, and beliefs of members in a specific community, as opposed to ‘big C’ culture which indicates outstanding and representative selections of literature, music, architecture, etc. (Brooks, 1975, p.22).

Strategic competence is emphasized as it promotes communication by using appropriate communicative strategies in order to maintain communication and compensate for insufficient L2 knowledge. The strategies include “paraphrasing, circumlocution, repetition, hesitation, avoidance, guessing, and shift in style” (Ministry of Education, 1994, p.77). The manual also introduces Brown’s (1994) speaking strategies: asking for clarification (What did you say?), using fillers in order to gain time to process (Uh, I mean, Well), using conversation maintenance cues (Right, Hm, Yeah, Okay), getting someone’s attention (Hey, Say, So), using formulaic expressions as well as using mime and nonverbal expressions to convey meaning.

Overall, the 7th curriculum employs the concept of communicative competence (Canale & Swain, 1980) as the ultimate learning objective and requires that learners be taught how they can use language appropriately in various discourse and sociolinguistic contexts and utilize communication strategies beyond knowledge about linguistic forms.
4.2.2. English as the Means of Classroom Communication

In order to improve students’ communicative competence, CLT encourages teachers and students to use the target language as much as possible. As such, the curriculum requires that English should be the language used within the classroom. The 7th curriculum states teachers should maximize their English use throughout class:

“수업은 가급적 영어로 진행하는 것을 원칙으로 하고, 교사의 능력에 맞게 교실 영어를 사용하도록 권장한다 (It is a principle for teachers to teach lessons in English as much as possible, and it is recommended that teachers use classroom English according to the teachers’ proficiency level of speaking English).” Furthermore, the Teaching English through English (TETE) policy proposed more frequent use and even the exclusive use of English (Kwon, 2000b).

The TETE policy is based on the argument that teachers’ use of English is expected to act as language and listening input and complement students’ limited exposure to English in EFL contexts. In addition, the manual indicates students’ use of English in class will increase communication experiences and thus enhance the opportunities to develop their communicative competence.


A teacher’s use of classroom English has advantages in that it provides students with communication experiences, more English input, and listening practice.

In addition to teachers’ unidirectional use of English (for example, greeting the class, giving instructions, explaining a concept or activity), the curriculum suggests teachers and students communicate in English through various communicative activities between teacher and students and also between students (ibid).
4.2.3. Communicative Activities and Task-Based Language Learning

In order to develop learners’ communicative competence, the current policy requires using communicative activities\(^5\). According to the curriculum, the activities should be similar to authentic communication and create meaningful and communicative interactions between teacher and students and between students as well. In addition, communicative activities are expected to develop learners’ fluency and accuracy\(^6\).

Data Excerpt 4.5. The 7th Curriculum (Ministry of Education, 1998, p.7)

중학교 영어 교육은 초등 학교 영어 교육을 통해 형성된 영어 학습에 대한 흥미와 관심을 지속시키고 영어로 의사 소통할 수 있는 기본 능력을 신장하도록 하며, 유창성과 정확성을 기를 수 있도록 학습 경험과 활동을 극대화하여야 한다. 이를 위해 교실에 도입하는 과제와 활동은 실제 의사 소통과 유사하거나 실제 의사 소통 상황이 되도록 구성할 필요가 있다.

Middle school English education should maintain students’ interests developed through English lessons in elementary school. Also, it should develop a basic ability to communicate in English and maximize learning experiences and activities in order to improve fluency and accuracy. For these aims, classroom tasks and activities need to be designed to create contexts that are similar to or are authentic communication.

The curriculum proposes that communicative activities be conducted and incorporated in four language skills (p.13). It is recommended that whereas spoken language activities include communication functions, written language activities should embrace linguistic forms as well as functions (p.14). Thus, the supplemental guide to the curriculum manual, ‘의사소통기능과 예시문 (Communicative Functions and Examples), provides functions such as agreement, refusal, compliment, and complaints with the related structures. Also, the supplemental guide, ‘의사소통에 필요한 언어형식 (Language

---

\(^5\) ‘Task’ and ‘activity’ are used interchangeably in the curriculum manual. Also, the curriculum uses ‘tasks’, ‘communicative activities (활동)’, and ‘communicative practices (연습)’ interchangeably.

\(^6\) In the 6th curriculum, accuracy in language forms was less valued than fluency and language functions. Since the curriculum was criticized in that it ignores the importance of accuracy in learning English, the 7th curriculum included accuracy of language use.
Forms for Communication), presents grammatical structure such as passive voice and tense, although actual grammatical terms are not used.

The concept of communicative activities is reinforced in terms of task-based instruction. Specifically, the idea that communicative activities are essentially a means for accomplishing task-based instruction is stressed in the 7th curriculum and in many descriptions of CLT (Breen, 1987; Nunan, 1988). Thus, the concept of real-life communication during classroom tasks or activities is well presented in the definition of task-based instruction as “학습자를 의사소통 상황으로 끌어들여 과제를 수행하거나 활동을 이행하게 하면서 자연스럽게 실제와 유사한, 혹은 실제 의사 소통이 일어나게 하는 수업이다 (lessons where learners are asked to be immersed in various communicative situations, perform tasks or activities and thus, they can communicate naturally in the contexts that are similar to or are authentic communications) (Ministry of Education, 1998, p.2).”

The curriculum adopts the definition of task proposed by Breen (1987) and Willis (1996). First, Breen (1987) defines a task as “…a range of work plans which have the overall purposes of facilitating language learning … from the simple and brief exercise type, to more complex and lengthy activities such as problem-solving or simulations and decision making.” This broad definition indicates that a task should promote language

---

7 ‘Communicative Functions and Examples’ involve seven big notional-functional categories and 48 categories under which 3-4 sub-categories are located. In total, communicative activity items amount to 80 items. Three to nine example sentences are presented for each item. For example, under emotions, there are six categories such as liking/hate, want, joy/anger/sorrow/pleasure, sympathy, wish/will, and complaints. For the category of joy/anger/sorrow/pleasure, there are four sub-categories such as expressing joy and sorrow, comforting sorrow, expressing anger, and expressing surprise. For each sub-categories, three to four example sentences are presented such as ‘I’m happy/I’m sad’ for expressing joy and sorrow.

‘Language forms for communication’ includes 37 grammatical structures (e.g., tense, passive, negative, interrogative, modal, to infinitive, gerund), under which three to twenty examples are listed, although actual grammatical terms are not used.
learning and can be implemented in various task types from short exercises to complicated activities.

Second, the definition of task by Willis (1996) in the excerpt below emphasizes the use of the L2 as a medium of communication to negotiate meaning during tasks as well as its use in a final product. In addition, the manual stresses that teachers should provide tasks to motivate learners and be sensitive to learners’ interests and proficiency. This shows that task-based language learning is closely connected with learner-centered language learning operationalized in the curriculum manual.

Willis (1996)는 과업을 ‘특정한 결과물을 포함하는 목적 지향적인 의사 소통 활동’으로 정의하고 있다. 여기서, 결과물은 도표 만들기, 그림 그리기, 지도에 표시하기 등과 같은 것을 의미한다. 과업 수행에서 중요한 것은 특정한 언어 형태를 기계적으로 발화하는 것이 아니라 언어를 사용하여 의미를 교섭(negotiate)하는 것이다. 교사는 학습자에게 관심과 홍미를 반영하는 다양한 과업을 제공하여 학습자의 동기를 유발할 필요가 있는데, 과업을 선정할 때에는 학습자들의 홍미 이외에도 학습자의 인지적인 수준, 언어 수준, 과업의 난이도 등을 고려하여 적절히 도전적인(challenging) 과업을 제공하는 것이 바람직하다. Willis (1996) defines a task as “an activity [where the target language is used by the learners] for a communicative purpose in order to achieve an outcome”. Here, an outcome means making a table, drawing, and/or marking a map. What is important in performing tasks is to negotiate meaning using the target language, not just repeating specific linguistic forms mechanically. In order to motivate students, teachers need to provide various tasks that are a reflection of students’ interests. Thus, when selecting tasks, it is desirable for teachers to consider students’ cognitive ability levels, English proficiency levels, and task difficulties in addition to students’ interests, and then provide appropriately challenging tasks.

Depending on pupils’ proficiency and cognitive levels, the curriculum recommends designing different kinds of tasks to maintain students’ motivation. As is shown below, in the lower level, activities such as games and role plays are recommended to enhance students’ interests. In the higher level, tasks where students can express their ideas and experiences and solve problems are suggested in order to stimulate their sense of achievement.
Depending on students’ cognitive level, teachers should design ways to motivate students and conduct instructional activities. For the students in lower grades, teachers need to use motivating methods in order to meet students’ interests. However, for the students in higher grades, teachers need to stimulate their sense of achievement more frequently. Concerning instructional activities, in lower proficiency classes, teachers need to employ learning activities such as games and role plays in order to stimulate their interests. On the other hand, in higher proficiency classes, teachers need to use teaching methods where students can solve problems using their thoughts and experiences.

The curriculum claims that in order to successfully enact task-based language learning, it is important that teachers take an appropriate role. Teachers should act as a helper to support pupils’ carrying out tasks themselves, as a monitor of their learning, and as an information provider. Also, teachers should manage small group work effectively and consider the processes to complete tasks, not only the outcomes.
In summary, the curriculum indicates teachers should use communicative activities and conduct task-based instruction to develop pupils’ communicative competence through meaningful negotiation with one another. In particular, the activities are expected to include four language skills which help learners acquire language functions. Teachers are expected to help students actively participate.

4.2.4. Learner-centered Language Learning

CLT theory supports learner-centeredness in the language classroom and believes that teachers should design instructional methods considering individual learners’ interests, styles, needs, and goals (Savignon, 1991). Furthermore, since students should feel comfortable and safe in a CLT classroom, teacher-centered and authoritarian posture should be avoided (Taylor, 1983). As such, the 7th curriculum promotes learner-centered language learning in that learners’ proficiency levels, needs, and interests are taken into account and learners’ participation is encouraged in classroom activities.


The learner-centered education means … offering diverse programs where students’ interests and needs are respected, their proficiency levels are considered, and their potential and creativities are developed. Thus, teachers should be provided with autonomy and students with rights to choose.

The curriculum supports the idea of pupils’ having a voice in what they learn, and indicates that learners can choose specific contents of given activities. As in the following excerpt, learners can express their opinions or personally relevant matters in communicative activities.
Learners can explain persons they like and/or respect briefly: In selecting and explaining persons they like and/or respect, it is effective to use topics which learners are interested in and curious about…. In other words, learners can choose the content they want to study and thus, activities where learners can explain a person they like or respect can be an example of learner-centered activity. But it is desirable for a teacher to show a model by describing the history of a person s/he likes and why s/he likes him/her, so the learners fully understand the activity, and then ask them to perform it.

Teachers should facilitate students’ learning through planning, preparing and implementing classes considering individual students’ English proficiency levels. The curriculum adds that because in a learner-centered class teachers’ responsibilities include generating individualized instruction and materials, their workload is heavier than those of teachers in teacher-centered classrooms.

Data Excerpt 4.11. The 7th Curriculum (Ministry of Education, 1998, p.77)

Teachers should plan learner-centered lessons so that learners can participate in classroom activities more actively. In so doing, teachers should be learners’ collaborators…. In order to conduct learner-centered lessons, teachers should develop individualized materials depending on learners’ proficiency levels. Thus, teachers take on more responsibility. Without careful development of individualized materials according to their proficiency, learner-centered lessons are impossible to conduct. In addition, without teachers’ meticulous plan for learner-centered lessons, the lessons could be diverted [and will not be successful]. The role of teachers as collaborators means lots of effort and sacrifice on the part of the teachers.
In order to meet pupils’ individual needs, the 7th curriculum launches a tracking system, in which classes and/or small groups are divided by pupils’ proficiency levels. The system is supposed to provide English lessons more effectively for both lower and higher proficiency learners. While lower level learners are assumed to need more help to learn basic skills, higher level learners are expected to achieve higher learning criteria.

Although the 7th curriculum recommends that secondary schools offer classes in English differentiated by proficiency level\(^8\), whether or how to implement level differentiated English classrooms (e.g., number of levels, class size) depends upon individual school contexts (Ministry of Education, 1998). In the lab school, four classes were divided into five different proficiency level groups. Thus, this study notes the tracking system enacted in the school as it impacts how student teachers understand teaching and how their training is carried out.

4.3. Summary

The analysis of the curriculum manual shows that the 7th curriculum supports communicative approaches to language learning in order to overcome the limitations of the prevalent traditional approaches that have focused on linguistic forms, translation and mechanical drills. Putting development of communicative competence as its primary learning goal, the curriculum intends to promote learners’ use of English based on both linguistic functions and linguistic structure. English is expected to be the medium of instruction and teachers are strongly encouraged to use communicative activities and/or tasks where meaningful and real-life negotiations are made. Teachers are expected to help learners function as an active participant in their learning process. Furthermore, the

\(^8\) A tracking system is also expected to be conducted in Math.
curriculum stresses that in designing lessons, learners’ proficiency, interests, and needs should be taken into account, and the curriculum recommends use of a tracking system.

Overall, the interpretation of CLT evident in the 7th curriculum reflects the wholesale importation of a western view of CLT: learning goal of enhancing communicative competence in L2, learning L2 through communicative tasks by using the L2, focus on individual active learners, and knowledge building through interactions between teachers and students and also among students. Apparently, however, the present curriculum 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. Since the current policy expects teachers to alter their perceptions and instructions to be compatible with western perspectives of CLT, it is essential to investigate how such reforms have been embraced in the realities of English classrooms as well as teacher education programs, which reveals the future as well as the present implementation of the CLT-based curricular reform in Korea. With the understanding of the assumptions and expectations of the mandated policies, the next two chapters analyze the participating student teachers’ perception and implementation of the CLT-based curricular reform.

---

9 For more details about conceptions of CLT in literature, refer to section 2.1.1 (Communicative Language Teaching) in the Literature Review Chapter.
Chapter five and six account for how the student teachers in the two teams (A and B) learned to teach during their practicum experience within the context of curricular reform mandates. Since the practicum experiences of these student teachers are interwoven with their individual beliefs and experiences in English language education, their day-to-day practicum activities and teaching, and existing educational policies and contextual factors, both common and diverse characteristics in learning and teaching within the practicum were evident. Chapter five first examines the practicum activities of team A to address the first research questions of this study, and then, in order to answer the second research questions, this chapter reveals the two student teachers’ development, specifically focusing on their changing perceptions of the curricular reform mandates and how they attempted to embrace them in their classroom practices.

5.1. Practicum Activities

In this section, the first research question along with one sub-research question of this study is answered, specifically related to team A: How have curricular reform efforts been enacted in the activities student teachers engage in during the practicum? What mediational means does the practicum provide to help student teachers understand and enact these curricular reforms?

This section initially explains the structure of the practicum activity system, wherein various practicum activities were represented as mediational means (e.g.,
conferences, observations, journals, mentoring) to assist the student teachers in understanding and embracing the curricular reforms (refer to Section 5.1.1). Then, it presents six themes that emerged from both the nature of the practicum activities and of Mrs. Ma’s mentoring which mediated these student teachers’ learning in the curricular reform context (Section 5.1.2).

5.1.1. The Configuration of the Practicum Activity System

Based on the analysis of the spoken and written data collected from Mrs. Ma, Sora, and Yuna\(^1\), the following practicum activity system emerged wherein Sora and Yuna each functioned as the subject\(^2\).

---

\(^1\) For details about the collected data, refer to the Data Collection section in the Methodology Chapter (3.2).

\(^2\) The instructional activity systems where Sora and Yuna separately functioned as the subjects are examined in sections 5.2 and 5.3, respectively. In fact, the practicum activity system and the instructional activity system for each student teacher are closely interconnected. They developed their conception of teaching over the course of the practicum, and taught as a practicum requirement. At the same time, the practicum activities mediated their instruction.
The tools embedded in the practicum activities (conferences, observations, and classroom teaching) and artifacts (journals, lesson plans, and a formative test) represented requirements for all of the student teachers. Through these tools, the learning of these student teachers was also mediated by their mentor teacher and their pupils. For example, Mrs. Ma influenced these student teachers’ learning through conference discussions and the pupils through their classroom participation. Mediated by these tools, Sora and Yuna had three objects in the practicum activity system. The principal object and rule was to complete the practicum requirements. In addition, since the mentor teacher’s teaching evaluation was the most important part of their grade, meeting the expectations of Mrs. Ma as revealed in her mentoring (e.g., maintaining control over pupils, teaching as she taught/mentored) was the principal object and rule. The last object of this practicum activity system was related to the actual teaching, namely, enhancing these student teachers’ teaching ability.

The figures that characterize each activity system in this study are adapted from Engeström’s human activity system model (1987, 1993, 1999a).
teachers’ instructional skills. The ultimate outcome of this practicum activity system was to successfully pass the practicum with a good grade.

The community of this practicum activity system included the mentor teacher and the peer student teachers in team A and those in other teams, as well as the pupils. Team members collaborated through planning, observing, and reflecting on their classes. Specifically, all the team A peers had the identical object and Mrs. Ma’s guidance was critical to these student teachers’ practicum experiences. Other mentors and peers also influenced these two student teachers’ practicum experiences: whereas mentors offered model lessons and guidance, peers shared similar goals to Yuna and Sora and gave each other feedback on classroom teaching. Additionally, the pupils were influential to these student teachers who were sensitive to the pupils’ response to their practicum teaching such as making choices about L1 or L2 as the medium of instruction.

The master-apprentice relationship between Mrs. Ma and her student teachers in team A defined the division of labor: Mrs. Ma not only told them what and how to teach, but her instructional practices reinforced her words, and the student teachers followed her directives and instructions. This division of labor and other components of the practicum activity system, especially the object and the outcome, explain how influential Mrs. Ma’s conception of “good teaching” is, as well as why Sora and Yuna usually complied with Mrs. Ma’s recommendations when they taught. Thus, under this practicum activity system, the curricular reform mandates were most likely understood and embraced through Mrs. Ma’s mentoring as situated in a specific context, together with these student teachers’ beliefs and prior experiences.
5.1.2. The Nature of the Practicum Activities and Mentoring

In order to provide a comprehensive view of the practicum activity systems from Sora’s and Yuna’s perspectives, the major characteristics of the mentoring and the practicum activities (conferences, journals, and classroom observations) are examined in this section. The daily team conferences, during which Mrs. Ma and the student teachers conferred about practicum-related matters, were an essential component of their teacher training and professionalization and provided an important opportunity for active discussion. Together with Mrs. Ma, the student teachers reviewed the classes taught that day, their lesson plans for their next class, and shared successful classroom activities with each other. In addition, they discussed societal perceptions of teachers, how teachers need to understand their profession, and the responsibility each teacher has to continue professional development. The second type of activity, the daily journals written by Sora and Yuna, chronicled their daily activities and highlighted how they thought and felt about their practicum experience. In particular, the journals revealed what these student teachers learned from class observations and how they planned and reflected on their own classes. The third activity, observation of other teachers’ classes, provided Sora and Yuna with the opportunity to consider what and how they should and could teach. Specifically, they observed how the mentor teachers used language, conducted activities, and adopted teaching methods. Also, observations of peer student teachers’ classrooms enabled them to see additional methods, activities and materials, and these often helped them reshape their own classroom teaching approach. In particular, these practicum activities revealed a mediational role of the pupils in these student teachers’ learning in that the pupils’
reactions to student teaching, their class participation, and their English ability were influential to the student teachers’ planning, teaching, and reflecting on each lesson.

The grounded content analysis of the practicum activities and of Mrs. Ma’s mentoring revealed six conceptual categories: 1) student teachers were apprenticed into their mentor’s style of teaching; 2) they were encouraged to use both English and Korean appropriately, depending on several factors such as students’ proficiency levels and textbook content; 3) using instructional activities were recommended specifically focusing on effective classroom management; 4) these student teachers were expected to maintain control over pupils to ensure their learning, while still being sensitive to the pupils’ needs; 5) teaching L2 knowledge for exams was positioned as more important than teaching L2 use; 6) these student teachers’ perceptions about the gap between their vision and the reality of teaching were reinforced.

5.1.2.1. Apprenticing Student Teachers to the Mentor’s Style of Teaching

Over multiple conferences, Mrs. Ma consistently requested that her student teachers both imagine and actually take on the role of a teacher. Furthermore, she expected her student teachers to teach in the manner she taught in order to maintain consistency for the pupils (Conference, May 17). Mrs. Ma believed this would help the student teachers and the pupils get accustomed to each other and would create less disruption to pupils’ learning⁴. Her mentoring indicated that student teachers should “do what I do” rather than try out new ideas or activities with her pupils. In fact, she described the practicum as an “apprenticeship” (Conference, May 8) and Sora even mentioned that some advanced level pupils would complain that their learning could be interrupted due to the change of teachers (from their “real” teacher to several student teachers) during the practicum (Mrs. Ma–Interview, May 12).

---

⁴ Mrs. Ma mentioned that some advanced level pupils would complain that their learning could be interrupted due to the change of teachers (from their “real” teacher to several student teachers) during the practicum (Mrs. Ma–Interview, May 12).
described Mrs. Ma as a “master to apprentices” (Sora–Interview, June 8). Clearly, she positioned herself as a model to be imitated rather than a guide or advisor.

Sora and Yuna stated that Mrs. Ma greatly influenced their teaching conceptions and practices, by meticulously showing them what and how to teach in the classroom context. For example, Sora mentioned, “구체적인 걸 배우니까 어떤 어떻게 해야겠다는 직접적인 생각을 할 수 있게 되는 것 같아요 (since [Mrs. Ma] shows us very concrete ideas and ways to conduct lessons, she enables us to come up with concrete ways we could teach)” (Sora–Interview, May 9). In particular, she stated that she was able to change her lessons due to her mentor’s evaluations on the organization of her activities and lessons and the mentor’s suggestions for improvement (Sora–Interview, June 8). Specifically, she was very quick to apply her mentor’s comments to her teaching “액티비티를 하나 했는데 좀 어려운 것 같았다…. 그러면 뭐 이렇게 좀 줄이고 시간이 좀 모자란 것 같다 그러면 앞에 걸쭉 줄이고 (If she said that a certain activity in the first lesson was a little hard for the pupils… I lowered the level of difficulty in the next class). If she commented that in the first class the time (for the activity) was short, in the second class I finished the earlier section in a shorter period of time (to make more time for the activity in question))” (Sora–Stimulated Recall, May 23).

Likewise, Yuna also said that her mentor’s detailed guidelines about lessons were critical to her teaching: “처음에는 수업 전체적인 구성을 말씀해 주세요. 이거는 뭐 어떻게 해 주세요. 이렇게 말씀해 주시니까 저는 따라서요 (She explained the overall organization of a whole lesson first and then she told us specific ways the lesson should be taught. So we just followed her)” (Yuna–Interview, May 23). She also stated the mentor’s powerful

---

5 The participating student teachers usually taught one lesson plan to two separate groups of pupils. That is, they used one lesson plan in two different class hours.
impact on her instruction as “지도교사는 따라갈 수 밖에 없는 것 같아요… 티칭방식에 있어서는… 보고 하면서 느는 거니까 (It seems inevitable to follow the mentor’s … ways to teach… I think teaching skills develop through observations of one’s mentor’s classes and through one’s actual teaching)” (Yuna–Interview, June 8).

Most importantly, observing Mrs. Ma’s classes allowed Sora and Yuna to frame their own teaching in this specific classroom context. One example is noted from Yuna’s reflections in her journal:

Data Excerpt 5.1. Yuna–Journal (May 1)⁶

What I realized in the first observation of an English lesson [taught by Mrs. Ma] was about how to make a good learning atmosphere rather than about how or what to teach. The class was very helpful for me to frame a 45-minute English class. Before observing Mrs. Ma’s class, I had no idea of how I could actually teach. First, I think it is important to show pupils specific lesson goals and to improve skills by using various multimedia. Also I was able to learn how I could use English in class, what levels of English words I could use. I was very surprised to find that the pupils’ English proficiency level was very low when I observed the class. And when Mrs. Ma told us that they were beginners, I finally came to understand their behavior.

This journal entry suggests that Yuna set the mentor’s lesson as a model for her own teaching and that she learned various teaching skills including class management and organization, use of English and multimedia, and consideration of pupils’ level.
Mrs. Ma’s lessons were intended to show what classroom practices should look like under the curricular reform mandates. More specifically, her instruction in her model class as a representative mentor teacher, on the surface, showed some evidence of being compatible with the curricular reform mandates. She consistently used English as the language of instruction. While doing some teacher-centered instruction, she organized students into small groups where they might have more opportunities for L2 use. However, her class showed different aspects from those of the curricular reforms in terms of use of Korean and English for classroom communication and central focus on classroom management and accuracy. The excerpt shown below is the first post-reading small group activity, that of putting sentences in order, and it reveals her instructional concentration on accuracy and activity management.

Classroom Excerpt 5.1. Mrs. Ma’s Model Class (May 4)

Activity I–Putting sentences in order (“After You Read”)
High Intermediate, 9th grade

1 → Mrs. Ma: Everybody, close your books, notebooks, and files.
((2-9: asks pupils to close books and materials repeatedly and introduces the activity))
Take out the sentences and put the sentences in order. I’ll give you a hint. What is the first sentence? Which number?

P5: Number 3.

Mrs. Ma: Number, number 3, number 3 is the first sentence. Now I’ll give you 4 minutes to finish the job. If you finish your job, raise your hands. Number 3 is the first sentence. OK/ ((sets the timer for 4 minutes))

Mrs. Ma: If you finish your job, raise your hands. The correct group will get points. ((each team works on the activity)) The first group—they got already three points. And let’s see. Second group will get two points and the third group will get one point.

((20-31: each group works on the activity, using Korean)) ((timer bell rings))

Mrs. Ma: OK. Are you finished? Let’s look at the answer together. ((shows the answer on a transparency)) Good job. First group this group 1, 2, 3. Second group 1, 2. Third group 1. ((marks points on board)) Good job.

In this excerpt, at the start of this activity, Mrs. Ma managed the class by repeating the instructions for the activity (lines 1-10) and making rewards for their prompt and frequent participation clear (lines 16-19, and 33-34). Since the activity, which was to order the eleven sentences from the textbook reading, was very simple, the students completed it quickly and accurately. The same instructional focus was found in the second activity, namely, finding errors in the eleven sentences, as seen below.

Additionally, this excerpt shows how the teacher and her pupils used Korean and English during the activity.

Classroom Excerpt 5.2. Mrs. Ma’s Model Class (May 4)

Activity II–Correcting Any Errors (“After You Read”)
High Intermediate, 9th grade

((38-44: gives the directions to activity 2 and reprimands a pupil who looks at the textbook))

Mrs. Ma: Each sentence is one point. If you say the correct answer, you will get one point. If you know the answer, raise your hands. OK/ ((shows each question using a transparency)) No. 1 is very easy.

P6: Very easy. ((student imitates Mrs. Ma))

P7: What are we supposed to do, (Mrs. Ma)?

Mrs. Ma: 고치라고.

P7: The teacher said we should correct the errors.

P7: 아.

Oh I see.

See Appendix D for the activity material.
Here, since the correct answers already existed in the textbook, the activity did not generate further discussion: The pupils answered each question (lines 64 and 69-70), and the teacher confirmed their answers (lines 66 and 71) and added translations of some sentences (lines 72-73) \(^{12}\). Furthermore, this excerpt reveals that Korean was primarily used for communication among the pupils rather than English. If they needed to ask Mrs. Ma to confirm her directions (lines 49), respond to their peers (line 50), or participate in group discussions, they typically answered in Korean.

During these activities, Mrs. Ma’s use of English and her use of several small group activities were consistent with the curricular mandates. In addition, she promoted participation by giving points and treats (rewards) for active participation and correct answers (lines 16-19, 33-34, 45-46, and 66). Throughout the lesson, except for a couple of instances of translation (lines 72-73), there were no examples of the grammar

\(^{12}\) The final activity, the excerpt of which is not presented here, was to fill in the blanks with one word in the thirteen sentences. Since the accurate answers were very evident, based on the reading passages in the textbook, each group focused on whether their own group or another group they were scoring answered correctly.
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translation or the audiolingual methods. The pupils appeared to understand her English because they performed the activities smoothly, and they spoke English when answering (line 12) or reading from the textbook (lines 64 and 69-70).

Despite these overt characteristics of a more communicatively-oriented classroom, pupils’ L2 use was actually rather limited and they rarely communicated in English. In fact, these activities, which were mainly accuracy-focused simple reading comprehension checks, triggered few negotiations among the pupils. In addition, the pupils were encouraged to complete each activity or answer each question quickly, and once they answered it, they moved on without any discussion.

Mrs. Ma’s instructional skills shown in her lessons impressed Sora and Yuna, one example of which is seen in Yuna’s journal entry:

Data Excerpt 5.2. Yuna–Journal (May 4)
오늘 들은 마선생님의 지도 수업은 많은 것을 생각하게 했다. 3 개의 activity 를 수업 시간에 모두 행하려면, 시간관리, 학생통제, time management, 그 밖의 수학가자의 노련함이 나공으로 쌓여있어야 할 탄두. 아. 갈길이 멀었다
Mrs. Ma’s model class that I observed today made me think a lot. I think in order for me to complete three small group activities I would need lots of experiences in a number of things such as time management and control over pupils. I know I have a long way to go.

In this segment, Yuna stated that she was strongly motivated to learn from her mentor concerning various teaching techniques for managing time and controlling pupils while conducting three small group activities. However, Mrs. Ma’s model class rarely showed the student teachers how small group activities might stimulate pupils’ L2 use or improve their communicative competence. Overall, Mrs. Ma’s mentoring helped to

---

13 One of the reasons would be that this class focused on post-reading activities with the aim of checking pupils’ reading comprehension.
socialize her student teachers into the existing norms of English language teaching in Korea.

5.1.2.2. Suggesting a Model for Teachers’ Mixed Use of English and Korean

Another important aspect that Sora and Yuna learned during the practicum activities was how teachers should decide when to use English and Korean as the medium of instruction. Classroom observations and conference discussions revealed that while Mrs. Ma used English almost exclusively in her classes and encouraged her student teachers to do so as well, she also advocated the use of both English and Korean depending on the content being taught, the pupils’ proficiency levels, and the extent to which it was necessary to maintain classroom control. This is well represented when she stated her perception about classroom language use to all the student teachers during the conference as shown below:

Data Excerpt 5.3. Conference after Mrs. Ma’s Model Class (May 4)
오늘은 [post-reading 수업이라, 문법, reading 수업처럼] 제가 할말이 별로 없었거든요.
하세요. 뭐하세요. 쓰세요. 제가 설명하는 것이 아니라 지시어만 하면 학생들이 하는 거기
때문에, 제가 굳이 한국말을 많이 사용하지 않아도 되구요. 그러니까 교생 선생님들이 계신
담에 집중력이 좋았다고 생각해요. 집중력이 좋으면 영어를 써도 아무 문제가 없구요…
그리고 교생 선생님들을 수업하시면 느껴시겠지만 단원, 하는 차시별로 영어가 많이 쓰여도
(예를 들면) 시간이 있고, 한국말로 해야 효과 보는 시간이 있거든요. 예를 들어서 문법
설명하거나 본문을 할 때 내용 설명을 할 때 잘하는 반은 paraphrase 를 해서도 잘하니까
영어로 계속해도 되는데 좀 level 이 낮아지거나 그러면 영어로 paraphrase 를 해도 소용이
없겠죠.
In today’s class [composed of post-reading activities] I didn’t have as much to explain [as I did for grammar or reading sections]. I only had to give my pupils some directives to ask them to do this and that. Also, I think they focused on the class very well because you student teachers observed the class. There is no problem using English when pupils are concentrating on class. … As you will notice when you teach, while some textbook sections can be taught more effectively if you speak English, other sections

14 Though Sora and Yuna had observed some mentors (e.g., Mrs. Cho) and their peer student teachers teach in a more communicative way (e.g., focusing on pupils’ L2 use), they did not think they would adapt such communicative aspects. Rather, Mrs. Ma’s mentoring was more dominant and influential to their conceptions of teaching and instructional practices.
may be better understood if you speak Korean. For example, even when you explain grammar points or reading passages, you can use English for paraphrasing in the higher level because the pupils can understand. But for the lower classes, you cannot.

In this excerpt, Mrs. Ma mentioned that she used English more often when giving directives than when explaining grammar or readings. Also, she used English more frequently when her pupils were under her control and their proficiency level was higher. She also indicated that using English for instruction may not be helpful when teaching the grammar and the reading sections for the low level pupils.

Furthermore, during several conferences (Conferences, May 4 and 12), Mrs. Ma gave explicit direction about how to use English and Korean. She said an appropriate ratio of English to Korean should be 80 to 20 for the high-proficiency pupils and 50 to 50 for the low-proficiency pupils. She added that Korean translation or comments would be appropriate if pupils did not seem to understand.

Still, Mrs. Ma was sympathetic that her student teachers might have difficulty teaching English through English or code-switching and she recognized their concerns about pupils’ not understanding their English (Conferences, May 12). Thus, although she repeatedly stressed the importance of using English in class, she allowed her student teachers to use Korean frequently and she even advocated the benefits of using Korean for several purposes such as increasing understanding for low level pupils and teaching grammar and reading (Conferences, May 4). Clearly, the nature of the practicum activities implied that the TETE policy was modified by Mrs. Ma to meet her own pedagogical reasoning and she employed a mixed use of English and Korean in order to teach English.
5.1.2.3. Encouraging Activities Focusing on Effective Management

Mrs. Ma frequently told her student teachers that they should use appropriate instructional activities. However, her conception about such activities differed from the communicative activities mandated by the curricular reforms, which in turn influenced the ways her student teachers carried out their classroom activities.

During the conferences, the team discussed aspects of task-based language teaching. Mrs. Ma suggested that the student teachers consider pupils’ levels and interests while planning and conducting activities. Additionally, the team discussed ways to motivate students, and to increase the pupils’ participation in small group work by giving treats or grades or assigning each group member a different role (leader, presenter, writer and monitor) (Team A-Conference, May 17). Furthermore, she encouraged the student teachers to conduct a series of activities in at least one class per grade, using materials outside the textbook (Conference, May 8).

However, her own definition of an appropriate activity differed from the definition of “communicative activity” as initiated by the curricular reforms, where the intent was for students to communicate in the L2 through meaningful negotiation (Ministry of Education, 1998). As shown below, she defined an “activity” as “what pupils actually do,” and not just listening to what the teacher explicates:

Data Excerpt 5.4. Team A–Conferences (May 17)
Activity 라 함은 활동했던 것 중에 뭐가 activity 가 될 수 있을까? 지난 번에 내가 예를 들어서 Bill Gates 랑 이렇게 글을 쓰보게 했던 거 그니까 그게 activity 이거나 지난 번처럼 scrambled sentence 처럼 문장을 맞춰 보거나 그니까 실제로 학생들이 워키를 하는 것이 activity 가 되겠죠. 그날 선생님이 수업 단계 중에 선생님이 설명하는 거는 activity 라고 하지 않습니까. ... 어떤 수업에는 activity 가 있고, 어떤 수업에는 activity 가 없고 그렇겠죠? What would be an “activity” among what I did in my lessons that you observed? Activities would include the writing activity in which pupils wrote about Bill Gates and the scrambled sentences where they ordered the sentences the other day. So activities are what the pupils actually do. When a teacher explains something to them, it may
not be called an “activity.” … So some classes may have activities, whereas some may not.

In this excerpt, she offered examples of activities by recalling those observed by the student teachers and showed her broad definition of activities in contrast to teachers’ explanations. Consequently, she allowed the student teachers to create both mechanical exercises and communicative activities.

Furthermore, Mrs. Ma focused more on how an activity might be managed rather than on how it might generate more opportunities for pupils’ L2 communication, which is the goal of the communicative activities. She stressed that in order to ensure their effectiveness, all classroom activities must be controlled by the teacher. Thus, she emphasized how to organize class activities (Conference, May 11)\(^\text{15}\) and how to apply consistent rules for each activity in terms of time limitations, noise control, ways to call upon pupils, and tangible rewards for class participation and/or correct answers (Conference, May 17). In addition to the conference discourse, Mrs. Ma’s classes also revealed how she paid attention to managing activities and controlling over pupils’ behavior, as evidenced by Sora’s and Yuna’s reflections on her classes (Sora, Yuna–Journal, May 1, 4). Therefore, while the practicum activities functioned as an opportunity for the student teachers to learn about how to create and teach by using communicative, learner-centered activities, little attention was paid to how to generate learner-centered communicative tasks that would ensure pupils’ use of English in meaningful ways.

\(^{15}\) A related excerpt is as follows: “일단 activity 들 넣을 때는 activity를 수습하고 설명하고 activity 하고 이케 굉장히 구조화되기 어려워요. 복습하고 도입하고 설명 확하고 배운 것 중에 어떤 것을 포커스를 맞춰서 활동을 들어가는 게 아마 좋을 거예요 (When you adopt an activity to your class, it is hard to organize the class well in terms of how to introduce the activity, explain it, and actually conduct it. You may want to review what they learned in a previous class, introduce (lesson goals), explain (the content of the textbook) and then start an activity to focus on some important points)” (Team A–Conference, May 11).
5.1.2.4. Providing Conflicting Ideas about Learner-centered Instruction

The student teachers were provided with conflicting views about learner-centered language learning during their practicum activities. Mrs. Ma wanted her student teachers to consider their pupils’ proficiency levels\(^{16}\) and interests in order to promote their participation in class. At the same time, she consistently emphasized that it was a teacher’s responsibility to maintain control over his/her pupils if s/he were going to be learner-centered which to her largely meant ensuring that her pupils learned the content of the textbook and/or lessons accurately. To help student teachers control the classroom effectively and achieve the desired learning outcomes, Mrs. Ma stressed the importance of meticulous lesson planning and of finishing each lesson plan.

On the one hand, Mrs. Ma stressed being sensitive to learners in terms of their interests (Conference, May 18) and affect (Conference, May 11) yet she also maintained that the student teachers should know their pupils’ proficiency levels and develop appropriate teaching techniques accordingly, as noted below:

Data Excerpt 5.5. Team A–Conference (May 4)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{윈터는 교과서 분량보다 줄이구요. 써머는 교과서 분량보다 늘리세요. … 여기 그래서 여기가 look and say 부분이 귀가 아니야 아이들이 말하기 연습을 할 수 있는 거의 유일한 부분이 거든요. 근데 우리 윈터반은 [교과서를 넘어서는] 응용까지 바라지 않아요. 있는 내용만 말하고 연습시켜도 되요 … 시험에 나올 거라고 생각하는 [핵심 문법과 표현 같은] 거는 study point 에 있어요. … 과 내용이 반복되지 않게 해주기. … 그러나 [본문을] 해석을 줄때는 아주 명확하게 … 3 학년 써머나 스프링 들어가면 해석 안해줘도 되거든요.} \\
\text{You don’t have to teach all the contents in the textbook in the beginner class, but you should expand those in the high level class. … This is “Look and Say,” the only textbook section that provides pupils with speaking practices. But I’d rather not hope beginner pupils could apply what they learn [into other situations beyond the textbook]. … I think it’s all right if you have them practice repeatedly what is inside the textbook … In the “Study Points” section, you can see almost everything that could be on the exam [such as key structures and expressions]. You need to repeat}
\end{align*}
\]

\(^{16}\) As previously mentioned in the Methodology Chapter, the pupils were divided into five different levels of classes depending on their exam scores: Advanced (called “Spring”), high intermediate (“Summer”), intermediate (“Autumn”), beginner (“Winter”), and very beginner (“Sky”). Each level had two different classes (about 30-35 students per class).
them to ensure pupils’ learning… You should translate [sentences and texts] very accurately. … For the high intermediate or advanced pupils in the 9th grade, you don’t need to translate that way.

This excerpt indicates that while Mrs. Ma recommended that the student teachers focus on repetition, structure, and accurate translation for beginners (non-communicative approaches), she recommended teaching the textbook content and beyond for their more advanced pupils (e.g., communicative activities). With her experiential knowledge, she emphasized taking student levels into consideration when planning.

On the other hand, Mrs. Ma emphasized the importance of classroom control to improve pupils’ learning throughout the team conferences and demonstrated this in her classes. In the team conferences, classroom management, organizing lesson content, and being prepared were consistent themes and Mrs. Ma often suggested ways to effectively control pupils and lessons. The importance of control also came out in the way she expected her student teachers to design their lesson plans. For each class, Sora and Yuna developed lesson plans which they discussed and then revised. More specifically, she expected the student teachers to design lesson plans that included what they were going to say in order to ensure they would speak clearly to control the pupils (Conference, May 11).

At the same time, Mrs. Ma also recognized the constraints on her student teachers’ authority and flexibility (Mrs. Ma–Interview, June 1). Although she believed teachers should have authority and control over their pupils, she recognized that this would be difficult for her mentees. She was well aware that since the pupils knew the

---

17 Student teachers were required to submit two detailed lesson plans and four lesson plan outlines. The detailed lesson plans included procedures (e.g., greetings, warm-up, activities, homework, and closing), teaching aids (e.g., slides, overheads, CDs) and a script of potential classroom interactions.
18 Sora and Yuna appeared to use these scripts to guide their teaching, but did not seem to be concerned with using the exact wording written in the script.
student teachers would only be there for one month, they would tend to be less respectful and studious in response to them (Conference, May 18). In addition, she acknowledged that the student teachers lacked flexibility because what each student teacher should teach was determined at the start of the practicum (Conference, May 10). These constraints further emphasized the student teachers’ role as classroom controller with the primary responsibility to cover the content of the textbook completely.

Overall, the student teachers were consistently mediated by these conflicting conceptions about learner-centered instruction through Mrs. Ma’s mentoring, specifically during the conference meetings and classroom observations. Thus, their reflections in the journals revealed that they primarily focused on the ways to promote pupils’ motivation on the one hand and more predominantly on how to maintain control over their pupils for their learning outcomes (Sora–Journal, May 4, 11, 20; Yuna–Journal, May 1, 4, 25). Clearly, the concept of controlling pupils in order to ensure effective learning is incompatible with learner-centered instruction that supports pupils’ roles as active participants in their learning process.

5.1.2.5. Prioritizing L2 Knowledge for Exams over L2 Use

Although Mrs. Ma was aware of the potential benefits of using English for communication, she positioned L2 knowledge over L2 use in her classroom due to certain contextual constraints and the school exams that measure pupils’ structural knowledge of English. In addition, as effective methods to teach L2 knowledge, she advocated traditional teaching approaches. These conceptions about English teaching were consistently presented to Sora and Yuna during several conferences and Mrs. Ma’s classes.
Mrs. Ma made it clear to her student teachers that middle school English classes should help pupils see English as the means of communication rather than as simply subject matter to be learned. One example of this is seen below:

Data Excerpt 5.6. Team A–Conference (May 25)

There are so many (authentic) materials other than the textbook. So it would be very good to try to use them [during activities and/or English lessons]. Using those materials may be meaningful because at least they enable pupils to see the fact that learning English is fun and that English is actually used and people communicate in English in countries such as the U.S.

This excerpt indicates that the student teachers should use authentic materials in order to raise their pupils’ awareness of using English to communicate as this may promote pupils’ motivation to learn English. However, she did not specifically see the potential of classroom activities utilizing such materials to promote actual English communications in the current classroom context.

More specifically, due to institutional constraints (e.g., large class size and time limitations) as well as pupils’ resistance to classroom participation in the L2, she believed it would be effective to teach knowledge about the L2 rather than spending valuable class time waiting for them to use the L2 (Conference, May 15). Also, she felt that if she communicated with one pupil, the rest of the pupils would be excluded from learning opportunities (Interview, May 12). Moreover, she was afraid that “학생들은 보통 나와서 하는 걸 썩스러워 하는 경향이 있고, 영어로 할라면 힘들겠죠 (pupils tend to be reluctant to speak in front of the class and it will be even harder if they have to speak in English)” (Team A–Conference, May 15). That is, because her pupils have not been socialized into
speaking in front of the class or even speaking English at all, speaking English in front of other pupils would be difficult for them. As a result, she believed a focus on L2 use is best suited for the speaking section of the textbook, and L2 use might not come up at all in a class depending on the content of the textbook or goals of each lesson (Conference, May 10).

For pupils’ learning of the prescribed L2 knowledge, Mrs. Ma encouraged her student teachers to improve pupils’ understanding of the textbook content and emphasized their responsibility for pupils’ test results. One example of this is seen below:

Data Excerpt 5.7. Team A–Conference (May 4)

Sora: 선생님 저희가 하는 4 과 부분도 아이들이 기말에 볼때 들어가는 거죠. Mrs. Ma, when pupils take the final exam, they should study Lesson 4 that we [student teachers] will teach, right?

Mrs. Ma: 당연하죠. 나는 다시 뭐 안해줘요. 할 시간도 없고. 그러니까 선생님들이 책임지고 [4 과를 가르치도록] 하세요. Of course they should. I’m not going to review Lesson 4 again. I don’t have time. So you student teachers should take full responsibility for teaching [Lesson 4].

This excerpt reveals Sora’s concern about preparing pupils for the final test and Mrs. Ma’s reinforcement of teaching to the test. The mentor teacher added that the content of the textbook should be completely covered. Moreover, Mrs. Ma stressed that successful teaching was assessed primarily by how well students performed on exams (Conference, May 12). She frequently offered her student teachers a sense of what would be on the test so that they would know what to include in their lessons (Conferences, May 15). During several practicum activities that included designing formative tests, she emphasized the importance of exams in determining what should be taught (Conference, May 12) and in helping them reflect on their teaching in terms of what needs more instructional emphasis (Conference, May 22 and 24).
Through the team conferences, Mrs. Ma was very comfortable advocating non-communicative approaches such as grammar translation and repetition drills, because these would be more effective in teaching L2 knowledge. In fact, even though the textbook advocates inductive grammar teaching\textsuperscript{19}, she believed that grammar should be taught explicitly (Conference, May 12), and that the use of grammatical terms was appropriate (Conference, May 8). She was also comfortable having her student teachers use drill and repetition to practice vocabulary, pronunciation, and useful expressions (Conference, May 4). In particular, she stated that explicit grammar instruction, accurate translation and repetition drills are most appropriate for low-proficiency pupils (Data Excerpt 5.5).

Overall, the instructional goal pursued in the mentoring and the practicum activities was that pupils must learn the prescribed knowledge of the content of the textbook for school exams rather than ways to enhance their ability to use English and eventually to develop their own communicative competence. To this end, non-communicative approaches were comfortably encouraged by the mentor teacher.

\textbf{5.1.2.6. Reinforcing the Gap between Vision and Reality}

An important theme that emerged from the practicum activities of team A was that the student teachers regarded instruction that matched the curricular reforms as solely an ideal and not achievable in actual classrooms. Most of all, this was noticeable when Sora and Yuna monitored and reflected on the use of English and Korean by themselves, mentors, peers and their pupils. Both believed that it was difficult to promote students’

\textsuperscript{19} The textbook has a grammar section after a reading section and in the grammar section (“Study Points”), “structure” and “expressions” are used as headings rather than “grammar”, and specific grammar terms are not used.
L2 communication in real classrooms. At the beginning of the practicum, Sora felt teachers needed to generate more authentic contexts for using English. However, she noticed that even a native speaking teacher failed in her attempt to get the pupils to speak in her class as shown below:

Data Excerpt 5.8. Sora–Journal (May 2)
두번째 들은 3학년 spring 반 원어민 교사 수업이었다. 학생들이 좀더 authentic 한 context 에서 [원어민 선생님과] 영어를 사용할 환경이 주어지는 것이 좋아 каз히 좋은 듯했으나, 오늘 보았던 word game 에서는 [영어로 의사소통하는 기회는 거의 없이] 그저 영어로 instruction 을 받는다는 것 외의 의미를 찾을 수는 없어서 조금 아쉬웠다.
The second class I observed today was a 9th grade advanced class taught by a native speaker teacher. I thought the class would be great if it could allow pupils to use English in a more authentic context [in which they can speak with the native speaking teacher]. But I’m sorry that I found that the pupils were only given the teacher’s instruction in English [instead of communicating with the teacher in English].

In the excerpt, Sora expected that the native speaker teacher would generate a favorable context where the pupils could communicate in English. However, she found that the teacher only used English during a few interactions involving pupils using English. This reinforced her perception that having the pupils use the L2 seemed to be an ideal only. Yuna also experienced a gap between the ideal of getting pupils to speak in English and the reality of their resistance as reflected in her journal below:

Data Excerpt 5.9. Yuna–Journal (May 9)
아이들에게 output 을 할 수 있는 기회를 주어야 하는데, 어떻게 하면 효과적으로 아이들의 입을 떨어지게 할 수 있을지. 특히 “Everyone, repeat after me”라고 한 뒤에 흐르는 정적이란 [참으로 난감하다].
I think I should give my pupils more opportunities to produce output in English. But how can I effectively have them speak something? In particular, [I can’t bear] the silence after I say “Everyone, repeat after me.”

This excerpt indicates that although Yuna cared about pupils’ L2 use, low-proficiency pupils did not respond well to even simple repetition drills. Even for high-proficiency pupils, the mentor and her student teachers shared the idea that having
Another discrepancy that emerged in the practicum activities was between the ideals of the curricular reforms, methods they learned from the coursework, and what they would actually do in their practicum teaching. For example, Yuna felt that what she had learned about communicative tasks in her university coursework would be difficult to adopt (Journal, May 4). Sora expressed concern in her journal about the significant gaps between the curriculum and reality in the actual use of English by teachers and their pupils (teachers’ and pupils’ communicative use of English vs. pupils’ difficulty understanding of teachers’ instruction in English; Journal, May 2), teachers’ conceptions of learners (active and experienced individuals vs. passive recipients of L2 knowledge; Journal, May 4), and teaching methods (CLT vs. grammar translation; Journal, May 16).

Overall, the student teachers perceived that the abstract pedagogical guidelines proposed in the curricular reform mandates were not feasible in their actual teaching due to contextual factors such as pupils’ resistance to speak English, low proficiency levels and teachers’ unwillingness and/or inability to promote classroom communication in English. Their classroom observations, conference discussions, and Mrs. Ma’s mentoring created and/or reinforced such perceptions and the journals consistently showed evidence of this in their reflections.
5.1.3. Summary

The practicum activities in team A helped these student teachers develop as teachers by allowing social interactions with the mentor teacher and the peer student teachers through conferences in addition to self-reflections and/or dialoguing with themselves through journaling. The pupils also mediated these teachers’ learning specifically by their resistance to participate and limited English proficiency levels. In particular, Mrs. Ma provided professional support for her student teachers drawing from her experiential and professional knowledge as an experienced teacher. In terms of curricular reform mandates, these were already integrated into her instructional context to some extent and therefore it was her interpretation and implementation of them that dominated the team conferences and her lessons. In her representative model class, in spite of L2 communication between herself and her pupils, opportunities for pupils’ L2 use and meaning negotiations were very rare. Moreover, she was most concerned with classroom control and having pupils accurately understand the content of the textbook. The team conferences provided a venue in which a somewhat contradictory conception of L2 teaching emerged. While advocating for many features of the curricular reform mandates, many of the long-standing traditions of L2 teaching in Korea remained. Whereas the team conferences created the social context in which this conceptualization of L2 teaching emerged, the student teachers were being mentored into Mrs. Ma’s conception of L2 teaching, which exposed their awareness of the gap between the curricular reforms and their teaching conceptions and practices. Overall, the team conferences, class observations, and journals functioned as mediational means to socialize the student teachers into Mrs. Ma’s ideas of teaching which included non-
communicative approaches and positioned learning about L2 knowledge over L2 use rather than the CLT-based curricular reforms initiated by the Ministry of Education.

5.2. Sora

The next two sections address the second research question and one sub-research question of this study, particularly concerning team A student teachers (Sora and Yuna): How do student teachers come to understand these curricular reforms and how do they enact them in their instructional practices? How do their instructional practices support their pupils’ opportunities for authentic L2 use?

In this section, Sora’s experiences in English language learning and teaching (ELLT) and the practicum are presented first (see Section 5.2.1). Then, the structure of instructional activity system from Sora’s perspective is described (Section 5.2.2), followed by focus on six themes that emerged from Sora’s data (Section 5.2.3) in order to examine her perceptions of the curricular mandates and how she attempted to implement them in her instructional practices.

5.2.1. Previous English and Practicum Experiences

Sora had the fortunate experience of learning English through different instructional methods and in diverse settings. Thus, she enjoyed learning English and had confidence in her own English proficiency. Since both of her parents worked in the field of English language education and were very interested in Sora’s learning English,

---

20 The description of Sora’s experience in this section was mostly from the interviews with her (Interviews, May 9, May 23, and June 8).
21 Sora’s father is a professor in linguistics at a Korean university and her mother is an office worker at a Korean-American Educational institute.
she started learning English at home. Also, while she was in elementary and secondary school, her parents provided her with English materials (e.g., books, CD-ROMs) and had her attend English conversation courses at private institutes. In addition, as an 8th grader she lived in the U.S. with her family for a year, and she studied various subjects at a middle school in the U.S. Thus, she was successful in English in her secondary education in Korea, and she even had the opportunity to study at a high school that specialized in foreign language education. She recalled that English classes at her secondary schools were mostly oriented toward getting good grades on the college entrance exam. Except for several English conversation classes taught by native speaking teachers, classes were mostly conducted in Korean and through the grammar translation method. She thought this traditional approach was useful for her to understand English texts and to prepare for her exams (Interview, May 9).

Through her university coursework related to ELT and general education, Sora learned about various teaching methods and theories and the current educational reform policies. However, she was concerned about how to effectively apply these idealized theories and teaching methods to her practicum teaching, and perceived that the huge discrepancies between theory and practice would make this application very difficult (Journal, May 1 and 2; Interview, June 8).

She was critical of English instruction in the public school system, because for her learning English as a subject meant learning knowledge about the English language (rather than learning specific content or subject matter through English). The following excerpt shows her views concerning English language education:

22 For the details of her coursework, refer to section 3.1.2 (Context of the Practicum) in the Methodology Chapter.
Data Excerpt 5.10. Sora–Journal (May 3)

When I observed classrooms of other subjects, the anxiety I have felt became clearer. In other subjects, teachers can organize a lesson coherently focusing on specific content. However, in English and other foreign language classes, teachers tend to cover grammar, expressions, and texts that are made for language learning. So I don’t think pupils would feel very interested in learning English as a subject…. The pupils that I talked with also thought that English is difficult and not interesting. Under this circumstance, I should think about how to make them feel excited to learn a foreign language (like English). I regret that as a secondary school pupil, I thought that school English lessons were not interesting and it would be better to learn English while studying abroad or in English conversation courses in private institutes. … Would it be possible to make the pupils focus on and feel interested in English classes?

This excerpt reveals Sora’s perception that the English classrooms within the public school system have not provided students with optimal learning experiences nor motivated them. In fact, based on her experiences, she thought the best way to learn English was through studying content in English, especially while studying abroad, practicing communication skills in private institutes. She also believed that learning independently through participating in personal activities (i.e. watching favorite English movies and reading interesting books) would be more helpful for developing English proficiency than studying the textbook (Interview, May 9). Sora’s prejudice against learning English as a subject made her doubt if she could create interesting English classes during the practicum, her first real teaching experience.

On the whole, the practicum experience allowed Sora to better understand the teaching profession and to shift her orientation from a learner of English to a teacher of...
English. As such, she perceived the overall practicum experience positively, which is also reported in a concluding journal entry below:

Data Excerpt 5.11. Sora–Journal (May 26)
(교생실습을 통해) 여태 나의 존재를 규정짓던 학생이라는 신분에서 일시적으로 벗어나 “선생님”이 되어 볼 수 있었던 소중한 기회를 가질 수 있었다.... 아이들의 반응 하나하나에 기분이 극상에서 최저로 떨어졌다 하더라도 새로운 경험이었다. 수업을 할 때 특히 그럴렸다. 머리 떨리는 마음으로 처음 교단에 오르던 그 순간이 생생하게 기억난다. 생각보다 별로 호응이 없어서 혼들었던 기억도 난다.... 그렇지 않음에도 불구하고 입구에는 내가 알고 있는 것을 남에게 어떻게 하면 쉽고 재미있는 방법을 통해 전할 수 있는지를 고민한 것 자체가 쉽게 가질 수 없는 소중한 경험인 것 같다. (Through the practicum) I was able to have the precious experience of becoming a “teacher”, temporarily away from being what I had been, a student .... It was a new experience to go from feeling great to terrible at pupils’ responses to different classes. I can recall the anxious moment when I taught them for the first time. I remember that I had a very hard time because I got a less active response from pupils than I expected. … But I think it was a priceless experience since I was able to think about how I could transmit what I already knew to the pupils through some easy and interesting methods.

Her reflection indicates that over the course of the practicum, due to her positive connection with students, she gradually felt more positive about teaching. In fact, Sora’s shifting sense of self from a learner to a teacher was, in large part, shaped by her sensitivity to her pupils.

At the same time, due to the heavy workload imposed by the current educational policy such as teaching English through English and creating tasks, her negative perceptions of the ELT profession remained unchanged throughout the practicum, as noted in her journal, “교생을 하면서 교직은 되게 급정적으로 생각하게 됐는데, 영어교사는 조금 힘든 거 같어요. (Through the practicum, I came to think of the teaching profession very positively, but I still think that working as an English teacher is very tough)” (Sora–Interview, May 23).
After graduation, Sora mentioned that she planned to study in a graduate program in English language education and that she would specialize in English language teaching or linguistics. In fact, she wanted to become a researcher or a professor.

In summary, despite Sora’s own success as an English language learner, she was critical of both English instruction in Korea and the ELT profession. In addition, her own schooling included very few communicative experiences and she was pessimistic about the current curricular reforms, describing them as unrealistic. Nonetheless, the practicum allowed her to transform her perceptions of herself from a learner into a teacher and to better understand the teaching profession.

The next two sections examine the instructional activity system where Sora functioned as the subject and subsequently how Sora’s perception of herself as a teacher and her teaching approach evolved, specifically related to the curricular mandates.

5.2.2. The Configuration of the Instructional Activity System

Founded on the analysis of the data collected from Sora including interviews, conferences, and classroom observations, journals, and lesson plans, the following instructional activity system becomes apparent.
Sora as the subject of this instructional activity system had four objects. The first two objects were directly related to the imposed rules from the mentor teacher, Mrs. Ma (community). First of all, she intended to complete the stated lesson plan as Mrs. Ma stressed throughout the practicum with proper classroom management. In fact, lesson plans functioned as a powerful artifact to organize and control her lessons.

The next goal and rule was to cover the content of the textbook in order to prepare students for school exams. Since she considered exam scores as the outcome of pupils’ learning and this activity system, school exams worked as a strong mediating tool for her instruction. Thus, several times in her journal (May 16) and during conferences (May 4), she revealed her anxiety about teaching to the exams. Since the textbook is the main source of school exams, she heavily adhered to this tool and constructed her class around it. As a supplementary material to the textbook, worksheets were used for activities and instruction in almost every class.
For Sora, teaching accurate L2 knowledge and form was also an important object. For this, she used traditional teaching approaches including the grammar translation method and repetition drills very comfortably. Even when she adopted artifacts (e.g., doing communicative activities/exercises using outside resources/authentic materials with advanced technology skills for searching and editing such materials) to achieve her goal of maintaining her pupils’ interest, her focus on accuracy and form was clear.23

Traditional classroom norms such as teacher-fronted instruction and pupils’ passive participation also functioned as an important rule for the activity system. This feature defines division of labor of this instructional activity system as follows: the teacher controls and transmits knowledge and her pupils receive it. As a result, even though Sora was sensitive to the interest and affect of her pupils (community), the hierarchical structure of power was predominant.

Since Mrs. Ma acted as an evaluator of her achievement in the practicum, another important rule of this instructional activity system was satisfying her expectations that include some rules represented in this activity system (e.g., completing the plan, covering the textbook for exams, classroom management) and some others specified in her mentoring (e.g., teaching as she taught/mentored).

Sora’s teaching was affected by the community in this activity system as well as her own beliefs as the subject of this system. The community includes the pupils she taught as well as mentors and peers in her own and other teams who more or less influenced and were influenced by Sora. Among these community members, the role of Mrs. Ma was most critical. Along with her mentor’s strong influences on her teaching, Sora’s own beliefs as the subject of this instructional activity system were also apparent.

---

23 For more details, see section 5.2.3.4 (Vision and Reality in Using Authentic Materials) in this chapter.
in her instruction, particularly in the case of her using mediational tools of English and Korean. For example, she held negative attitudes toward using English in her classroom so she chose to speak Korean as the medium of instruction. Thus, despite Mrs. Ma’s imposed rule of using more English with high level pupils, Korean was a more dominant language tool for her instruction.

A more thorough understanding of this instructional activity system is possible by looking at the results of the grounded analysis of Sora’s perceptions and instruction, presented below, because this analysis examines the source and composite features of each component of this instructional activity system. Moreover, the results reveal the existing inner contradictions within the activity system and how she reacted to these contradictions. In so doing, these findings help explain why she was unwilling to enact the curricular reform mandates during the practicum.

5.2.3. Understanding and Enacting the Curricular Reforms

From Sora’s data, including journals, interviews, conferences, classroom observations, six themes emerged that explicate her understandings and enactment of the curricular reform efforts: 1) The medium of instruction was shifted from English to Korean; 2) Learners were considered as passive recipients, 3) Pupils’ accuracy was focused in instructional activities; 4) A discrepancy was found between her vision and the classroom reality in using authentic materials; 5) Traditional methods were regarded as essential in her instruction; and 6) Developing learners’ grammatical competence was primarily focused in her classroom practices among the four components of communicative competence.
5.2.3.1. Switching the Medium of Instruction from English to Korean

Despite Sora’s agreement with the rationale behind teachers’ using English as the medium of instruction, she was critical of its effectiveness. This generated a contradiction within herself about language choice for teaching, as noted from the journal entry below:

Data Excerpt 5.12. Sora–Journal (May 9)
교실에서 영어로 가르치는 것이 얼마나의 교육효과가 있을지에 대해 잠깐 생각해 보았다. 학생들이 본인에게 직접 향하는 English input을 접할 기회가 많지 않다는 점에서 교사가 그 역할을 담당하고 있는 것 같은데, (교사가 영어로 수업하는 것을) 정작 학생들이 그리 탐탁치 않아 하는 것 같았다. 아무래도 영어 선생님이기 전에 보통 교사와 학생으로 관계가 형성되었기 때문에, 선생님들이 자신들이 못 알아듣는도 계속 영어로 수업하는 것이 이상하게 느껴지는 것이 아닐까?

For a moment, I thought about how effective teaching English through English would be. It seems that teachers play the role of providing English input, because pupils are not exposed to sufficient L2. But it seems that the pupils don’t like (their teacher’s using L2). Since their relationship has been formed as a teacher and students before their relationship has been formed as an English teacher and students, the pupils may feel awkward when their teacher continues to speak English even though they do not understand his/her English very well.

In this excerpt, while Sora clearly perceived that teachers’ use of English would be helpful to provide pupils with L2 input, she thought that her pupils would not prefer the teachers’ use of English as the medium of instruction. This theme consistently appeared in her data. She stated that some teachers (e.g., native speaker teachers) could therefore create more authentic contexts for pupils’ L2 use (Data Excerpt 5.9, Sora–Interview, May 2) and that the use of English by some of the mentor teachers and the peer student teachers was quite successful (Team A–Conference, May 4, 9). At the same time, however, two concerns seemed to discourage her from using English. First, since she and her pupils all share the same mother tongue, she felt uncomfortable communicating with them in English. Secondly, she believed pupils would find it easier to understand her and would participate more if she used Korean.
Sora’s concerns about pupils’ reaction to the use of English became even clearer when she taught. As clear from her interview below, she felt that her use of English made her pupils uncomfortable and less responsive, and finally made lessons boring:

Data Excerpt 5.13. Sora–Interview (June 8)
일단 영어로 수업을 하면 재미가 별로 없어요. 애들이 별로 대답을 안하고 그러니깐. … 보통 수업에서 영어로 말하면 굉장히 일반 굉장히 공격적이 되고, offensive 하게 되고, defensive하게 되고 둘다.
When a lesson was conducted in English, I think it was not fun at all because pupils did not answer very often. … If I taught English through English, the pupils seemed to become very offensive [i.e., offended] and defensive.

Since Sora felt more comfortable speaking Korean (Interview, June 8), and when she did it seemed to be instructionally more effective, she used Korean as the medium of instruction. She felt it was more efficient especially when she had to teach vocabulary (Interview, May 9), reading, or grammatical structures (Team A–Conference, May 25) and it seemed to foster more participation from the pupils.

Even though she taught high-proficiency level pupils\textsuperscript{24}, the frequency of her use of English decreased over the course of the practicum. This shift from the first class to later in the practicum is quite striking. The following excerpt is her first class in which she used English as the medium of instruction:

Classroom Excerpt 5.3. Sora’s Lesson (May 11)
Words and Expressions (“Reading” & “Study Points”)
High Intermediate 9\textsuperscript{th} Grade, Lesson Plan 1 (1\textsuperscript{st} for High Level)
1 Sora: You are going to learn 16 new words and the next thing you are going to do is (learn) (7) expressions. ((writes on blackboard))
((3-6: makes sure if pupils can see powerpoint slides clearly))
7→ Sora: Then how many are you going to learn altogether?
8→ Ps: 스물 세개

\textsuperscript{24} The student teachers in each team were able to decide together which levels of classes and which class sessions each student teacher would teach. After teaching both a high level and a low level lesson, Sora chose to primarily teach the high level pupils (Yuna–Interview, June 8).
Twenty three

9➔ Sora: In English?
10➔ Ps: Twenty three.
11 Sora: It won’t be that hard. Next, you’ll see (what) you are going to learn
today. 
((13-17: makes sure if pupils can see slides again))
18➔ Sora: These are the sixteen words you’re going to learn today. Do you know all
19➔ of them?
20➔ Ps: [No
21➔ Ps: [Yes
22➔ Sora: Yes 누구야/ (hh) Yes. 물어봅니다.
23➔ P1: I’m not sure.
24➔ Sora: Yeah, that’s one of the expressions. Don’t worry if you don’t know them
25➔ all. We’ll go over them altogether one by one.
26➔ Sora: Look at the TV screen. New words and expressions. The first one of
27➔ these is recent. Repeat, recent. (“(recent” shows up in a slide))
28➔ Ps: Recent.
29➔ Ps: 최근에.
30➔ Sora: Yeah, you know the word. It means in English in the past, but not very
31➔ long ago. (“in the past, but not long ago” in slide) So it
32➔ means in Korean
33➔ Ps: 최근에.
34 Sora: 최근에. ((word in Korean “최근에” shows up in slide))

((moves on to the next word))

In this excerpt, when giving directives and explaining the meaning of words (lines
30-32), she used English. In addition, especially during the first half of the class, she
asked the pupils to answer in English (line 9), and interacted with them in English (lines
7-10, 18-25, and 26-34).

During her latter classes, however, Sora primarily used Korean, reserving English
for basic instructions (e.g., “What do you think the answer is?”, Classroom Excerpt 5.4)
and when reading aloud and/or conducting repetition drill (see below Classroom Excerpts
5.4-5.7). Thus, despite being aware of the benefits of using English, Sora used Korean
more and more. She rationalized her language choice based on what she believed was
best for her and her pupils in this instructional context. This created a tension with her mentor teacher who suggested student teachers use more English than Korean with the advanced learners. Clearly, her choice of language was incompatible with the teaching English through English policy mandated by the Ministry of Education.

5.2.3.2. Learners as Passive Recipients

Sora had an internal conflict within herself between learner-centered instruction and teacher-directed transmission of knowledge. She herself experienced the value of encouraging pupils to be autonomous learners, but she felt it was too ideal, and unmanageable in her teaching context. The excerpt below shows such a dilemma:


I don’t know what I should assume about pupils when I teach. I think it would be general and simple to regard them as “learners who should learn what they don’t know.” But based on my experience as a student, this kind of class may be too distant from pupils. I don’t know. It might be better to just teach language skills well rather than to think about this issue in this abstract way. … I think it would be sufficient to teach [the content] “well.”

In this journal note, while she was aware of the weakness of teacher-fronted skill based instruction, she felt it was realistic to her classroom and she chose to teach pupils language skills and knowledge as efficiently and effectively as possible. At the same time, Sora’s practicum teaching experience confirmed her view of learners as passive recipients of knowledge. As seen below, the pupils showed little motivation, remained passive, and she felt frustrated by their lack of participation:
Data Excerpt 5.15. Sora–Journal (May 20)
확실히 내가 많이 아는 것과 잘 전달하는 것은 천지차이인 것 같다. 그 격차에 허덕이고 있는 내 모습이 너무 안쓰럽다. 하나라도 더 쉽게 알려주고 싶어서 발악하는 나와 학생들의 지루해 죽겠는 눈빛이 동시에 공존하는 교실의 분위기라니! 영어에 흥미가 없는 건지 수업에 흥미가 없는 건지. 교생도 끝나가는데 왜 나아지고 있지 않은지.
It seems that there is a huge discrepancy between how much I know and how efficiently I can transmit my knowledge to them. I feel sorry for myself that I’m in such a pain due to the gap. Can you believe that I’m in the classroom where I’m eager to teach pupils as much as I can, but the pupils look really bored? I don’t know if they don’t feel interested in English language or in my English class. I don’t know why it is not getting better at all now that the practicum is almost over.

This excerpt indicates that Sora experienced a tremendous conflict between her own desire to be an engaging teacher with motivated students and the reality of the practicum in which students were non-responsive and bored. She admits she does not understand why students are like this, and seems to assume the “problem” is with the students. In addition, this excerpt shows her beliefs about the teachers’ role as being knowledgeable in a specific subject and effectively transferring the knowledge to their pupils, again demonstrating the transmission model of teaching and her perceptions about students as inactive receivers of knowledge. Moreover, as noted below, she remained overly concerned with covering the content of her lessons, although she was sensitive to learners’ interests, needs, and affect:

Data Excerpt 5.16. Sora–Journal (May 11)
3-1에서 학습지 뒷면 문제를 풀 때 어떤 학생을 시켰는데 모르겠다고 해서 그 랜 아무 생각 없이 다른 학생을 시켰다. … 웅당 학생이 모르는 것은 내가 같이 했어야 되는데 학생 자존심이 상할지도 모르게 다른 아이를 시켰으니. … 학생에 대한 affective 측면 배려가 너무 부족하다. 그 학생이 상처받지 않았으면 좋겠다.

In the first class of the 9th grade, I called upon a pupil when I worked on one of the questions at the back page of a worksheet. He said that he didn’t know the answer, so I just called upon another pupil without consideration. … I should have worked with him on the question that the pupil could not answer, but I may have hurt the pupil’s feeling because I just called on another pupil … I don’t think I gave careful consideration to the pupils’ affect. I hope the pupil’s feeling didn’t get hurt very much.
In this journal entry, she expressed concern over a student’s affect but justified her instructional behavior because she believed it was her duty to cover certain content. Obviously, she thought that pupils should be guided about certain knowledge to be mastered, rather than able to actively participate in their learning process.

Overall, although she was sensitive to her pupils, her conception of the learners’ and teachers’ role led her to perceive teaching as delivering prescribed L2 knowledge in a very controlled way. This teacher-centered instruction created a contradiction for her with the learner-centered premise outlined in curricular reform mandates.

5.2.3.3. Valuing Accuracy in Activities

Although Sora believed creating activities was an additional burden for teachers, she believed it would increase pupils’ participation. More importantly, she clearly felt task-based instruction provides them with opportunities to take an agentive role in their learning in that “일단 학생 스스로가 주체가 되어서 할 수 있는 기회가 이것 말고는 주어질 일이 별로 없죠. 이렇게 조별로 하지 않는 이상은 (only small group activities could provide learners with opportunities to take an agentive role in their learning)” (Interview, June 8). However, despite this vision, most of her activities were quite traditional. In fact, she had few prior experiences with activity-based instruction and had little time to prepare new activities. She expressed her anxiety about this in the excerpt below:

---

25 The notion of classroom or instructional activities follows Mrs. Ma’s conception of activities and refers to activities in which students actually “do” and not just listen to the teacher’s explanation (Conference, May 17). On the other hand, “communicative activities” refers to activities in which students can communicate in the L2 through meaningful negotiation, as proposed by the curricular reform mandates (Ministry of Education, 1998).
While I was revising the detailed lesson plan, I still wasn’t sure if I could make my class not boring. I’m surprised to hear how other peer student teachers (in the English division) teaching the same section, “Study Points,” came up with such good activities. At the same time, I’m worried why I cannot do that myself. Maybe I am a person who lacks creative ideas.

Although she wanted to have engaging activities, she did not feel confident in her ability to make them. Since she was aware that many of her peer student teachers in the English division used more communicative and interesting activities, she blamed herself for this perceived deficit. Despite her awareness of innovative activities, she primarily used activities based on drills and exercises (e.g., reading aloud the text). In particular, most of her activities were based on the textbook and she focused primarily on accuracy in structure, pronunciation, and listening and reading comprehension. Among the instructional activities that she used (Table 5.1), “finding errors” (Lesson plan 4) was a typical activity where groups of pupils were supposed to find errors in grammar, spelling, and content that the teacher modified from the reading passages of the textbook.
Table 5.1. Instructional Activities in Sora’s Lessons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lesson Plans***</th>
<th>LP1</th>
<th>LP2</th>
<th>LP3</th>
<th>LP4</th>
<th>LP5</th>
<th>LP6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dates for Class A, B</td>
<td>May 11 (2 classes)</td>
<td>May 15, 17</td>
<td>May 18, 22</td>
<td>May 19, 24</td>
<td>May 23, 25</td>
<td>May 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade (level)26</td>
<td>9th (high)</td>
<td>8th (low)</td>
<td>9th (high)</td>
<td>9th (high)</td>
<td>9th (high)</td>
<td>9th (high)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textbooks/activities</td>
<td>Words; expressions</td>
<td>Expressions; grammar</td>
<td>Reading 2</td>
<td>Reading 3</td>
<td>On your own; Writing</td>
<td>Special Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small group work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>•Find errors</td>
<td>•Writing an opinion* (Exc. 5.5)</td>
<td>•Movie: Monsters Inc.* (Exc. 5.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual/Whole class work</td>
<td></td>
<td>•Riddles* (Exc. 5.4)</td>
<td></td>
<td>•Reading aloud the text</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction/Exercise**</td>
<td>Vocab* (Exc 5.3)</td>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td>Reading* (Exc. 5.7)</td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>Textbook questions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Presented in classroom excerpts  
** Coverage of the textbook or worksheets without instructional activities  
*** For most lesson plans, the student teachers taught two class sessions. For Lesson Plan 6, Sora did not submit the formal lesson plan outline and taught this lesson just once.

Sora’s focus on the correct use of language continued even when she used activities for her pupils to speak or write English. She mostly centered on accuracy and forms rather than on fluency and meaning. In so doing, she strictly controlled the way they used English. One example of this is the following classroom excerpt in which Sora and her students were engaged in a riddle activity.

Classroom Excerpt 5.4. Sora’s Lesson (May 17)  
Seven Riddles (“Study Points”)  
Low Level, 8th Grade, Lesson Plan 2 (1st for Low Level)  
((Sora shows slides, each of which has a riddle composed of a statement to explain a person or an object as well as a relevant figure))

1 Sora: 자 여러분 잘 배웠는데, 그러면 한번 여러분이 문제를 풀어보도록 해요. 자 예를 들어서 풀어봅시다. OK. Everyone. Today we learned a lot of things. Now you will solve riddles. OK. I’ll give you an example.

2 Sora: I am the person who invented Hangul. 누구죠?  
   Who is he?

3 Sora: ((In slide, “I am the person who invented Hangul” and a figure of King Sejong is shown))

---

26 Sora taught two different classes each for both high intermediate 9th graders and low level 8th graders. In this paper, for convenience, 9th grade high intermediate level is called high or higher level compared to 8th grade low level.
P1: 세종대왕.

King Sejong

Sora: 자 오늘은 대답할 때 오늘 배운 표현을 이용해서

OK. When we answer today, let’s use the expression we learned today.

“I think that the answer is” blah blah 이렇게 합시다. 자. 누구지/

Let’s do this way. OK. What’s your name?

P3: P2.

P2: 훨 큰소리로 한번 말해줄까/

P2. Would you say it aloud?

Sora: I think that he is 세종대왕.

King Sejong.

P2: I think the answer is King Sejong.

자 King Sejong 이에요

OK, (the answer) is King Sejong.

Sora: 다음 문제. 자 여러분 같이 한번 읽어보세요.

Next riddle. OK. Everyone, read aloud the question together.

Ps: This is the thing which dries your hair.

Ps: Drier.

Sora: This is the thing which dries your hair. 자 따라 읽어 봅시다.

OK, repeat after me.

Sora: [This is the thing which dries your hair.

Ps: [This is the thing which dries your hair.

Sora: What do you think the answer is?

Ps: Hair dryer.

Sora: 자 그림 문장으로 대답해보세요. I [think the answer is a hair dryer.

OK, then, answer it in a sentence.

Ps: [I think that the answer is a hair dryer.

(Sora and pupils work one more riddles in the same way above: “Ji-seong Park” (I am a Korean who is playing in Manchester United), “washer” (This is the thing which washes your clothes), and “Mozart” (I am the person who made music at the age of five))

In this excerpt, Sora organized a speaking activity in such a way that it essentially became a substitution drill to practice specific sentence structures. She intentionally constructed the riddles using the same sentence structure that contains relative pronouns (lines 3, 11-30, 32-36). Moreover, she restricted the pupils’ output, having them answer using “I think (that) the answer is~” (lines 5-6), seemingly to avoid potential confusion about pronoun use (Conference, May 11)27. Thus, when a pupil answered correctly using the pronoun (“I think he is~”), line 9), she ignored his phrasing, and corrected his answer.

27 Sora observed how the low level pupils’ confusion about proper use of pronouns slowed down the pacing of Yuna’s speaking exercise (Yuna–Lesson Plan 2, May 11).
to the one she preferred, “I think the answer is ~” (line 10). In this way, the teacher’s control over the activity created a conflict with the pupils’ desire to use their own English knowledge. Her focus on the specific language structure continued throughout the class as she asked them to read the questions that aloud (lines 31-36) and answer the riddles in unison (lines 39-40). Ultimately, Sora’s instruction was praised within her community in terms of her use of an effective activity structure to practice targeted forms and proper classroom management as well (Conference, May 15). She, herself, was satisfied with the activity and explained her intention of creating this activity as follows:

Data Excerpt 5.18. Sora–Stimulated Recall (May 23)

I just wanted to check if the pupils really understood [relative pronouns]. Also, I conducted this activity to have fun and have them look at how the structure can be used in real-life situations. The reason that I made the pupils answer each riddle using “I think” is that I wanted them to use it because they have already learned the expression.

This interview excerpt shows that Sora’s purpose of this activity was to have the pupils use the structures in “real-life situations” using real people and objects. However, the classroom excerpt indicated that she focused solely on practicing the targeted forms rather than on using language in a more natural way or discussing the people or objects shown in the riddles. As a result, what on the surface might have been a student-centered communicative activity turned into focus on accurate use of language structure.

Sora’s emphasis on accuracy in language use was also evident in the writing activity. In the following, she asked her pupils to write their opinion about one of the four responses to the article in the textbook.
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Classroom Excerpt 5.5. Sora’s Lesson (May 25)
Writing an Opinion (“Let’s Write”)
High Intermediate, 9th Grade, Lesson Plan 5 (4th for High Level)
((1-29: reviews the structure of the reading text and introduces the activity))
30 Sora: 이런 식으로 글이 하나 나오겠죠/ 한번 읽어볼까요. This kind of opinion will come up. Shall we read it together?
31 Ps: ((read a writing example on a transparency)) “Yes, I agree with your opinion. It seems that adults only think of us as a studying machine.
32 Sora: 이거 내가 쓴 건데 누군가 대답이 같아요./ I wrote this. Whose response do you think I’m replying to?
33 P1: “Need a break.”
34 Sora: “Need a break”죠/ It is “Need a break.”
35 ((37-42: repeats the direction about the activity; pupils work for about 15 minutes))
36 Sora: 여러분 Be creative as you can 창의적으로 쓰세요. Write creatively. Read my writing sample.
37 ((44-50: talks about writing on a transparency; pupils ask questions and Sora answers))
38 P2: 선생님 “business” 어떻게 쓰요?/ Teacher, how do we spell “business”?
39 Sora: BUSINES ((spells out “business”))
40 ((53-56: asks pupils to pay attention)) ((reads one group’s example on a transparency))
41 Sora: 자 한번 읽어봅시다. “I agree with your opinion. We are not machines.”
42 P3: “We DON’T study”죠 “We DON’T”예요. “We don’t study, do not study every time. We need TO take a rest. So,”
43 Sora: OK. Let’s read it together. “I agree with your opinion. We are not machines.” It’s “We don’t study.” It should be “We DON’T.” “We don’t study do not study every time. We need TO take a rest. So”
44 P3: “Parents.”
45 Sora: “Parents try to understand.” 이거 뒤, 부모님이 우리를 이해해 줬으면 좋겠다는 거죠. “We want our parents to understand us” 이렇게 쓰면 되죠./ “Parents try to understand.” I guess you meant that we want our parents to understand us. So you can write “We want our parents to understand us” Whose response do you think is this writing about?
46 P4: “Need a break.”
47 Sora: “Need a break.”
48 ((reads aloud six more group’s writing, corrects errors, and asks pupils to guess to which each group writing is replying))

The small group activity above was positively evaluated by Sora, her peer student teachers and Mrs. Ma based on the time management, class organization, and pupils’

28 The reading text is composed of one article about six girls taken to the hospital at a pop star’s concert and four opinions about the article. The four senders are toooconserv@teen.net (a teenager who doesn’t understand young students who are crazy about pop stars), worried@adults.com (an adult who worries about them), needabreak@young.com (a youngster who understands them), and stillhopeful@parents.com (a parent who understands them).
participation (Conference, May 25). She actually gave clear instructions (lines 1-29), made appropriate use of a model (lines 30-33) and gave extensive feedback (lines 57-62). This small group activity seemed to trigger negotiation between pupils to develop their ideas (Stimulated recall, June 8). In addition, when receiving pupils’ questions about appropriate expressions and correct spellings, she helped them (lines 51-52). However, since her focus was on the accuracy of language, her feedback was mostly correcting their written product. In fact, she was disappointed that the students’ writing was so similar to the textbook examples (Interview, June 8). This confirmed her low expectations about pupils’ ability to express their ideas in English.

Overall, even though Sora increased the number of instructional activities over the course of the semester, and she was aware of their learner-centered characteristics, she consistently focused on accuracy and form of English language use and maintained tight classroom control at all times.

5.2.3.4. Vision and Reality in Using Authentic Materials

Sora felt positive about using authentic materials in language classrooms, and she believed these real artifacts would provide “real” content to spark pupils’ curiosity about how language is used (Interview, May 3). Thus, she considered the primary teaching aid, the textbook, a barrier to effective teaching, as she noted, “좀 자율적으로 할 수 있을 거 같애요. 교과서에 매이지 않고 (I think I would be able to teach more autonomously if I

---

29 Sora’s example and two groups’ writing samples are opinions about the response written by needabreak@young.com. One of the responders to the news article wrote: “I fully understand why an article like this worries our parents. At the similar time, however, I want our parents to be more understanding of us and our situation. It seems that all they want from us is to study and go to a good college. I know that studying hard and to going to a good college can be important for us to succeed in life, but we are not machines. We cannot study 24 hours a week, seven days a week. Sometimes we need to have fun. We want to watch TV, play computer games, and do some silly things.”
didn’t have to stick to the textbook)” (Interview, May 23). She was able to use authentic materials such as commercials (e.g., kit-kat chocolate) and excerpts from movies (Nightmare before Christmas, Monsters Inc.) in warm-up activities. However, she mostly used these materials to teach linguistic knowledge\(^{30}\). In the following special activity class, for example, Sora brought in an animated movie. However, she mostly pointed out important expressions and used a fill-in-the-blank and short answer worksheet to check students’ accurate listening comprehension.

Classroom Excerpt 5.6. Sora’s Lesson (May 26)
Watching a Movie, Monsters, Inc.\(^{31}\) (Special Activities Class)
High Intermediate 9\(^{th}\) Grade, Lesson Plan 6 (5\(^{th}\) for High Level)
((80-104: introduces the activity and promises rewards for correct answers))
((105-108: explains a fear that western children have of boogeyman, a monster living in a closet))
((109-124: pupils watch the first movie clip))

125 Sora: 자 여기까지.
126→ Ps: 아:::
127→ Sora: OK. The first clip is over here.
128→ Ps: Oh. ((look like they want to see more))
((127-129: talks about the summary of Monsters, Inc.))
130 Sora: Proctor: can you tell me what is wrong? 뭐가 잘못됐지/ 말해보래/I, P1?
131→ Ps: It means “can you tell me what you did wrong.” P1? ((asks him to fill in the first blank in the script))
132→ P1: Fell down.
133→ Sora: Fell down 이 뭐에요./ What does “fell down” mean?
134→ P1: 넘어지다.
135→ Sora: Fell down 이 fell down from heatstroke 우리 (교과서에서) 배웠잖아요.
136→ P1: “fell down.” We learned “fell down from heatstroke” (from the textbook). What does “fell down” mean?
137→ Ps: 넘어지다.
138→ Sora: 쓰러지다 넘어지다 쓰러지다 두개 되죠. 여기선 넘어지다 맞죠/

\(^{30}\) Sora used the commercial in order to elaborate the meaning of a word from the textbook (Need a break). Also, Sora selected the two movies to explain an aspect of cultural knowledge as well as linguistic knowledge (Interview, June 8).

\(^{31}\) The background of the movie is as follow: “The story is set in Monstropolis, a city inhabited by monsters, some of whom are the ones who emerge from bedroom closets to scare human children. This is used to collect the screams of kids, which power the city. The main power company in the city is called Monsters, Inc.” (From http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Monsters,_Inc.).
Come down, tumble down, come down. Both are right. Here tumble down would be better. Good job.

((140-147: talks about the expression filled in the next blank, “wide open”))

148 ➔ Sora: Question 1. What is the most dangerous thing in the monster world?
149 ➔ What is the most dangerous thing in the monster world? (xxx)
150 ➔ P3: Children.
151 ➔ Sora: 예 뭐에요/ children 이 가장 위험한 거 맞죠. 이렇게 문장으로 말하면. (..)
152 ➔ Children is the most dangerous thing in the monster world 하면 되죠/
153 ➔ 1 번 맞아요. 1 조. 네. ((Marks the point on the board))

Yes. What was that? Children are the most dangerous thing, right? If we speak in a sentence, “Children is [are] the most dangerous thing in the monster world.” No. 1 is right. Group 1. Yes.

Pupils were interested in the movie (line 126) and participated in the activity extensively (lines 131-137 and 148-150). In the team conference (May 26), she stated that she was very satisfied with this class because she was able to accomplish what she intended (e.g., to understand cultural aspects of English using an authentic material and heighten pupils’ interest). However, she structured the activity in ways that focused on checking the accuracy of pupils’ listening comprehension (lines 131-139 and 148-151) and sentence structure (lines 151-2) as well as reviewing word meanings (lines 132-139), some of which were covered in the textbook (line 135).

As a result, while Sora employed authentic materials that could potentially make instructional activities much more communicative and interesting, she mostly used them to teach accurate L2 knowledge, the same lesson goal she held for the textbook.

5.2.3.5. Traditional Methods as Essential

Sora believed that the communicative approach was unrealistic for her instructional context where she believed students must learn the prescribed content of the textbook. Moreover, her criticisms of CLT in the Korean EFL context were reinforced by
her practicum experience. She was certain that her class size was too big, pupils’ English proficiency level too low, and that pupils did not feel any need to communicate exclusively in English (Interview, May 9). As a result, she relied on grammar translation and the audiolingual methods. The journal note below indicates her perceptions about the effectiveness of grammar translation method in her reading class:

Data Excerpt 5.19. Sora–Journal (May 16)

어쨌든 reading 은 철저히 GTM 의 방식을 따를 것이다. 학교 수업시간에 배운 CLL [Community Language Learning], CLT 같은 것을 일단 다 after reading 으로 미뤄놓고, 본문을 철저히 분석해야겠다. 학생들이 지루해 하면 어역하나, 그렇지만 본문을 cover 안할 수도 없지 않나, 참으로 닥래마다. 그래도 교생들은 떠나도 학생들은 남아서 시험을 볼 것이 아닌가? 나중에 [점수가 좋지 않다고] 원성을 듣지 않게 알찬 수업이 되도록 준비해야겠다.

I will follow the grammar translation method [when I teach the reading section in Lesson Plan 3]. I think I should analyze the reading text completely, putting other teaching methods such as CLL [Community Language Learning] and CLT that I learned in college coursework behind for post-reading activities. What if the pupils feel bored? But I think I should cover the reading text first. I’m really in a dilemma. Even though we student teachers leave them, won’t they take school exams? I should prepare a very good class completely so as not to be blamed [for their low test scores].

In this journal entry, she believed the grammar translation method was very useful in order for students to acquire the knowledge that would no doubt be on the exams. This created a contradiction for her because she worried that the traditional method bored students. However, due to her strong beliefs about the importance of teaching L2 knowledge and Mrs. Ma’s stress on it, she chose not to adopt communicative approaches. This excerpt shows Sora’s fear that she would be blamed for students’ performance, revealing the powerful influence of exams as her instructional goal as well as her perception of the outcome of her instruction (exam scores) on her teaching practices. This is clearly represented in the following reading class excerpt:
Translation and Grammar (“Reading”)
High Intermediate, 9th Grade, Lesson Plan 3 (2nd for High Level)
((1-57: listen to the CD about the first response to the article; work on the first two sentences))

58 → Sora: 자 다음은 P1 다음 문장 읽어주셔요/ OK. P1. Would you read the next sentence?

((59-61: P1 reads a sentence, and Sora asks him to read the sentence starting “besides”))

62 → P1: Besides, there are so many teenagers who want to become stars themselves.

63 → Sora: Besides, there are so many teenagers who want to become stars themselves. Besides는 무슨 뜻이에요/ ((slide: “besides, ~”))

What does besides mean?

66 → Ps: 게다가 ((slide: “게다가”, Korean equivalent of “besides”))

In addition.

67 → Sora: Beside는 뭐에요. S가 빠진 beside.

What does beside mean? Beside, there is no S after beside.

68 → Ps: (xxx)

69 → Sora: 뭐뭐 앞에 이런 뜻이죠. 그래서 게다가 besides 에 S가 없으면 틀린 거죠/ It means next to something. So if there is no S at the end when you mean besides or in addition, it is wrong.

70 → There are so many teenagers who want to become stars themselves.

71 → 여기서의 who 는 뭐에요/

What is “who” here?

72 → Ps: 주격 관계 대명사.

Subject relative pronoun.

73 → Sora: 주격 관계 대명사죠. 예 다음은 themselves 선생님이 빨간 색으로 했어요. 왜 yourselves 를 이런 격 제귀대- 제귀대명사라 그리는 거 알죠. 이거 없어도 문장이 되요. 안되요/

It is a subject relative pronoun. Yes. Next, I made “themselves” in red [on slide]. As you know, “themselves” and this kind of things are called reflexive pronouns. Does this sentence make sense without it or not?

76 → Ps: 되요.

Yes.

77 → Sora: There are so many teenagers who want to become stars. 되요 안되요.

Yes or no?

78 → Ps: 되요.

Yes.

79 → Sora: 이렇게 없어도 문장이 되는 제귀대명사를 제귀대명사의 강조 용법이라/ 그래서 해석할 때 강조를 넣어줘서 해석하면 되요/ 그들 스스로 스타가 되고 싶어하는 사람들에게 많이 들다는 뜻이죠/ The reflexive pronouns are used for emphasis, and a sentence without the pronouns makes sense. So it would be all right if you translate the sentence with an emphasis on the pronoun. So the sentence means there are so many teenagers who want to become stars themselves.

((82-99: works on the next sentence))

100 → Sora: 여러분이 이제 다른 책에 적어야 되요/ (...) 적고 있습니까/

Everyone. You should write down what I’m saying in your textbook. Are you jotting down what I’m saying?

32 See Appendix E for the handout/worksheet.
In this lesson, Sora used the grammar translation method to explain word meanings (beside, besides, lines 64-69), grammatical structures (subject relative pronoun, lines 71-73; reflexive pronoun, lines 73-81), and accurate translations (lines 80-81). Although she frequently interacted with her pupils, her interactions were mostly used to review knowledge of the English language. At the end, she confirmed that her pupils took notes on the information she gave them in preparation for the upcoming exams (line 100).

Overall, Sora believed it was her responsibility to teach knowledge about the language, particularly for exam preparation, and thus she considered traditional approaches to be the most appropriate for all proficiency levels. As a result, Sora was very comfortable using such traditional approaches.

5.2.3.6. Primary Focus on Grammatical Competence

Although the curricular reform mandates call for the development of communicative competence, Sora’s instruction focused mostly on developing pupils’ grammatical competence. While dimensions of sociolinguistic and discourse competence were only addressed when she covered relevant parts of the textbook, attention to strategic competence was almost non-existent.

Sociolinguistic competence was typically addressed while practicing communication functions provided in the textbook. For instance, Sora taught the function of showing one’s opinion (“I think~”) as a new structure that can be combined with another clause (e.g., I think that it is delicious) and then had the pupils practice it through two kinds of substitution drill using multiple cues and a riddle activity (Lesson Plan 2,
Classroom Excerpt 5.4). In addition, through animated movies, she wanted to expose her students to a cultural aspect of western societies, namely, a fear that western children have of the boogeyman, a monster living in a closet (Lesson Plan 6, Classroom Excerpt 5.6). However, this was taught as a piece of cultural knowledge and not actually connected with pupils’ language use.

Discourse competence was addressed when Sora described the reading text genre, a newspaper article and four e-mail responses (Lesson Plan 3). She explained how the article follows the 5Ws and 1H strategy and how the senders’ e-mail addresses from the four responses might be read. Additionally, she had groups of students write their opinion about one of the four responses to the main article (Lesson Plan 5, Classroom Excerpt 5.5), so that they could make a coherent writing. However, she paid more attention to accuracy in language than on developing pupils’ competence at the discourse level.

5.2.4. Inner Contradictions in the Instructional Activity System

Sora consistently stated conflicts that emerged over the course of the practicum experience. For example, she wanted to conduct interesting classes for the pupils, but she realized she did not have enough ideas, time, or resources. In addition, she felt responsibility to teach accurate knowledge about English to prepare pupils for their exams. Then she worried that it might generate a boring class. In order to comprehend these dilemmas more systematically, the notion of inner contradictions (Engeström, 1987, 1993, 1999a) was employed to the activity system in which Sora functioned as the subject.

---

33 Since it seemed that Sora’s classroom teaching in the practicum activity system where she was the subject could be included in the instructional activity system from her perspective, inner contradictions in the former were not explained separately from those in the latter. This applies to all the student teachers in the present study.
Four levels of inner contradictions that emerged out of Sora’s data are characterized in the following figure\textsuperscript{34}.

Figure 5.3. Contradictions in the Instructional Activity System from Sora’s Perspective

5.2.4.1. Primary Contradictions

Several primary contradictions arose within the subject, Sora, in terms of language choice for instruction, learner-centered instruction, and a priority in lesson goals.

A primary contradiction arose when Sora chose language as the medium of instruction between English and Korean. Even though Sora recognized the benefits of using English, she primarily used Korean because both she and the students felt more comfortable with this medium as instruction (Data Excerpts 5.12 and 5.13).

\textsuperscript{34} The zigzag arrows represent inner contradictions that emerged within the activity system and the numbers 1-4 are the four levels of contradictions. The shaded parts indicate the components involved in the secondary contradictions.
Next, Sora struggled as to whether learners should be autonomous individuals or passive recipients of knowledge. This struggle about her view of learners relates to her another primary contradiction between her desire to be learner-centered and yet to maintain classroom control. She embraced the view of passive learners and focused on control because she felt it was the most feasible in her instructional context where teaching prescribed knowledge about English language was most important (Data Excerpt 5.19). In addition, pupils’ lack of motivation and participation in the classroom reinforced her perception of learners and justified her teacher-controlled instructional practices.

Finally, she grappled with either creating an exciting class to maintain pupils’ interests or with helping them learn accurate L2 knowledge for the school exams. Due to her own dissatisfaction as a learner with English taught as a subject, she wanted to make her instruction interesting for her pupils (Data Excerpt 5.10). However, she chose to teach L2 knowledge considering her duty as a teacher (Data Excerpt 5.19) and her choice was reinforced by her mentor teacher. Thus, despite being aware of the possibility of causing students’ to be bored, she frequently used grammar translation and repetition drills. Moreover, when she adopted authentic materials to motivate her pupils, she focused more on teaching about L2 knowledge.

Overall, these primary contradictions indicate that Sora firmly believed the curricular mandates (learner-centered instruction using English) as unfeasible in her teaching context.
5.2.4.2. Secondary Contradictions

Several secondary contradictions, as a condition for change (Engeström, 1993), emerged in this instructional activity system. These include contradictions between (1) subject and community, (2) subject and tool, (3) subject and rule, (4) community and rule, and (5) community and division of labor.

First, a secondary contradiction emerged between Sora (subject) and Mrs. Ma (community) in terms of teachers’ use of language as the medium of instruction. Mrs. Ma recommended that her student teachers use English for about eighty percent of the time in the high level classes. However, although Sora understood the benefits of teachers’ using English for instruction, due to her negative sense of her using English and pupils’ response to it, she mostly used Korean as the medium of instruction. This secondary contradiction simultaneously revealed the contradictions between Sora (subject) and use of English (tool) and between Sora (subject) and satisfying the mentor teacher’s expectations regarding language choice for instruction (rule). These contradictions were not actually resolved, but Sora continued to use Korean as the medium of instruction.

Second, regarding the issue of teacher control, a prominent secondary contradiction was revealed between the teacher (subject) and her pupils (community). For example, in the riddle activity (Lesson Plan 2, Classroom Excerpt 5.4), a conflict emerged when her pupils wanted to answer using their own knowledge, whereas Sora asked them to use the form she had taught them. This contradiction is also related to another contradiction between students (community) and teacher control (rule, division of labor). The resolution of these secondary contradictions was not really made, but Sora constantly maintained control over all instructional activities and pupils.
Another secondary contradiction was present between Sora (subject) and her pupils (community) in terms of pupils’ passive participation. Although Sora wanted her pupils to participate in her class more actively, she found her pupils were bored, non-responsive and passive. This was specifically evident when she taught grammar and reading section using the traditional approach (Data Excerpt 5.15). This secondary contradiction brought the contradiction between Sora (subject) and her students’ inactive classroom participation (rule) as they were socialized into Korean ELT classrooms. These contradictions were not actually settled, but the students’ passive role continued since Sora’s ultimate goal was to teach L2 knowledge for exams over conducting engaging lessons. Moreover, her pupils’ role as passive recipients allowed her to maintain the role of a typical English teacher in Korea.

Ultimately, all three of the secondary contradictions remained largely unresolved. Thus, little transformation of this activity system was made.

5.2.4.3. Tertiary Contradictions

Tertiary contradictions emerged between the instructional activity system from Sora’s perspective and the culturally advanced activity system of the curricular reforms mandated by the Ministry of Education. These contradictions were related to the teaching English through English policy and communicative language teaching.

First, the contradiction between the teaching English through English policy that the Ministry of Education imposed and Sora’s use of Korean as the medium of instruction created tension in this instructional activity system. For Sora, her own beliefs about language use in the classrooms and her pupils’ reaction to her use of English were more
powerful in shaping her language choice. As a result, Sora decided to conform to the old practices that were used in her own schooling and that she believed feasible and effective in the classroom context.

Second, another tertiary contradiction emerged between task-based, learner-centered instruction advocated by the Ministry of Education and Sora’s teacher-controlled transmission of knowledge through drills and practices. While she mostly agreed with task-based, learner-centered initiatives and benefits of communicative activities, she felt they were too idealistic. Instead, she believed that the teacher-fronted teaching of prescribed content was a much more realistic approach to ELT in Korea. Thus, she played the role of holder of legitimate knowledge and overseer of accurate answers rather than the role of the creator of a comfortable atmosphere wherein pupils could meaningfully use language while engaging in communicative activities. Again, she was able to justify her traditional instructional practices (grammar translation and repetition) based on Mrs. Ma’s emphasis on teachers’ control and teachers’ responsibility for pupils’ learning for exams as well as the norms of participation that exist in Korean schools (pupils’ passive participation).

5.2.4.4. Quaternary Contradiction

A quaternary contradiction existed between the instructional activity system where Sora was the subject (a central activity system) and her university coursework (a neighboring activity system). Although she thought the practicum could have been the place where theories or methods were put into practice, she considered the coursework to be too theoretical and abstract and not directly applicable to her actual teaching (Journal,
May 1 and 2; Interview, June 8). Ultimately, her instructional practices were based more on her own beliefs about language learning and teaching within the Korean educational system, the advice of her mentor teacher and pupils’ response to her lessons, rather than on her knowledge of the curricular reform mandates.

5.2.5. Summary

This section provides evidence of Sora’s understanding of the curricular reform mandates and the extent to which she was able to implement them during the practicum. On the surface, her use of different types of instructional activities and authentic materials, and her concerns about learners’ interests and participation might indicate that her instructional practices were consistent with the curricular reform mandates. However, a careful examination of the instructional activity systems where Sora was the subject and specifically the inner contradictions that were present revealed how minimally she enacted the curricular mandates.

Recurrent primary contradictions uncovered how she regarded CLT-based curricular reforms as unrealistic in her classroom setting. Moreover, several secondary contradictions revealed how her strong beliefs about language use and teacher control remained in spite of tension with her community. Instead of transforming the instructional activity system where Sora was the subject, she continued the traditional practices she thought appropriate in her teaching context. As a result, over the course of the practicum, Sora came to use less and less English, maintained tight control over all of her instructional activities, and focused on grammatical forms and accurate knowledge of
the L2 as well as mechanical drill and practice rather than generating opportunities for L2 use.

It is somewhat surprising that Sora held such negative attitudes toward the ELT profession and curricular reforms because she had had such positive experiences learning English and was very proficient herself. Despite her positive English language learning history, her pessimistic views of the innovations currently being mandated and her “apprenticeship of observation” (Lortie, 2002) allowed her to teach traditionally. In addition, the nature of Mrs. Ma’s mentorship, her pupils’ lack of participation and the power of exams as the instructional goal all reinforced her traditional instruction. Consequently, her instruction did not reflect what she learned from her coursework and had a tremendous conflict with the CLT-oriented curricular reforms in terms of the teaching English through English policy and task-based, learner-centered instruction. Ultimately, the lesson goal of the curricular reform mandates, namely, developing communicative competence was not fully addressed, and only grammatical competence was taken up. Thus, overall, Sora’s practicum experience ended up simply maintaining existing ELT instructional norms and beliefs about English language teaching and learning in Korea.

The findings indicate that her conception of ideal teaching was rarely developed in her learning to teach in the practicum. Her ideal image about language classroom was that motivated pupils actively participated in lessons where teachers provide authentic materials and context for using English (Interview, May 9; Journal, May 2). One way Sora saw a possibility of transferring her own ideals of teaching into her classroom setting was to use authentic materials in her lessons, but in fact they were solely used to
achieve the immediate instructional goal of teaching L2 knowledge. More specifically, not only did her beliefs about infeasibility of the curricular reforms in her classroom context keep her from attempting those ideals in her classroom, but also her mentor teacher reinforced her beliefs by socializing her into the existing norms of the EFL teaching in Korea. As a result, throughout the practicum activities, no evidence was found that transformation occurred in the instructional activity system where Sora functioned as the subject or that she internalized the curricular reform concepts within her practicum teaching.

5.3. Yuna

Similar to the previous section on Sora, this section answers the second research questions of this study, centering on Yuna, one of the team A student teachers. This section examines how Yuna experienced English language learning and her teaching practicum, specifically through six themes that emerged from Yuna’s data (refer to Section 5.3.3), by focusing on how she came to understand the curricular reform mandates and endeavored to embrace them in her instructional practices. To address these, Yuna’s experiences in English learning and the practicum are reviewed (Section 5.3.1) and the structure of the instructional activity system where Yuna was the subject is presented (Section 5.3.2).
5.3.1. Previous English and Practicum Experiences

Yuna learned English through various teaching methods and in different instructional venues\(^{35}\). Overall, she enjoyed learning English, but did not feel very excited about it as a subject in classroom settings. She has taken courses at private institutes for grammar, reading, and conversational skills since 5\(^{th}\) grade and at public school since the 7\(^{th}\) grade. While Yuna learned English mostly through the grammar translation method, she also experienced some small group activities. Specifically, she recalled that in the middle school, one English teacher (a Korean native) taught English through English and a native speaking English teacher taught an English conversation class once a week. In college, Yuna stayed in the U.S. for 10 months after her junior year: she took ESL classes at a private language institute and other courses at a community college. The experience improved her communication skills and provided her with abundant opportunities to use English for communicative purposes.

As a student majoring in English Language Education, like Sora, Yuna learned a variety of methods and theories about teaching English and about the current national curriculum. Her methods class allowed her to participate in group projects\(^{36}\), observe other groups’ presentations and participate in whole class discussions about the pros and cons of various teaching methods including communicative approaches. Furthermore, in the course *Teaching Materials in English Language Education*\(^{37}\), Yuna had direct exposure to the curricular reform mandates, the textbooks under the current curriculum,

---

\(^{35}\) The description of Yuna’s experience in this section was mostly from the interviews with her (Interviews, May 9, May 24, and June 8).

\(^{36}\) Yuna recalled the group project was about multiple intelligence theory (Gardner, 1983).

\(^{37}\) All English student teachers took *Teaching Materials in ELE* together during the same semester. Since the practicum in Korea was held in every May in spring semester (March-early June), the course was intensive and almost completed before the practicum started (with the exception of one group project which was to be submitted after the practicum).
and effective classroom tasks. This was made possible through three group projects, including analyzing the textbooks developed and used under the 7th curriculum, revising tasks in those textbooks, and examining the opinions of textbook users (teachers and pupils) in the practicum lab school. While Yuna’s coursework helped raise her awareness of the communicative approach along with other approaches and see the potential of the curricular reforms, she admitted that what she learned from the coursework did not have a substantive influence on her practicum teaching (Yuna–Journal, May 4).

Just like Sora, Yuna had no previous teaching experience except for tutoring elementary and secondary school pupils. However, she felt that through the practicum, she became more confident as a teacher and gained a much better understanding of herself as a teacher. This is well shown below in the journal entry at the conclusion of the practicum:

Data Excerpt 5.20. Yuna–Journal (May 25)

It seems like my knowledge, efforts, and ability to search useful information were not enough to make “a class which pupils are enthusiastic about” as Mrs. Ma mentioned. But through the last practicum class I taught today [i.e., a special activity class for low level pupils about a crossword puzzle, scrambled sentences, and a pop song], I felt much better about my teaching. It looks like I came to know what it means to have a class, which makes me feel great. That’s what I was able to get after making so many efforts. … I felt so good because I was able to conduct a successful class using various learning materials. I think I came to know why people want to be a teacher and how much I have an aptitude for teaching.

In this excerpt, Yuna was satisfied with her last class due to her own perception of sufficient class preparation and her pupils’ active response. Thus, she expressed her
emerging confidence in her teaching capabilities and her positive attitude toward the practicum experience as well as the teaching profession.

As a result of the practicum, Yuna’s conception about the English teaching profession also changed. Before the practicum, she had thought that teachers’ work would be very repetitive and simple. However, through the practicum experiences, she came to recognize the complexities involved in real teaching and came to see learning to teach as a continual process of professional development (Journal, May 9 and 22).

Yuna stated that after graduation she wanted to work in something other than secondary school English teaching. However, since she enjoyed teaching, she mentioned that she might choose to become a teacher, but felt it was only one among several potential future careers for her.

In summary, Yuna found the communicatively oriented curricular reforms desirable but somewhat unrealistic within the context of her practicum teaching. Despite this, through the practicum, she gained confidence in her own teaching and began to understand the teaching profession better. Moreover, she even developed more positive attitudes toward her own teaching and the teaching profession.

With Yuna’s English language learning and teaching history as a backdrop, the next section examines the instructional activity system from Yuna’s perspective and then the extent to which her emerging conception of herself as a teacher and her teaching practices were shaped by the mentoring of Mrs. Ma, with particular attention paid to how she came to conceptualize and enact the curricular reform mandates.
5.3.2. The Configuration of the Instructional Activity System

Out of the analysis of the data collected from Yuna, the instructional activity system can be illustrated as in Figure 5.4. Mainly due to Mrs. Ma’s influence as her mentor teacher, the instructional activity system appears to be similar to the one from Sora’s perspective. However, Yuna’s beliefs, her use of certain tools, and her adherence to certain rules created a substantively different activity system.

Figure 5.4. The Instructional Activity System from Yuna’s Perspective

Yuna as the subject of the activity system had similar rules and objects to Sora. Like Sora, Yuna also wanted to complete the lesson plans and cover the textbook for exams. These were imposed major rules by Mrs. Ma through the practicum activities (e.g., conferences) and became Yuna’s important objects of this activity system. The lesson plans functioned as an important artifact to guide and control Yuna’s instruction and the textbook was a major tool around which each lesson was shaped. To support instruction centering on the textbook, handouts and extra materials were also used. Moreover, exams
were considered an important mediational artifact in that Yuna and the community (mentors, peers, and pupils) assumed that the evidence of student learning would be reflected in their exam scores, which is consistent with the outcome of this activity system. In order to teach L2 knowledge from the textbook for exams, against her preference she accepted tools of the grammar translation method and repetition drills imposed by Mrs. Ma, and mechanical exercises were used for these traditional methods. Since meeting her expectations was also an essential rule for this instructional activity system, Yuna complied with her mentor teacher.

The last object of this instructional activity system is to increase pupils’ motivation by using several tools such as communicative activities and English or Korean. She believed her language choice contributed to an increase in her pupils’ motivation in that while her frequent use of English facilitates high level pupils’ language input and use, her Korean use enhanced low level pupils’ understanding and classroom participation. In addition, communicative activities were used to encourage her pupils to use English: however, in order to finish the lesson plan she often controlled the activities.

Traditional classroom norms such as teacher-directed instruction and participation structure were an important rule of this activity system. This feature defines division of labor as teacher’s ratification of knowledge and pupils’ guessing and/or comprehension of it.

Mrs. Ma’s mentoring played a critical role in Yuna’s choice of content and in the nature of her instruction. At the same time, her teaching was also influenced by her beliefs about English language learning and teaching. In addition, the pupils as
community members were influential in that their proficiency levels and response influenced Yuna’s instructional decisions.

Just as in the previous section for Sora, the findings from the grounded analysis of Yuna’s data are provided below in order to examine the evidence of the origin and multifaceted characteristics of each component of the instructional activity system from Yuna’s perspective. Furthermore, the findings uncover the contradictions that occurred within the activity system and her response to them, and finally explain to what extent she was able to embrace the curricular reform mandates in her particular practicum teaching context.

5.3.3. Understanding and Enacting the Curricular Reforms

Six relevant themes emerged from Yuna’s data that capture her perceptions of and implementation of the curricular reform mandates during the practicum: 1) She had a positive attitude about using English as the medium of instruction; 2) She was optimistic about using instructional activities, but lacked in resources; 3) She attempted her pupils’ English use in communicative activities, 4) but she often controlled activities; 5) Despite her support of the communicative approach, she employed traditional approaches to teach the prescribed content; 6) As a result, she mostly focused on enhancing pupils’ grammatical competence.

5.3.3.1. English as the Medium of Instruction

Yuna stated that she felt very positive about using English in class (Yuna–Interview, May 9, May 24, and June 8) and was observed to consistently use English as
the medium of instruction. Yuna’s constant use of English, especially in the high level
class, was influenced by her positive attitudes toward her pupils’ response to her English
use as well as other teachers’ use of English. This is well represented in the excerpt below
showing her reactions to her pupils’ resistance of her using English:

Data Excerpt 5.21. Yuna–Interview (June 8)
[제가 영어 쓰는 걸 싫어해요. 선생님 영어 쓰지 말아요 그래요. 3 학년 수업 때. 3 학년 1 반
수업. 영어 좀 그만 쓰라고 그래요. 너희는 쓰레반이지니? 그러니까. 나도 쓰기 싫지만
써야 한다. … [아이들이 표현은 안하지만 제가 영어 쓰는 걸] 사실은 좋을 거에요. 제생각도
그래요. … 그리고 자기가 알아 듣는다고 생각할수록 재미를 (느끼니까)
I don’t think pupils like [my using English]. One day, a pupil in the high intermediate
9th grade said to me, “Please stop using English.” Then I answered, “You are high
intermediate level pupils. I don’t want to do that very much but I should use English
in class for you”... But I think the pupils would like [my using English even though
they do not express it explicitly]. … They would feel successful if they think they can
understand my English.

Here, she knew that some of the pupils did not like her English use as the medium
of instruction, which created a contradiction in the instructional activity system. However,
she continued to use English because she believed that frequent use of English would be
helpful to her pupils and that those who could understand her English actually would like
her speaking L2.

At the same time, she complied with Mrs. Ma’s advice to use English and Korean
differently depending on pupils’ proficiency levels and the skill sections of the textbook.
In fact, the proportion of Yuna’s use of English was observed to relate to the proficiency
level of her pupils. While she used English extensively with the high level pupils, she
used more Korean with the low level pupils. This created a tension for her as noted in the
interview below:
I don’t think I can code-switch very well between English and Korean. I think I need more practice. … I need to use English for about 80% of the talk in the high intermediate class and 50% in the beginner class [as Mrs. Ma recommended]. But I usually speak in Korean most of the time in the beginner class. When I speak English, the beginner pupils seem to look at me without understanding me very well. … I think I am sort of biased. I often think, “What if I use English (all the time) when I teach the beginner pupils?” Anyway, that’s what I was told to do [to use English for about 50% of the teacher talk] for the beginner class. If beginner pupils don’t understand my direction in English, the class will not progress as fast as I intended. [So I use more Korean.] … Anyhow, I think it is good for teachers to try to use English in the classroom. I think that the more English input teachers provide for pupils, the more helpful it would be to them.

This interview segment indicates that Yuna was willing to follow her mentor teacher’s advice regarding using English and Korean depending on the pupils’ proficiency levels. However, even more than using English for half of her teacher talk for the benefit of the low level pupils as recommended by Mrs. Ma, she believed that using English as much as she did for the high level pupils would be also helpful. In reality, she found that she used Korean more than English in the low-proficiency level class since she was afraid that they would not understand her English well, which she surmised might cause slower class pacing.

Overall, despite her consistent use of English, her use of Korean slightly increased over the course of the practicum since she had difficulty code switching between Korean and English and she felt more comfortable speaking Korean (Interview, June 8). However, her consistent attempt to use English as the medium of instruction was praised by Mrs. Ma and her peer student teachers.
5.3.3.2. Optimistic about Instructional Activities but Lacking Resources

Yuna firmly believed that instructional activities have several advantages for pupils’ learning, such as providing for students to experience fun and motivating their English study. Thus, she thought that English teachers should use many different instructional activities in their classes as shown below:

Data Excerpt 5.23. Yuna–Interview (May 9)
선생님은 많이 알고 있어야 되는 것 같아요. 그게 영어적 지식이던지 애들이 영어를 즐겁게 할 수 있는 여러가지 activity 들을 정말 많이 갖고 있어야 되요. 자료가 정말 많아야죠. 그 자료를 이때 이때 적응해야 된다는 걸 알고 있어야 되는. 그러니까 선생님이 일단 애들을 잘 파악하고 있어야 되고 수준 알고 이 수준에 맞춰서 플랜을 짜을 때 어떤 activity 가 여기여기 맞다고.

I think English teachers should know considerable knowledge about English language and various activities to make their pupils interested in learning English. Also, they need to have lots of good class materials and know when to use them. Furthermore, they should understand pupils’ proficiency levels and plan their lessons with appropriate activities to meet their proficiency levels.

The excerpt showed the critical teacher role in planning and using appropriate instructional activities at different proficiency levels as well as at different sections to be covered. For this role, she mentioned that teachers should be knowledgeable of various types of activities and resources.

Over the course of the practicum, Yuna used whole class and pair work more often at the start of practicum and gradually increased the number of small group activities near the end of the practicum. Additionally, her instructional activities differed depending on her pupils’ proficiency levels. With the low level pupils, her activities were much more controlled and focused more on receptive skills. On the other hand, with her high level pupils she gradually became less restricted and created more opportunities for pupils to develop their production skills.
Table 5.2. Instructional Activities in Yuna’s Lessons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lesson Plans***</th>
<th>LP1</th>
<th>LP2</th>
<th>LP3</th>
<th>LP4</th>
<th>LP5</th>
<th>LP6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dates for Class A, B</td>
<td>May 9, 10</td>
<td>May 11, 12</td>
<td>May 16, 18</td>
<td>May 19, 22</td>
<td>May 23, 25</td>
<td>May 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade (level)</td>
<td>9th (high)</td>
<td>8th (low)</td>
<td>9th (high)</td>
<td>8th (low)</td>
<td>8th (low)</td>
<td>9th (high).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textbook Section</td>
<td>Warm-up, Listening</td>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td>Reading 1</td>
<td>Reading 1</td>
<td>None (Special Activities)</td>
<td>None (Special Activities)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small group work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reading comprehension Qs</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*Crossword puzzle</td>
<td><em>Creating a monster</em> (Exc. 5.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary of reading text</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*Scrambled sentences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual/Whole class work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-reading: Scoldings and complaints* (Exc. 5.9)</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*Sing along (listen/sing)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair work</td>
<td>Reading aloud dialogues (worksheet)</td>
<td>Practice function of asking opinions</td>
<td>Selecting pizza toppings* (Exc. 5.10)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction/exercise **</td>
<td>Textbook questions</td>
<td><strong>Reading</strong> (Exc. 5.11)</td>
<td>Reading; textbook questions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Presented in classroom excerpts  
** Coverage of the textbook or worksheets without instructional activities  
*** For most lesson plans, the student teachers taught two class sessions. For the Lesson Plan 6, Yuna did not submit the formal lesson plan outline and taught this lesson just once.

Yet, at the same time, while teaching, Yuna simply covered the content of the textbook and used typical activities in her instruction. This appeared to create some dissonance for Yuna in that she clearly wanted to draw on outside resources to make her instruction more meaningful and interesting for her pupils, but often fell back on the activities outlined in the textbook or what she frequently observed in other teachers’ lessons, because like Sora she had few prior experiences with activity-based instruction and little time to find new resources or to modify those resources for her practicum pupils (Interview, May 24). For example, Yuna’s adherence to the typical sources and activities clearly appeared in her special activity class for the low level pupils (Lesson Plan 5) in
which she was encouraged to use outside resources and new ideas. In fact, most of the activities she conducted were from the content of the textbook (e.g., words, expressions, and structures) and typical activities used by other teachers (e.g., a crossword puzzle and scrambled sentences).

Overall, her instructional activities included not only communicative activities but also “what pupils actually do” such as drills and exercises (e.g., reading aloud dialogues and listening to a pop song), which is somewhat consistent with Mrs. Ma’s definition of tasks. The following two sections examine features of Yuna’s communicative activities: while she tried to encourage pupils’ use of English in some communicative activities, she was more concerned with how to manage and control these activities.

5.3.3.3. Encouraging Pupils’ L2 Use in Communicative Activities

As with her mentor teacher and Sora, Yuna understood pupils’ resistance to speaking English in her classes. However, while Mrs. Ma chose not to spend much time waiting for her pupils to use English (Interview, May 12), and Sora viewed supporting pupils’ L2 use as unfeasible in her classroom context and rarely attempted it, Yuna was aware of the importance of encouraging her pupils to use English. The interview segment below indicates her view of creating a comfortable environment for the pupils to use English as critical:

Data Excerpt 5.24. Yuna–Interview (May 9)
영어를 쓸수 있는 환경이 좀 중요한 것 같어요. 그러니까 누가 부끄러워하지 말고, 근데 우리나라 학교들이 좀 다 그러 거 같거든요. 학생들이 의진 표현하는데 나아지고는 있지만 한국말로도 표현하는데 굉장히 수줍어하고 분위기가 그런것이에요. 그러니까 가뜩이나 영어면 굉장히 자신감이 있어야 되거든요. 그러니까 정말 두려워하지 말고 얘기해라 그러니까 나무가 위 어렸을 때 한국말 배울 때 받아쓰기 몇천번 하지 않았나. 뭐 계속 말해보고 그러지 않았나. 틀리두. 그렇게 필요하다라고 애들한테 그런 분위기를 좀 형성해 주는 게 중요한 것 같아요.
I think it is important to **generate an environment for pupils to speak English** because they are very shy. But it may be **related to our classroom culture**. I think pupils are getting better at it, but they are sort of **afraid to express their opinion in class**. In case of speaking English, they need much more confidence. So it seems to be important to **create favorable and safe environment for them to practice speaking English**, encouraging them like “**Don’t be afraid. Just speak.**” Think about this. You practiced speaking and writing Korean so many times when you learned it as a child. You made lots of mistakes. You cannot help making mistakes even when you learn your native language.”

In this excerpt, Sora understood that pupils were resistant to participate in classroom communication, even using Korean and even more reluctant to do so when using English. Thus she felt the importance of providing for a safe atmosphere where pupils could be allowed to make mistakes as they did in the learning of their native language.

Yuna was observed to attempt to encourage pupils to express their opinions in English. For example, she asked her pupils to speak in English while interacting with her (e.g., scoldings/complaints, classroom excerpt 5.9) and/or presenting their small group work (creating a monster, classroom excerpt 5.8). Also, she had each group write their ideas (creating a monster and summary of the reading text) in English.

The following classroom excerpt from the special activity class shows that the high proficiency pupils were able to use spoken and written English to express their ideas despite limited abilities in their L2 use:

Classroom Excerpt 5.8. Yuna’s Lesson (May 26)
Creating a Monster (Special Activities)
High Intermediate, 9th Grade, Lesson Plan 6 (3rd for High Level)

((1-15: introduces the activity, drawing, describing, and presenting their group’s monster))
((16-28: gives 5 minutes for the group work, goes around the classroom and repeatedly mentions what they need to do))
→((Each group works on the activity, speaking Korean))

29 Yuna: Please, class, attention. ((claps)) Let’s see what this group drew. (..)
30 Group no. 6. Let’s see group no. 6’s picture. (..) OK. Who’s gonna
In this excerpt, each group drew and described their own monster (lines 16-28). They expressed their ideas in English (lines 34, 40, 42, 47 and 51) because Yuna encouraged them to both present in English (lines 30-33 and 45-46) and to tell more about their group’s monsters by expanding sentences or asking additional questions (lines 41, 43, 48 and 50).

Yuna challenged the way her pupils were socialized into limited classroom participation and L2 use, and encouraged them to actually speak English and communicate with her in English. This created a contradiction between herself and her

---

38 Due to the time shortage, only two groups had a chance to show their outcome in front of the class.
pupils in terms of the pupils’ resistance to participation using English and her challenge against it, but she continued to expect pupils to speak in English. However, more often than not, pupils’ L2 use was limited to a word or a phrase or to reading their written products aloud. Even when the final outcome of small group activities was in English, the pupils communicated each other in Korean rather than in English.

Yuna rarely attempted to have the pupils communicate in the L2 between themselves, because she was unsure of the possibility that the L2 could be used as the sole means of communication in her classroom context (Interview, May 9), and furthermore this issue was hardly discussed in the team conferences, indicating that neither Mrs. Ma nor student teachers expected students to speak to one another in English.

5.3.3.4. Teacher-Controlled Activities

When observing activities conducted by her classmates or Mrs. Ma, Yuna consistently focused on their skills to maintain control over students. At the beginning of the practicum, she experienced difficulty with time management and classroom control. However, by the end of the practicum, she had gained more confidence, especially in conducting small group activities as shown in the conference after her last class:

Data Excerpt 5.25. Team A–Conference (May 25)

I felt very good [in my last class for beginners where I conducted three activities], I intended to do many activities and I did them all. Time management was good and the pupils read sentences [as activity products] loudest of all … Many of the pupils raised their hands eagerly and I speeded up the activities. … Because I promised treats, the pupils participated in the activities more eagerly.
What Yuna liked most about the final class was that her good management skills brought about an instructional success. She was able to complete the three activities that she planned within the class hour by keeping class pacing fast\(^{39}\). Also, she was able to gather pupils’ engagement in these activities using treats. Clearly, in conducting activities, she viewed appropriate control over pupils as the key to attaining educational success.

The following classroom excerpt shows that Yuna tightly controlled an activity in which high-proficiency pupils were asked to guess what she prepared for the two ranking lists about parental discipline:

___

**Classroom Excerpt 5.9. Yuna’s Lesson (May 18)**  
Scoldings and Complaints (“Before You Read”)  
High Intermediate, 9\(^{th}\) Grade, Lesson Plan 3 (2\(^{nd}\) for High Level)

1 Yuna: I changed it a little into this one. I already have some ranking lists. ((2-16: introduces activities, 3 top scoldings from parents and complaints about them))

17Æ Yuna: You have to say in English. I’ve got some candies. ((18-21: talk more about the activity))

22 Yuna: OK. P1 ((calls upon one student among those who raise hands)).

23Æ P1: Study.

24Æ Yuna: Study.

25Æ P2: 

26Æ Yuna: Should we answer in English?

27Æ P2: Stop playing the game.

28Æ Yuna: Which game?

29Æ P2: Computer game.

30Æ Yuna: That’s right. Stop playing the computer game and go to bed.

31Æ Repeat after me.

32Æ P5: Stop playing the computer game and go to bed.

33 Yuna: OK. So the last one? ((calls upon P3))

34Æ P3: Stop playing. I stop watching TV.

35Æ Yuna: No, sorry. That’s not the answer.

36 Yuna: Who are you? P4?

37Æ P4: Shut up. ((pupils giggle))

38Æ Yuna: Please please talk about (xxx). Not this one, this one is too common, too.

39 Yuna: OK. P5.

40Æ P5: Clean your room.

---

\(^{39}\) In this class, Yuna seemed to be more interested in managing and completing three activities rather than influencing actual student learning.
Yuna encouraged the pupils to participate in English (lines 17 and 25-26) by using treats as rewards (lines 17), and she communicated with her pupils in English. However, to complete what Yuna planned for the activity, she only accepted the answers that matched what she prepared and thus she asked them to guess more (lines 23-26, 27-29, and 40-42) or rejected other possible answers (lines 34-35 and 37-38). Also, the responses the pupils typically gave in English were single words or simple sentences, and she did not expand pupils’ answers in ways that might foster further discussion in the L2 use. Instead she simply had the pupils repeat the sentences she created for this lesson (lines 30-32 and 46-47). As a result, a conflict between Yuna (teacher control over knowledge) and her pupils (contribution to constructing knowledge) emerged and the teacher maintained her control over the structure of the activity and knowledge produced in the process of the activity.

Activities for the low level pupils were much more controlled by the teacher. The following classroom data from the first class for the low level pupils illustrates how Yuna turned a potential “speaking activity” into a teacher-controlled substitution drill:

Classroom Excerpt 5.10. Yuna’s Lesson (May 12)
Choosing Pizza toppings (“Look and Say”)
Low level, 8th Grade, Lesson Plan 2 (1st for Low Level)

---

40 See Appendix F for the handout/worksheet.
41 “Look and Say” indicates the section of the textbook to which the activity is related.
Pupils repeat two dialogues from the textbook: “Do you want some~?” “No, thanks”)

(25-124: introduces the activity, i.e., two people select toppings at Tony’s Pizza; using slides, Yuna and pupils practice pronouncing 7 pizza toppings; Yuna frequently asks pupils to be quiet)

(125-192: explains how to do the activities 1& 2 and asks the pupils to do the activities using expressions “Do you want some~?” “Yes, please.” or “No, thank you.”; Yuna frequently asks pupils to be quiet))

Yuna: 자 그럼 시켜볼거야. 자 두사람씩 일어나서 하는 거에요. 내가 이름을 부르면 둘이 일어나서 물어봐야. Do you want some more/ 한 다음에 대답을 세게만 세가지만 물어봐요. 세가지만. 어 세가지만 물어 와서 대답을 하고 그거를 한 명이 말하는 거야. He wants 그 중에 니가 원하는 것. He wants ham and cheese. 이렇게 대답한다든지. ham 이랑 cheese 를 원한데요. 이렇게/ 무슨 뜻인지 알겠어요/ OK. Then. I will check. OK. Two people stand up and talk. If I call upon two of you, please stand up. Then, one will ask the other about his topping choice using the expression “Do you want some more.” Ask your partner about only three toppings. OK/ Ask about three toppings. If you get the answer from your partner, make a sentence about his topping choice. “He wants” and say what he chose such as “He wants ham and cheese,” something like that. He wants ham and cheese. Is it clear?

Ps: 네.

P5: Do you want some ham, cheese, bacon?

P6: (xxx)

Yuna: Yes, please. Do you want some/ Pineapple?

P5: Do you want some pineapple?

P6: Yes, please.

Yuna: Pineapple?

P5: Do you want some cheese?

P6: Yes, please.

Yuna: 자 그럼 정리해서 물어보러 왔을 때 “P6 wants.” OK. You can summarize [the toppings that your partner chose and when the waiter or waitress] came to take an order, you could say, “P6 wants”

P6 wants (xxx), pineapple, and cheese.

((213-230: Yuna asks pupils to be quiet in class again; class ends))

In this classroom segment, Yuna brought in an activity in which pupils could talk about each other’s favorite toppings and decide which ones to order. However, she

---

42 Brief instructions of activities 1 and 2 are as follows (Yuna–Lesson Plan 2): Activity 1–Check the toppings you want in the table on the worksheet. Then find the toppings your partner likes using expressions such as “Do you want some ~?”, “Yes, please.” or “No, thank you.” and mark it in the table; Activity 2–Make a sentence telling what toppings your partner wants and does not want; for example, “Taehee wants ham, cheese, bacon, onion, and tomato, but he doesn’t want pineapple and potato.”
consistently controlled the activity to make sure that the students acquired the targeted expressions and completed filling in the worksheet and the activity. She first conducted drill and practice for the targeted expressions (lines 1-24), and then introduced the activity and asked the pupils to repeat words that were supposed to be used in the activity (lines 25-114). Then she actually had them practice the targeted expressions, substituting words they practiced (lines 125-192). In addition, at the end of the activity, since two pupils (P5 and P6) did not understand what Yuna wanted them to do (lines 193-198) and the class hour was almost over, Yuna strictly controlled one pair’s practice in front of the class (lines 200-212). Moreover, it was observed that she continually attempted to control classroom noise since the pupils were excited to discuss their favorite food and kept talking about something on and off task (several times in lines 65-189). Finally, by taking control over the “speaking activity”, she was able to finish what she planned within the given class hour and maintain classroom management.

Overall, while Yuna’s intent was to have the pupils express their ideas in English and to interact with them in English, concerns over classroom management and constraints on pupils (limited participation and low proficiency) kept her from creating more opportunities for her pupils to use English. In particular, her more controlled activities for the low level pupils got her pupils to do repetition and/or substitution drill. This teacher-directed instruction generated a contradiction with the learner-centered initiatives outlined in curricular mandates.
5.3.3.5. Conflicting Beliefs about Traditional Approaches

Although Yuna had a positive attitude toward CLT, believing English language teaching in Korea would gradually move toward it (Interview, June 8), she thought the priority of English classes in the lab school was to increase pupils’ understanding of the content of the textbook (Interview, June 8). Because of Yuna’s belief about the use of CLT and Mrs. Ma’s influence, Yuna adopted traditional approaches into her class in the manner Mrs. Ma suggested. Mrs. Ma recommended the grammar translation method and drill and repetition to cover the content of the textbook during their conferences, and this seemed to generate some conflict for Yuna. The following conference discussion about teaching reading is an example of this:

Data Excerpt 5.26. Team A–Conference (May 15)
Yuna: 제가 reading 을… 한문장 한문장 해 줄 필요는 없잖아요.
For the reading…. I don’t think I need to translate every sentence.
Mrs. Ma: 아. 필요가 없는 건 아니에요. 그러나 까지는 여기가 정말 grammar translation 이 될 수도 있거든요…. 선생님들이 하기 편한 수업이고.
학생들이 그렇게 능률적인 수업이 될 수 있어요…. I don’t think it is unnecessary. Many teachers can use the grammar translation method here…… It can be convenient to teachers and efficient to pupils.
Yuna: 저는 계속 다 물어보고 답을 구하는 방식으로 하려고 했거든요. 제가 해석을 굳이 안해주구. 하지만 대답했을 때 틀렸을 때 바로 잡아주구…. I was going to keep asking pupils many questions, but I was not going to translate the text myself. But I was going to correct their wrong answers if any……
Mrs. Ma: … 여기 보면은 여기 Study point 에서 사용한 단어나 문장 같은게 나오거든요. 그런 거는 좀 학생들에게 깊이 주거나 같이 설명을 해 줄 필요가 있구. 그게 아님에도 불구하고 시험에 잘 나오는 표현들입니다…. 어 수동태면 단순한데 이제 by 행위자가 생략된 수동태도 … 어 여기 완료 진행형도 하나 있는데. “Have been standing.”
…… In the reading passage, you could find words and expressions the pupils already learned in “Study Points.” You need to focus on and explain those to the pupils. Besides, you need to let them know about expressions that can be on the exam…… The passive forms are special here because the agent after “by” was omitted…… Also you can find past perfect progressive here. “had been standing”
Yuna: 아 “have been standing.”
Oh, "had been standing."

Here, although Yuna had intended to teach grammar inductively and use minimal translation for the reading section in the high level class, Mrs. Ma advocated deductive grammar teaching and accurate translation. Also, Mrs. Ma suggested Yuna explicitly teach expressions that might appear on the test (e.g., passive without a specific agent, past perfect progressive) and in further conference discussion, she stated the necessity of reading the text aloud (Conference, May 15). Mrs. Ma’s suggestions were clearly reflected in Yuna’s teaching, as shown in the classroom excerpt below.

Classroom Excerpt 5.11. Yuna’s Lesson (May 18)\(^{43}\)

Reading (“Communication Across Generations”)
High Intermediate, 9\(^{th}\) Grade, Lesson Plan 3 (2\(^{nd}\) for High Level)
((1-73: introduces the reading text and goes over each sentence))
((Slide: “Yesterday, six girls were taken to the hospital from pop star HOD’s concert”))
74 → Yuna: OK. P1. Read it aloud please.
75 → P1: Yesterday, six girls were taken to the hospital from pop star HOD’s concert.
76 → Yuna: So, were taken to. What does that mean?
77 → P2: 실려갔데요.
78 → Yuna: Driven to. Why. This is a passive form. 수동태에요.
79 → P2: 왜? 'cause you don’t know who took them to the hospital.
80 → Yuna: 그저 실려갔어요. Why. This is a passive form. It’s passive.
81 → P2: Why?
82 → Yuna: Just like the same way, the concert was planned to begin at 3 o’clock.
83 → P2: 특징한 주어가 없죠.
84 → Yuna: Nobody knows who took the six girls. So to express “they were taken to somewhere,” “were taken to”, “be + past participle” was used.
85 → P2: 표언하기 위해서 be+pp 형태인 were taken to 라고 표현했어요.
86 → Yuna: There is no specific subject.
87 → P2: In this case, too, there is no specific subject, right?
88 → P2: 특정한 주어가 없죠.
89 → Yuna: You guys have to write down some words on your textbook. Otherwise, you cannot (remember) all the expressions you learn today.
90 → P2: 알았지/ 더 안다고 자신하지 말고.

---

\(^{43}\) This reading section was conducted after the pre-reading activity about parental discipline (Classroom Excerpt 5.9)
In this excerpt, Yuna explained grammar deductively (lines 82-88, lines 158-187) using specific grammatical terms (수동태 (passive voice), line 82; 주어 (sentence subject), line 88), gave the exact meaning of words and expressions (lines 146-157), translated sentences (lines 89-132), and had the pupils read the text aloud (lines 74-76). She also stressed the importance of the accurate knowledge she taught in this class in preparing for school exams (lines 133-137). Although she utilized grammar translation method in this reading class, the dissonance regarding how to teach grammar remained for Yuna as noted in the interview below:

Data Excerpt 5.27. Yuna–Stimulated Recall 1 (May 24)

I didn’t want to explain grammar as much as possible. But if needed, I tried to speak in English and something like that. But I still don’t know which is better, deductive or inductive grammar teaching.

In this excerpt, Yuna stated that she tried not to teach grammar explicitly, but when she had to do so due to her mentor’s suggestions, she attempted to do it in her own way. Moreover, she was not sure whether deductive or inductive grammar teaching was better, although she preferred the latter.
On the other hand, in the beginner reading class (Lesson Plan 4), Yuna felt comfortable following Mrs. Ma and teaching grammar and translation in a more traditional way. Yuna gave the exact Korean translation for each phrase through slides. In addition, at the end of the class, she asked the pupils to copy six sentences which contained key expressions and structures from the textbook, write the exact translation in their notebook and submit it to her. Then she checked the accuracy of each pupil’s work carefully, and returned it to them in the next class. Her focus on accuracy specifically shown in the teaching of low-level pupils was indicated as follows:

Data Excerpt 5.28. Yuna–Journal (May 11)
내가 내 준 handout 에 대해서, 책임감이 들기도 했다. 오답이 적힌 체로 파일철에 꽂혀있을 그 학습지가 마음에 걸렸다. 그렇지만 그렇다고 이제 와서 학습지를 일일이 다 걷어서 체크해 줄 수는 없는 일.
I feel responsible for the handout I asked them to work on in today’s class. I feel uncomfortable because the pupils probably wrote some incorrect answers in the handout and kept it in their folder. But I know it would be impossible to collect their handout and check their answers.

Here, Yuna believed that her responsibility as a teacher is to ensure that her pupils accurately learned whatever she was teaching. Her sense of responsibility for ensuring that students learned accurate knowledge about English became even stronger after she observed a class taught by her peer student teacher, Inho, in another team. When she noticed that he used several expressions incorrectly and did not make any efforts to improve his class, she reflected, “영어교사의 역량과 노력이 학생들의 학습에 직접적인 영향을 미치는 것을 눈으로 확인하면서, 수업에 대한 책임감이 증가하고, 더소 긴장도 되었다 (I realized how a teacher’s capability and efforts could have a direct influence on pupils’ learning. Then I felt nervous and more responsible for my own class)” (Yuna–Journal, May 16).
In sum, despite her positive attitude toward the communicative approach, Yuna considered traditional approaches useful in her classroom to make sure she was correctly teaching information and aligning her students to be successful with exams. Although, unlike Sora, she experienced more tension when she used them with her high level pupils, she was very comfortable using the traditional methods with her low level pupils.

5.3.3.6. Uneven Attention to Components of Communicative Competence

Despite the fact that the learning goal of the curricular reform mandates is to develop learners’ communicative competence by focusing on its four components, like Sora, Yuna mostly centered on developing grammatical competence by teaching linguistic knowledge. Any instructional attention to sociolinguistic and discourse competence was limited, whereas strategic competence was rarely mentioned due to limited opportunities for the pupils’ use of English.

Dimensions of sociolinguistic competence were typically covered through practicing expressions and dialogues for communication functions presented from the textbook\textsuperscript{44}. For example, for the low level pupils (8\textsuperscript{th} grade), “asking others’ opinion” was practiced through repeating expressions such as “Do you want some~”, “Yes, please” or “No, thank you” in unison and then doing a controlled activity using those expressions (Classroom Excerpt 5.10, Lesson Plan 2). Clearly, sociolinguistic functions of language were taught more like linguistic knowledge and practiced through repetition

\textsuperscript{44} The communication functions in the textbook are based on “communicative functions and examples” attached in the curriculum manual. Two communication functions are presented for each unit of the textbook: asking for permission, disagreeing indirectly (9\textsuperscript{th} grade; Lesson Plan 1), asking others’ opinion, and making offers and accepting or refusing offers (8\textsuperscript{th} grade; Lesson Plan 2).
and substitution drills. This was reinforced by the limited time and pupils’ low proficiency.

Discourse competence was only addressed instructionally when Yuna explained different reading genres in the textbook or conducted a simple reading activity. For example, after reading a newspaper article about the generation gap (high level 9th grade), Yuna briefly mentioned that newspaper articles are written based on using the strategy of 5Ws and 1H and then asked the pupils to summarize the short article based on this strategy (Lesson Plan 3). For the letters (8th grade), she explained that the reading text is composed of four letters and each letter has the sender’s name and city in which they live (Lesson Plan 4). In this way, discourse competence was covered only on the surface level.

5.3.4. Inner Contradictions in the Instructional Activity System

Inner contradictions (Engeström, 1986, 1993, 1999a) emerged out of the instructional activity systems where Yuna was the subject. The three levels of contradictions illustrated in figure 5.5 are explained in the following.
5.3.4.1. Primary Contradictions

The primary contradictions occurred within the subject, Yuna, with regard to her use of English—between her beliefs about its usefulness and the classroom reality. First, although she felt her use of English would promote low level pupils’ English ability, at the same time she felt using more Korean would help them understand her and help her complete what she planned for the lessons as well. Thus, she used more Korean in her low-proficiency class. This indicates her priority of sensitivity to learners and her lesson goal which is more immediate than her beliefs about teaching English through English. In addition, it shows her idealized conception of using English for instruction only applied to the advanced learners, but not to the beginners.

Another primary contradiction emerged in terms of resources of instructional activities. Despite her wish for more frequent use of external resources, she mostly fell back on the textbook and typical activities. This dependence resulted from her learning
experiences in which she had limited personal exposure to activity-based classrooms and from the practicum experience where an emphasis was put on teachers’ responsibility for learners’ mastery of the required content, and the time to search for resources and adapt them for her pupils was limited. Thus, her vision of using more communicative activities was somewhat discouraged by her lack of relevant prior experience and limitation of the practicum experience.

5.3.4.2. Secondary Contradictions

Multiple secondary contradictions occurred between (1) subject and community, (2) subject and tool, (3) subject and rule, (4) community and rule, (5) community and division of labor, and (6) community and tool.

The first contradiction occurred between Yuna (subject) and high level pupils (community) concerning the use of English. Some of the high level pupils responded negatively to Yuna’s use of English and wanted her to use Korean instead. However, since she had a positive attitude toward her own English use and pupils’ response to it, she used English consistently throughout her teaching. Furthermore, even when the pupils were reluctant to speak in English, she consistently encouraged them to speak in English (Classroom Excerpts 5.8 and 5.9). This secondary contradiction also uncovered the contradictions between Yuna (subject) and pupils’ reluctance to participate using English (rule) and between her pupils (community) and use of English (tool). The resolution of these contradictions was not really made but Yuna continued to use English as the medium of instruction.
Another secondary inner contradiction between Yuna (subject) and the high level pupils (community) appeared in terms of students’ role in certain communicative activities and the teacher’s role of controlling pupils to complete the lesson plan. Whereas some of the pupils expressed their ideas and experiences in the pre-reading activity about parental discipline (Lesson Plan 3), Yuna wanted the pupils to figure out the answers that she prepared in her lesson plan and did not accept their alternatives as legitimate. This contradiction simultaneously disclosed another contradiction between pupils (community) and teacher-directed classroom (rule, division of labor). These contradictions were not actually settled, but the pupils did allow Yuna to control the activity.

Finally, there were differences in opinion between Yuna (subject) and the mentor teacher (community) about how to teach the reading section. Although Yuna preferred inductive grammar teaching and minimal translation for the high level pupils, she taught the reading section following Mrs. Ma’s advice about using deductive grammar teaching and accurate translation. This contradiction caused related contradictions between Yuna (subject) and the grammar translation method (tool) and between Yuna (subject) and meeting Mrs. Ma’s expectations (rule). Despite her uncertainty about the effectiveness of the non-communicative method, the contradictions were resolved by Yuna’s acceptance of Mrs. Ma’s approach.

5.3.4.3. Tertiary Contradiction

As was the case with Sora, a tertiary contradiction emerged between task-based and learner-centered language learning that the Ministry of Education imposed and
Yuna’s need to control her classes. Yuna at times employed activities that were controlled following the procedures of drill and practice rather than creating pupils’ more authentic L2 use. In addition, Yuna felt she should preserve control over the pupils so that she could complete the lesson plan and cover materials within the limited period of time as well as help them learn the precise L2 knowledge from the textbook. Thus, she justified her use of non-communicative approaches to the reading section. In addition, she functioned as the only holder of legitimate knowledge and expected her students to learn exactly what she taught them. This is incompatible with learner-centered instruction in which teachers function as facilitators of their pupils’ language learning and pupils play an agentive role in their own learning. However, Yuna’s obsession with classroom control is not only common among pre-service teachers, but it was also consistently reinforced by Mrs. Ma’s instruction and her advice to her student teachers.

5.3.5. Summary

Yuna’s instruction was in some ways consistent with the curricular reforms in that she was sensitive to learners’ needs and used several communicative activities in which she and her pupils had meaningful communication in English. Despite this, an analysis of the instructional activity systems from Yuna’s perspective, particularly, the ways in which secondary inner contradictions were resolved, indicates how the curricular reforms were not fully embraced in her classes. Like Sora, Yuna frequently relied on teacher-fronted instruction and adopted non-communicative approaches. Moreover, her focus on the components of communicative competence, which is the instructional goal of the curricular reform mandates, was unequal, mostly stressing grammatical competence.
Whereas Yuna’s apprenticeship of observation was primarily based on traditional approaches to English language teaching, she also experienced and/or learned communicative approaches while studying abroad as well as at the university, and considered CLT as desirable and helpful. Yuna’s vision of teaching English through English and making pupils speak English in communicative activities aligned with the curricular mandates. Despite the secondary contradictions with her high-proficiency pupils, she attempted to apply her vision in her instructional practices. Consequently, she had several instances of meaningful interaction in English between herself and her students.

However, the pupils’ limited participation and ability in English communication and her own limited English ability led her to only partially implement her vision. Furthermore, the more immediate rules and objects in her practicum teaching constrained her from implementing such an instructional vision. Most of the time, Mrs. Ma’s expertise trumped Yuna’s own beliefs and education about ELT. Therefore, in order to meet her mentor’s expectations, she focused on covering the textbook for exams and completing the lessons rather than fully supporting her pupils’ opportunities for authentic L2 use. The secondary contradictions leading to maintaining her control over pupils and accepting the grammar translation method against her own conception of teaching showed how she was socialized into the ELT norms advocated by Mrs. Ma.

Overall, although she appeared to have started developing some of the curricular reform concepts, the mentoring and the institutional constraints reinforced her apprenticeship of observation rather than supported her development of the curricular reform concepts. As a result, the process of Yuna’s learning to teach in the practicum
found her becoming aware of the gap between vision and reality, and between theory and practice. Ultimately, she was mostly being socialized into teaching English in the specific Korean classroom context rather than achieving her idealized conception of teaching and the curricular reform initiatives. In conclusion, Yuna was not able to fully internalize the curricular reform concepts in her practicum teaching.

5.4. Conclusion

The analysis presented here provides descriptive evidence of the challenges these student teachers faced as they attempted to enact the mandated curricular reforms and developed their teaching conceptions under the reform context. Specifically, the findings of this chapter revealed that the mentorship, individual student teachers’ learning histories and beliefs, and the contextual limitations influenced these teachers’ development.

As the primary evaluator of their performance in the practicum, Mrs. Ma’s experience and expertise placed her in a position of power over these student teachers, and they reacted to her mentorship by engaging as she expected. This apprenticeship model of mentoring seemed to strengthen the norms of the current teaching profession and confine her student teachers to an apprenticeship of observation rather than support the enactment of the curricular reforms. Thus, enhancing pupils’ accurate knowledge of the L2 in preparation for school exams was clearly valued over developing their authentic L2 use and communicative competence. In addition, teacher-controlled instruction and non-communicative approaches were not only recommended but praised by Mrs. Ma. Overall, the structure of the practicum experience for team A was top-down and the
student teachers were socialized into existing instructional norms and practices with only minor adjustments that were reflective of the curricular reform mandates.

The findings also uncover how the student teachers’ individual histories and beliefs about language learning and teaching influenced their understandings of and attempts to enact the curricular reform mandates. Both Sora and Yuna found themselves teaching the way they were taught through the grammar translation, drill and repetition. On the other hand, despite their similar schooling experiences, college coursework, and the practicum, differences in Yuna’s and Sora’s beliefs and attitudes about ELT enabled them to enact the curricular reforms to very different degrees. For example, Yuna had a positive attitude toward the use of the L2 as the medium of instruction and encouraged the pupils to use L2 in spite of their resistance. However, Sora had negative opinions about the use of the L2, believing that her use of English was directly related to her pupils’ lack of participation, and thus chose to use Korean as a language of instruction despite Mrs. Ma’s encouragement for more frequent L2 use. In addition, Yuna was more sensitive to the pupils’ proficiency levels, attempting to encourage high level pupils’ L2 use and feeling uncomfortable when using the grammar translation method, whereas Sora was comfortable using traditional teaching methods for both high and low level pupils. In particular, Sora’s perception of learners as passive recipients of prescribed knowledge and of her responsibility to teach for exam preparation allowed her to justify her teacher-fronted, traditional lessons.

Furthermore, the two student teachers exemplify teacher development at different points of transformation while learning to teach within the practicum. Sora had ideals of teaching that aligned with the curricular reforms in terms of conducting learner-centered
communicative activities using authentic materials. However, her pessimistic view of embracing such idealized instruction in this particular institutional context prevented her from attempting it. Despite having outside resources and/or authentic materials, she employed them to achieve the same goal she held for using the textbook, namely, teaching accurate L2 knowledge. Thus, no transformation in her teacher development was found. On the other hand, although Yuna was aware of the gap between her vision and the classroom reality, she attempted to implement her conception of teaching such as communicating with learners in English and letting them speak in English. However, due to her more essential and immediate instructional goals as framed by Mrs. Ma and several contextual constraints (e.g., pupils’ limited participation and language ability and her own limited L2 communication skills), such communicative instruction stayed on the periphery of her teaching. Thus, in Yuna’s teacher development, transformation remained at the initial stage and was not fully supported or achieved.

To conclude, the findings revealed that the nature of practicum activities (conferences, observations, journals) and mentorship and these student teachers’ individual experiences and beliefs influenced the extent to which these student teachers embraced the curricular reforms and were able to realize their vision of teaching. The analysis also indicated that pupils’ behavior during their lessons and the institutional context both were influential on these student teachers. Overall, despite individual differences between Sora and Yuna, their ideals of the curricular reforms were not significantly embraced in the practicum activities of either student teacher in team A.
CHAPTER SIX
TEAM B: MR. BAEK, BOHEE, JUBIN

Chapter six investigates the manner in which the two student teachers in Team B (Bohee and Jubin) learned to teach as they experienced the practicum activities under the curricular reform, which specifically answers the first research questions of this study. Then, in order to address the second research questions, this chapter examines to what extent the student teachers understood these curricular reforms and then attempted to enact them in their instructional practices.

6.1. Practicum Activities

This section addresses the first research questions with regard to team B: How have curricular reform efforts been enacted in the activities student teachers engage in during the practicum? What mediational means does the practicum provide to help student teachers understand and enact these curricular reforms?

Just as with team A, in order to reveal the extent to which the curriculum reforms were embraced in the practicum activities, this section first presents the practicum activity systems from the perspectives of these student teachers, in which several practicum activities function as mediational means (e.g., conferences, observations, journals, mentoring) to help the student teachers understand and implement the curricular reforms (see Section 6.1.1). Then the next section focuses on the six themes that emerged as the features and the mediational function of both the practicum activities and the mentoring realities under the curricular reform context (Section 6.1.2).
6.1.1. The Configuration of the Practicum Activity System

After analysis of the data from the team B mentor’s and student teachers’ practicum activities and experiences\(^1\), the practicum activity system from the perspectives of Bohee and Jubin can be characterized as figure 6.1\(^2\).

Figure 6.1. The Practicum Activity System (Team B)

Since Bohee and Jubin had similar practicum requirements to the student teachers in team A, the components of the practicum activity system looked identical (refer to Figures 5.1). The practicum activities (conferences, observations, and teaching) and artifacts (journals, lesson plans, and a formative test) were the practicum requirements and functioned as important tools; finishing these requirements was the first rule and the

---

\(^1\) For more details about the collected data, refer to section 3.2 (Data Collection) in the Methodology Chapter.

\(^2\) As in the case of Team A’s student teachers, the practicum activity system and the instructional activity system where Bohee and Jubin each functioned as the subjects are interconnected. They developed their conception of teaching over the course of the practicum and taught as a practicum requirement; at the same time, the practicum activities mediated their development as teachers and their instruction.
object of this practicum activity system. Since Mr. Baek was both their mentor teacher and a major evaluator of their practicum activities, meeting his expectations indicated within his mentoring (e.g., setting achievable goals and completing it, attempting new interesting activities) was also the rule and object of this activity system\(^3\). The last object was to enhance the student teachers’ teaching capabilities. The outcome of this activity system was to successfully complete the practicum with a high score.

Just as with team A, the community of this practicum activity system included the mentors and peer student teachers in team B and in other teams. The peers shared the identical object and had mutual influences, and the mentors affect these student teachers by providing model lessons and advice on practicum experiences. The pupils also functioned as community members as they played an important mediational role in shaping these student teachers’ learning, for example, through their language ability and participation in classroom interaction.

Given that the relationship between Mr. Baek and his student teachers was less hierarchical than what existent for team A, the division of labor of this practicum activity system and the way these student teachers used the tools differed from those of team A. While Mr. Baek gave his student teachers direction in terms of what and how to teach, he was much more open to discussing options for their lessons than Mrs. Ma. In addition, the student teachers used the same tools differently. For example, lesson plans functioned most of the time as flexible outlines for instruction rather than as strict prescriptions\(^4\).

\(^3\) Due to Mr. Baek’s flexible mentoring style, this rule and object was observed to be less powerful than that of team A.
\(^4\) One exception of this is Bohee’s model class that she taught as a representative student teacher at the end of the practicum, where she intended to adhere to the lesson plan.
6.1.2. The Nature of the Practicum Activities and Mentoring

Just as in the previous chapter, in order to fully understand the present practicum activity systems where the team B student teachers operated as the subjects, this section presents the nature of the three practicum activities (conferences\(^5\), observations, and journals) and the mentoring, as well as what these student teachers have learned from them. Just as noted in the description of team A, during daily conferences, Mr. Baek and his student teachers discussed the classes the student teachers taught, their next classes, and other practicum and teaching related issues. Next, the daily journals allowed Bohee and Jubin to reflect on their practicum experiences and express what they thought and how they felt about them. Finally, observing classroom teaching provided these two student teachers with opportunities to look at how secondary school classrooms in Korea function since they had no prior experience in Korean secondary school contexts. In particular, observations helped them frame their own lessons by allowing them to understand pupils and learn management techniques as well as criticize and give suggestions for others’ classes.

Six conceptual categories emerged from the grounded content analysis of the practicum activities and mentoring by Mr. Baek: (1) student teachers were encouraged to attempt new ideas, but received insufficient support. Also, (2) they were allowed to choose English and/or Korean for instruction, and (3) encouraged to motivate pupils and at the same time manage their behavior. Moreover, (4) they were exposed to the normative ways of teaching and various teaching practices, and allowed to critique classes they observed, (5) and they were given immediate teaching objectives and

\(^5\) As mentioned in Chapter 4 (Methodology), instead of being audio-recorded as in the case of Team A, Team B’s conference data were taken from the conferences section of the daily journals of the team B student teachers.
approaches such as using the traditional approach for test preparation. Finally, contextual constraints were emerged as powerful mediators during the practicum experience.

6.1.2.1. Encouraging Attempts at New Ideas, but Providing Insufficient Support

Mr. Baek was much more flexible and open to his student teachers’ ideas about instruction than Mrs. Ma and, as long as they met the practicum requirements, he respected the student teachers’ autonomy. Mr. Baek had less of an expert-novice relationship with his student teachers due to their teaching experiences, educational backgrounds and English proficiency levels. Mr. Baek had learned English in the Korean public school system, whereas his student teachers were native-like English speakers educated in English-speaking schools while studying abroad. Also, both Mr. Baek and the students were beginning teachers with limited teaching experiences: Mr. Baek had less than two years of teaching experience, and his student teachers had both taught as a part time English instructors while undergraduate students.

Mr. Baek’s flexible mentoring style meant that there were several key differences between his expectations and Mrs. Ma’s; in fact, several of his practices would have been unacceptable to Mrs. Ma. For instance, he allowed Bohee and Jubin to present ideas about a lesson during their conferences, but to turn in their official lesson plans later. Furthermore, he was also open to improvised conversation during a lesson. In addition, Mr. Baek considered on-task noise acceptable if the class was exciting and achieving its planned goal. The following excerpt shows Jubin’s perception about Mr. Baek’s flexible mentoring style and minimal expectations:
Data Excerpt 6.1. Jubin–Interview (June 8)

Mr. Baek really wanted us to teach fun classes. … to make the pupils have fun in class … For example, he liked activities like “catch a mouse” in Bohee’s class … [Over several conferences], he said class goals should be clear. … If the goals were clear and achieved by pupils, he said we don’t have to stick to the textbook all the time. So I think I taught as I wanted.

This excerpt suggests that Mr. Baek allowed his student teachers to teach in their own way without always being constrained by the content of the textbook. He specifically encouraged his student teachers to conduct interesting lessons using outside resources, expected them to set achievable goals which fit pupils’ proficiency levels, and to meet their lesson goals.

Mr. Baek’s concerns about lesson goals were represented in conference discussions. At the beginning of every conference, team B discussed how the classes had gone, first by pointing out what the goals were, to what extent the pupils understood the lesson, and whether lesson goals were achieved, and if so, how. (Bohee–Journal, May 11, Conferences Section). He justified his emphasis on lesson goals below:

Data Excerpt 6.2. Mr. Baek–Interview (June 1)

I think I kept emphasizing one thing from the beginning to the end of the practicum. I emphasized what class goals are and how they could be achieved. About teaching techniques, there were few I could teach my student teachers.

According to this excerpt, his perception that he could not provide his student teachers with appropriate expert and experiential knowledge led him to set the minimum requirement as lesson goals and to have a flexible mentoring manner.
While his open mentoring encouraged autonomy, it also resulted in a perceived lack of appropriate support. This aspect of Mr. Baek’s mentoring is represented in Bohee’s perceptions of his mentoring as “저희 선생님은 이렇게 많이 안도와주셨어요…. 저는 선생님이 좀 이렇게 믿었었던 거 같애요. 몇 번 하고 나서 믿었어요 (I don’t think my mentor teacher helped me a lot… I guess he somewhat trusted me. I’m sure he trusted me [he felt I could succeed] after he observed my first a few lessons)” (Bohee–Interview, June 8).

Overall, Mr. Baek respected his student teachers’ ideas that had been developed through their language learning and teaching experiences and from their coursework. Although Bohee and Jubin liked Mr. Baek’s flexible mentoring style, they did not feel that he provided sufficient guidance.

6.1.2.2. Allowing Making Choices about the Use of English and Korean

Through conference discussions, Mr. Baek allowed his student teachers to choose which language they would use as the medium of instruction depending on their own capability, comfort level, and the pupils’ proficiency levels. He was observed to be the only mentor teacher who used Korean as the medium of instruction in the lab school, and the conference discussions revealed his conflicting perceptions about classroom language: whereas he considered the teaching English through English policy useful, at the same time, he believed that using Korean was more appropriate for pupils’ comprehension. Yet, Mr. Baek felt pressured to teach English through English, stating that it was his intention to do so gradually, especially in the advanced classes (Interview, June 8). Thus, Mr. Baek was supportive of Bohee’s and Jubin’s use of English as the
means of instruction, especially in their advanced classes. Likewise, though Hanbi\(^6\) (not a focal student teacher in this study) spoke Korean most of the time during her instruction, he did not ask her to use English more often. Instead, he believed a teacher’s ability and comfort level in English would influence pupils’ perceptions of the student teacher’s use of English (Interview, June 8). The following excerpt from an interview illustrates his view about Bohee’s use of English and her pupils’ response to it:

Data Excerpt 6.3. Mr. Baek–Interview (June 1)
보희 교생 같은 경우에는 영어 자체를 위너 편하게 영어를 하는 스타일이잖아요. 그냥. 또 우- 일반적인 영어 교사랑은 또 다른…. Native speaker니까. 영어 자체를 굉장히 편하게 했기 때문에 [학생들이] 편하게 받아들였던 거 같고.
Bohee spoke English very naturally in class. She is different from other English teachers… because she is like a native speaker of English. \[As she spoke English naturally in class, I think [her pupils] felt comfortable with her English.\]

In this excerpt, Mr. Baek indicated his positive attitudes toward Bohee’s English use. He thought that since Bohee spoke English as a near-native speaker, most of her pupils seemed to be comfortable with her use of English.

Mr. Baek encouraged his student teachers to modify their English according to their pupils’ proficiency levels by speaking slowly and using simple expressions and/or providing Korean translations. He stated that beginner pupils have difficulty understanding lessons even though teachers speak in Korean, and that even some of the advanced pupils might have difficulty understanding their English. Thus, he supported the mixed use of English and Korean, and the team explicitly discussed how they could balance the use of the L1 and L2 effectively (Conference, May 9). Consequently, Bohee and Jubin used English and Korean flexibly as the medium of instruction according to what they believed to be effective for the students and the classroom context.

---

\(^6\) Hanbi learned English mostly in Korea in the EFL context (like Yuna and Sora in team A).
6.1.2.3. Emphasizing Motivating Pupils and Managing Them

Mr. Baek encouraged his teachers to attempt new ideas and activities in order to make their lessons more interesting and to use the resources most appropriate to the pupils’ proficiency levels and affect. At the same time, he emphasized the importance of managing pupils’ behavior. As a result, although the extent of teacher-control over pupils was not nearly as strong as what emerged in team A, team B frequently discussed how to effectively manage instruction and pupils’ classroom behavior.

Mr. Baek stressed that the student teachers should motivate their pupils by adapting their teaching to the pupils’ proficiency levels in terms of using the L2, conducting instructional activities, and asking questions (Conferences, May 9-10). For example, he recommended that the student teachers use English more frequently for the high level students along with advanced expressions and vocabulary as well as conduct more challenging activities and ask more open questions in the classes. On the other hand, he suggested that for the low level pupils, they use more Korean, ask more close-ended questions, and conduct relatively easier activities.

In addition, Mr. Baek stressed that the student teachers should consider the pupils’ affect by creating an enjoyable and positive atmosphere, providing encouragement, and recognizing any attempt to participate quickly. In this way, he believed pupils would feel more interested in the class and more comfortable talking with their teachers (Conferences, May 8 and 9). For instance, this note from team B’s conference below shows how the team talked about motivating pupils through classroom interaction:

Data Excerpt 6.4. Bohee–Journal (May 9)–Conferences Section
아이들의 반응을 어떻게 끌어낼 것인가?: • Interaction 이 될리면 바로바로 feedback 을 줘야 한다... • 아이들의 눈을 쳐다보면서, use big gestures • 목소리 tone, facial expression 중요함. • Low-level 반 아이들은 feedback, 칭찬을 굽추한다.
How to make the pupils respond more actively? • To have more active interaction with the pupils, we should **give them feedback as soon as we can**….• We should look at their eyes and use expressive gestures. • Our tone of voice and facial expressions are important. • Low-proficiency pupils want our **positive feedback**.

In this excerpt, Bohee listed the ways for teachers to respect pupils’ affect, designed to encourage pupils’ classroom participation. This conference discussion implies that teachers should make efforts to create favorable learning environments.

Moreover, Mr. Baek emphasized the importance of using interesting activities to create engaging lessons. As a result, Bohee and Jubin frequently scheduled small group work, and thus, during team conferences, various issues related to planning and carrying out group work were discussed. For example, the team reviewed the advantages and disadvantages of group work (e.g., some groups can give up in the middle of doing an activity; Conference, May 11 and 19), how to increase their participation in group work (e.g., giving rewards; Conference, May 19), and how to make all the pupils participate in group work (e.g., assigning them different roles such as leader, speaker, writer, monitor; Conference, May 4 and 11).

At the same time, Mr. Baek stressed that all instructional activities must be well managed. He suggested that they provide clear directions and correct answers for each activity, if possible (Conference, May 20), and complete the activities within the assigned class hour (Conference, May 11). In fact, over multiple conferences, Team B discussed how to manage classes effectively, especially in terms of time management and noise control. In particular, since Bohee and Jubin faced difficulties controlling distracted and noisy pupils (Bohee–Journal, May 9, 18; Jubin–Journal, May 11, 12, 16), Team B talked about possible solutions, such as walking around the classroom (Conference, May 10) or having pupils take notes or complete worksheets (Conference, May 17).
Overall, team B was sensitive to learners and talked about the teachers’ role in creating an atmosphere that is conducive to language learning. At the same time, the conferences worked to inform the student teachers of the importance of classroom management and monitoring pupils’ behavior. Thus, while the practicum activities in team B supported the learner-centered and task-based instruction mandated in the curricular reforms, they also emphasized maintaining control over pupils and managing them appropriately.

6.1.2.4. Exposing Teaching Practices and Allowing Critiques

Through the practicum activities, Bohee and Jubin were exposed to the teaching norms and various instructional practices of English classrooms in the Korean secondary school context. Specifically, observing mentors’ lessons allowed these student teachers to learn about both macro- and micro-level structure of classroom teaching as shown below:

Data Excerpt 6.5. Bohee–Journal (May 2)
각 선생님마다 teaching style 이 다양하다. 아이들을 조용하게 하는 법, extra credit 을 사용해 아이들의 참여를 유도하는 방법, 가르치는 teaching method 등등. 2틀 동안 많은 걸 배웠으며 남은 참관동안 열심히 수업에 참여하며 많은 걸 얻어갈 것이다. Teaching styles vary depending on the mentor teachers–e.g., ways to make pupils quiet and encourage pupils’ participation using extra credits, and teaching methods. I learned a lot during the two days of observations of mentor teachers’ classrooms. I would like to observe more in the remaining observation period and learn a lot more.

On the macro-level, what Bohee said she observed from the mentor teachers’ classrooms were different teaching styles and class atmospheres. On the other hand, she also learned a micro-level of instruction in terms of teaching materials and techniques,

---

7 Bohee and Jubin observed ten classes taught by four mentor teachers (one to three classes per mentor teacher). All the observations were in the first week.
classroom management issues and how to promote pupils’ participation. She also showed
her willingness to learn from class observations.

These two student teachers observed a variety of instructional practices from
mentor teachers’ classes. For example, Jubin observed Mrs. Ma frequently using English
even with low proficiency pupils (Jubin–Journal, May 2) and she saw how to promote
pupils’ use of English through a writing activity from Mrs. Cho, the mentor teacher in
team C (Jubin–Journal, May 2). Bohee and Jubin also observed rather traditional classes
taught by their mentor teacher, Mr. Baek, one example of which was his extracurricular
activity class, as noted below. Despite the use of outside resources and rewards to make
it an interesting and engaging activity for the pupils, Mr. Baek actually taught quite
traditionally.

Classroom Excerpt 6.1. Mr. Baek’s Lesson (May 8)
Learning a Pop Song (Extracurricular Activity), Low 9th Grade

1  Mr. Baek: 그림 오늘은 [교과서에서] 뭐 할 수가 없고, 오늘은 노래 나하차.
          So today we won’t be able to do something [from the textbook]. So let’s
          learn a song.
((pupils clap for excitement; Mr. Baek makes class announcements))
((3-6: talks about the song and the singer; listens to the song))
7  Mr. Baek: As long as you love me.
8  Ps:     As long as you love me.
9  Mr. Baek: As long as 예 좀 그어보고 as long as 그러면 다 배웠지. 그지.
10  Let’s underline “as long as.” What does “as long as” mean? I think all of
     you already learned it. Right? It means as long as you do something.
     Then what does this title mean?
11  Ps:     당신이 나를 사랑하기만 한다면.
          As long as you love me.
12  Mr. Baek: 그지 당신이 나를 사랑하기만 한다면 어릴 것이다.
          Right. As long as you love me, I will do such and such.

8 Due to administrative needs all the English mentor teachers agreed with the idea of extracurricular
activities on that particular day (Private communication with Mrs. Ma and Mr. Baek, May 8). The major
reasons are that the pupils just started being divided into newly placed classes resulting from their mid-term
exam, and the following day the student teachers were to start teaching. Thus, the first 30% of the class
hour was spent checking pupils’ attendance according to a new roster and making classroom
announcements.
In this excerpt, Mr. Baek first asked his pupils to listen to an English pop song and choose what they heard between two words written on the worksheet (lines 3-26) and then he checked the answers with the pupils as he translated words, phrases, or sentences (lines 27-74). Then, he asked them to repeat every sentence in the chorus after him and sing along with the recording (lines 75-117). Lastly, he asked the pupils to complete a cross word puzzle (118-120). Clearly, his instruction was traditional: he focused on a listening comprehension exercise, translations, repetition drills, and word spellings in both activities (learning an English pop song and a crossword puzzle). Moreover, his class was teacher-fronted and he consistently used Korean as a classroom language throughout the class.

Based on the student teachers’ journal notes about Mr. Baek’s other classes and the interviews with members of team B (May 1-4), it was possible to infer that the classroom practices in the other classes were similar to this classroom episode. Mr. Baek
did use interesting game-like activities that helped to promote pupils’ participation.

However, as reported in Jubin’s journal about Mr. Baek’s class below, he basically relied on traditional teaching methods:

Data Excerpt 6.6. Jubin–Journal (May 1)

At the beginning [of the high-proficiency class, Mr. Baek] reviewed grammar points and presented relevant examples. Next, he gave time for pupils to solve questions in the vocabulary worksheet and then they checked the answers together. He had the pupils read the words out loud three times…. Then he had the pupils listen [to the reading text] and fill in the blanks. Finally, he had the pupils fill in the blanks in the table using Korean. All the pupils seemed to participate in the lesson actively and work on the worksheet arduously. But I think it would be more effective to have them just listen without looking at the text at the same time.

This excerpt indicates that the mentor teacher frequently used grammar-translation and drill and repetition techniques. After describing Mr. Baek’s class, Jubin made suggestions about his instruction of a listening exercise. In this way, these student teachers were exposed to traditional ways of teaching English and allowed to improve such approaches.

In fact, the relationship between Mr. Baek and his student teachers was more dynamic and reciprocal in learning to teach: Bohee and Jubin stated Mr. Baek’s lessons helped them learn how to facilitate the pupils’ participation and manage their behavior (Bohee, Jubin–Journal, May 1-4). In turn, these student teachers’ observation notes allowed Mr. Baek to also learn new activities (e.g., Mrs. Cho’s writing activity) as evidenced in his comments, “선생님 실습록을 통해 제가 배우네요 (I’m learning by reading your [Jubin] journal)” (Jubin–Journal, May 2).
Just as with the mentor teachers, while learning from observations of peers, these two student teachers also critiqued the classes they observed and frequently made suggestions to improve the lessons. Specifically, observing their peers’ classrooms that mostly covered the same content of the textbook gave Bohee and Jubin a chance to learn about their own teaching and consider ways of adapting their own instruction. In particular, they made active suggestions for their peers’ classroom practices based on their own beliefs and what they learned from the team conferences in terms of using English/Korean as the medium of instruction, employing activities, and/or classroom and time management.

Overall, Bohee and Jubin were able to learn a great deal from observing other teachers’ classrooms and reflecting on them. Unlike team A, they felt freer to make suggestions about lessons taught by their mentor, other mentors, and peers, and their mentor-student teacher relationship remained quite open and reciprocal and less hierarchical. Consequently, the practicum activities allowed them to experience norms of the Korean-English educational system, but also to monitor classrooms more critically and frame their own lessons in the classroom context.

6.1.2.5. Providing Feasible Teaching Objectives

The mentor teacher provided the student teachers with instructional objectives and methods that he thought feasible for the teaching context. Although Mr. Baek was aware that developing pupils’ L2 communicative competence is the ultimate objective of ELT in Korea and he wanted to use a more communicative approach, he experienced difficulties finding appropriate teaching materials to achieve this objective and thus felt
discouraged about conducting any sort of communicative classroom (Interview, June 1). Instead, he clearly considered teaching the content of the textbook for school exams to be the more realistic and more important objective of English lessons in middle school in Korea (Interview, June 1).

Specifically in the latter half of the conferences, he emphasized the importance of linking instruction and assessment. He asked the student teachers to think about what kind of exams they could make out of their instruction and how exams can make actual teaching different (Conference, May 16). In addition, he mentioned that student teachers could get pupils’ attention by saying, “this part will be on the test” (Conference, May 15). He specified the rationale for emphasizing exams in the following excerpt:

Data Excerpt 6.7. Jubin–Journal, May 16
((Mr. Baek’s reply to Jubin’s reflection on lesson planning considering a formative test))

Interesting classes are important. It is impossible for pupils to learn something from classes in which they don’t feel interested. Since I wanted you student teachers to think about the ultimate objective which you would like to obtain from teaching interesting classes, I just told you [during the conference meeting] to consider exams. Since a test may be composed of what teachers think important, I think it would be helpful for you to determine the content and what should be more or less focused.

Here, Mr. Baek stressed that whereas interesting activities should be adopted to promote pupils’ learning, the activities themselves could not become the lesson goal. Instead, he argued that teaching certain content from the textbook for exams could be the ultimate objective of English language education in the Korean middle school classroom context (Conference, May 16; Mr. Baek–Interview, June 1). Moreover, he suggested that
his student teachers use various follow-up activities to ensure that pupils had understood the content of the textbook (Mr. Baek–Interview, June 1) as noted below:

Data Excerpt 6.8. Mr. Baek–Interview (June 1)
이렇게 자꾸 이제 가르칠 내용이 주가 되야지 막 어떤 activity 를 먼저 할까 이렇게 되어서 안된다고 생각을 했어요. 이걸 가르치기 위해서 필할까 그런 거 하는 식으로 자꾸 잡 수 있도록 같이 얘기를 했었고 이걸 위해서 grammar translation 이 가장 맞다면 그렇게 해야 된다고 자는 생각을 하는 거고, 그랬던 거 같아요.

I thought that the content to be taught in each lesson should be the focus rather than deciding which activities should be conducted first. I repeatedly mentioned that the student teachers need to focus on what to do to cover the content. If grammar-translation method works for teaching particular content, I think it could be used.

In this excerpt of his perception of his mentoring during the conferences, he stressed the importance of teaching the prescribed content and allowed them to use a more traditional approach if necessary.

Overall, the team B practicum activities enabled these student teachers to experience more institutionalized goals and methods such as using a traditional approach for pupils’ test scores. For example, Bohee mentioned exams in her teaching in order to focus the pupils’ attention to the specific content of the textbook (Jubin–May 16), and Jubin thought about the importance of teaching grammar and the reading text more explicitly (Jubin–Journal, May 16, 24). However, the effects of exams on their conceptions and instruction in the practicum were much less than on those of the team A student teachers for several reasons: Bohee and Jubin preferred the communicative approach; they had not experienced either traditional English teaching approach nor exam focused English language education as students in the Korean secondary school context prior to this practicum experience; their mentor teacher had flexible mentoring style.
6.1.2.6. Revealing Contextual Constraints

The practicum activities enabled Bohee and Jubin to be aware of several institutional constraints such as large class size, noise control, and pupils’ limited participation and L2 ability. They were faced with these constraints when they observed others’ classes and taught their own. At the start of the practicum, Bohee and Jubin indicated excitement about teaching English in Korean English classrooms and intended to carry out their own understandings of the curricular mandates. Later in the practicum, they faced several barriers that most likely inhibited them from doing so, and they adjusted their instruction to the context, working within or, in a few cases overcoming the constraints. Mr. Baek described some of the relevant constraints within the school context, made suggestions, and allowed his student teachers themselves to work out ways to overcome them.

First, these student teachers reflected on their concerns about inactive response from pupils when they used English as a classroom language. One example is recorded in Bohee’s journal below:


When I stand in front of the pupils, I can see some pupils make faces full of complaints or taking a nap. I hate them, but in fact I’m really worried about them. Do they dislike English lessons? Is it because I only used English? Do they behave in the same way in other classes? I really hope they don’t.

In this excerpt, Bohee was concerned about her pupils’ non-response to her class and she suspected that her use of English might intimidate low-level pupils from participating. Mr. Baek replied to this journal entry as “중학생이 가장 싫어하는 과목 1 위가
‘영어’입니 다 (English seems to be the subject that middle school students dislike most)” (Bohee–Journal, May 17), adding that she did not have to feel too frustrated by pupils’ every single behavior. Also, concerning Jubin’s similar concern about pupils’ inactiveness (Jubin–Journal, May, 12), he replied that “자기 스타일로 아이들을 이끌 수 있어야 합니다 (You should lead your pupils in your own way).” In this manner he provided more general information and encouraged the student teachers’ application of their teaching conceptions into classroom teaching in spite of pupils’ low response. On the other hand, Mr. Baek suggested that his student teachers should adapt their English use and instruction to the pupils’ levels so that pupils could understand them (Conference–May 9, 16). Although Bohee advocated and implemented teaching English through English, her own perception about pupils’ understanding of her English and the mentoring caused her to use Korean frequently for her low level pupils. Jubin also experienced low level pupils’ lack of confidence in understanding the teachers’ English in the classes she observed (Jubin–Journal, May 16) and in her own classes (Jubin–Interview, June 8). Thus, she felt the need to use Korean to enhance their comprehension and actually used the L1 frequently in her low proficiency classes.

Another example of contextual constraints that Bohee and Jubin confronted was that her students were mostly reluctant to speak the L2. Although these student teachers used English and encouraged their participation in English, it often caused less engagement from pupils than they expected (Bohee–Class, May 16; Jubin–Journal, May 20). At times they used alternatives to pupils speaking L2: allowing their pupils to use the L1 (Bohee) or presenting pupils’ group work herself (Jubin). At other times, they
encouraged their pupils to speak the L2 despite their limited ability and confidence (Bohee–Class, May 25; Jubin–Class, May 24).

Large class size and noise control were also found as barriers to conducting communicative activities as indicated by Jubin’s journal below:


I appreciate it since my pupils answered questions well [in the activity of asking opinions (“what do you think of~”) and answering them (“I think~”)]. Many of the pupils did make very long and complex sentences, not only using just one word. I think it would be all right if I give them more challenging activities. I wanted to conduct the activity as a debate, but I thought it hard since there are too many pupils in the class.

Here, while Jubin was satisfied with her pupils’ response about her teaching, she found that the large class size discouraged her from trying out more communicative approaches. She added that such an attempt was also constrained due to an inability to control the noise level of her students (Jubin–Interview, June 8). Bohee also revealed her dilemma that her pupils’ active participation tended to increase the noise level, which she sometimes could not control (Bohee–Journal, May 18). Although noise problems at times prohibited more attempts to teach communicatively, Bohee and Jubin other times viewed that classroom noise as indicative of high levels of engagement in the class and much better than their pupils’ non-responsiveness. They also made efforts to lower the noise level through proper classroom management strategies. Mr. Baek was supportive in this issue in the sense that he was rather tolerant of the on-task noise and even suggested available resolutions (Conference, May 10, 17).
Overall, the practicum activities (classroom observations and teaching, conferences and journals) allowed student teachers to experience and reflect on contextual constraints embedded in Korean English classrooms. While these student teachers sometimes accepted the constraints and did not challenge them (Bohee–Journal, May 17; Jubin–Journal, May 11, 20), they also attempted to surmount some contextual constraints (e.g., pupils’ limited participation and L2 use) in order to enact their ideas consistent with the curricular reform mandates (e.g., encouraging pupils’ participation and/or L2 use; Bohee–Journal, May 2, 3, 18 and Jubin–Journal, May 16, 19, 22, 23, 24), specifically based on their beliefs and the mentor support.

6.1.3. Summary

Mr. Baek was relatively open to his student teachers’ classroom practices, and Bohee and Jubin had highly positive attitudes toward communicative approaches and direct experiences applying the approaches. Therefore, the practicum activities of team B created multiple opportunities for these student teachers to try out ideas and activities advocated by the curricular reforms. However, in the practicum experiences these student teachers also became aware of a range of institutional constraints such as large classroom size, the need for classroom management and the existing norms for pupils’ classroom participation and L2 use. They were also exposed to institutionalized lesson goals and teaching methods such as teaching the content of the textbook for school exams and using traditional approaches. Additionally, the data that emerged from the team conferences, observations, and journals suggested that despite the existence of a more open and less hierarchical mentor-student teacher relationship, Mr. Baek did not provide sufficient
support to more effectively enable his student teachers to embrace the curricular reform mandates in the classroom. In spite of these constraints, team B student teachers had much more freedom than team A to teach based on their beliefs about communicative approaches that already aligned with the curricular reform mandates in many ways.

6.2. Bohee

The next two sections answer the second research questions of this study, specifically regarding team B student teachers (Bohee and Jubin): How do student teachers come to understand these curricular reforms and how do they enact them in their instructional practices? How do their instructional practices support their pupils’ opportunities for authentic L2 use?

This section provides a characterization of the instructional activity system from Bohee’s perspective (refer to Section 6.2.2). For this, the experiences of Bohee are examined, specifically as related to her English language learning and teaching history as well as to the practicum activities and teaching (Section 6.2.1). In particular, this section uncovers six themes showing her development as a teacher, focusing on her perception of the curricular reforms and on their implementation within her practicum teaching (Section 6.2.3).

6.2.1. Previous English and Practicum Experiences

Although Bohee was born in Korea, when she was 7 years old her family immigrated to Saipan\(^9\), a capital city in one of the U.S. commonwealths\(^{10}\). Therefore,

---

\(^9\) Saipan is located in the Pacific and is the largest island and capital of the United States Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands.
Bohee spoke English fluently because she learned English in schools where English was the primary language. Moreover, she regularly attended a Korean language school in order to learn Korean, and she spoke Korean with her family and her Korean friends. Bohee thinks of herself as a bilingual, but she feels that she is not a perfect native speaker of either language. Although she feels more comfortable using English than Korean\textsuperscript{11}, she often worried that her English pronunciation was not exactly native-like, so she hoped to learn more proper pronunciation in the U.S. while completing a TESOL certificate program. In thinking about the teaching methods used during her own schooling, she recalled she was frequently assigned project work in small groups, had active classroom interactions, and received positive feedback and encouragement about her work.

Bohee learned about the current curricular reform mandates and various teaching methods and materials through her university coursework in the department of English Language Education. In her Methods in Teaching English as a Foreign Language, she was interested to find that many of the methods mentioned in the courses (e.g., CLT) were ones she had experienced in her own schooling and teaching. In addition, Teaching Materials in English Language Education allowed her to look at the textbooks used in the public secondary educational system and analyze tasks from middle school English textbooks in order to modify them to meet the 7\textsuperscript{th} national curriculum. Thus, despite difficulties in catching up with the coursework, she enjoyed learning various teaching

\textsuperscript{10} The description of Bohee’s experience in this section was mostly from the interview with her (Interviews, June 8).
\textsuperscript{11} For this reason, Bohee had difficulty adjusting to using academic Korean in her university courses. In addition, she felt uncomfortable writing the daily practicum journal in Korean and, for the first couple of days, she wrote some parts in English.
methods and she appreciated learning about the English language policy in Korea; she found them useful to her instruction in the lab school (Interview, June 8).

Bohee had several experiences in teaching English in Korea as an undergraduate student. She tutored several ESL pupils in an international school in Korea and through this experience she became interested in becoming an ESL teacher. In addition, she taught English at several private institutes where she taught from assigned textbooks or by conversing with the students on the phone. Furthermore, she worked two summers at English language camps for elementary and secondary school students. As an assistant teacher at the first camp, she learned useful management skills and communicative activities. In her second camp, she taught 10th grade pupils communication skills through debates and presentations. She noted that in her prior experiences, she had taught advanced pupils with high motivation, and she had had more extensive freedom about what and how to teach. Nonetheless, she thought these teaching experiences were helpful because they built her confidence in three important areas: teaching in classroom settings, classroom management, and teaching methods (Interview, June 8).

As a fluent English speaker with certain teaching experience, Bohee demonstrated enthusiasm and excellence in teaching from the beginning (Mr. Baek–Interview, June 1; Bohee–Interview, June 8). As a result, she was selected as a representative student teacher to demonstrate a model class at the end of the practicum. While planning and conducting the class, she had a hard time negotiating a balance between what she wanted

---

12 Bohee had a phone call with each pupil for 10 minutes every day (Telephone English) to teach English communication skills. She did this for about three to four months. She stated that she felt good when she found her pupils improved their English speaking skills and pronunciation. (Interview, June 8).
13 As mentioned in the Methodology Chapter, Bohee, in the role of a representative student teacher, conducted a model class during the last week of the practicum. The model class was planned through collaboration among the student teachers with the help of the mentor teachers, and was observed and discussed by administrators and university professors other than English mentor teachers and peer student teachers.
to teach and what the observers (i.e., university professors, administrators, mentor teachers, and peer student teachers) recommended or would expect. The excerpt below indicates how she felt frustrated in this experience:

Data Excerpt 6.11. Bohee–Interview (June 8)

I hate teaching what I don’t like. So that’s why Mr. Baek talked about my class [that I taught before the model class with the earlier version of the lesson plan] as “it’s not like your class you’ve shown so far.” … If I’m really interested in activities or games that I planned, I’m excited to teach and enjoy myself. … I tend to go overboard and I just enjoy the game with the pupils. But [for the model class], I couldn’t enjoy my class since I should do what I don’t like to do.

Although Bohee desired to teach as she liked, she had to act in accordance with the teaching norms already in place in the classroom context. This experience left her anxious and she felt less excited about her teaching. However, finally, she gradually recovered from frustration and inconfidence, and taught the class successfully by making efforts to align teaching practices of the model class with her teaching conceptions.

In the practicum, where Bohee experienced a Korean English classroom setting for the first time, she was surprised that the teachers in the field school had to take on so many responsibilities for not only teaching the subject matter, but also for doing other student related work such as counseling (Bohee–Journal, May 12). Apparently, her reflections in several journal entries (May 3, 12, 26) and interviews (June 8) indicate that the practicum experience allowed her to develop deeper and more positive perceptions of the teaching profession.
Overall, Bohee entered the practicum as an experienced and talented teacher with positive attitudes toward communicative approaches and with eagerness to use them in her classroom. However, the model class made her feel that she had to conform to what was considered to be appropriate in the school context, but eventually she was able to regain confidence in applying her own instructional conceptions into her teaching. Clearly, the practicum allowed her to experience actual classroom teaching in a Korean secondary school and to better understand what it means to be an English teacher in the Korean school system.

6.2.2. The Configuration of the Instructional Activity System

Based on Bohee’s spoken data (interviews, conferences, and classroom interactions) and written data (journals, and lesson plans), the instructional activity system in which Bohee played the role of the subject is illustrated in figure 6.2.

Figure 6.2. The Instructional Activity System from Bohee’s Perspective

- **Subject:** Bohee
- **Rules:** typical classroom norms (pupils’ limited participation and L2 use), classroom management, satisfying Mr. Baek’s expectations, covering textbook for exams, achieving goals stated in lesson plan
- **Community:** Pupils, Mr. Baek, Mentor teachers, Peer student teachers, Univ. professors*
- **Object:** fostering pupils’ participation, enhancing pupils’ L2 use, achieving goals stated in lesson plan
- **Tool:** Practicum activities, lesson plans, L1/L2, textbook, exams, handouts, extra materials, communicative activities, game-like activities
- **Division of Labor:** teacher facilitates pupils’ learning
- **Outcome:** pupils’ increased participation/interest

* specifically related to the representative student teacher’s model class
Bohee, as the subject of this instructional activity system, had three different objects. She wanted to foster pupils’ participation in lessons, specifically using instructional tools such as communicative activities and/or game-like interesting activities. She also wanted her students to use English more often. These two objects were closely related to her own beliefs about language learning and teaching. The third object was to achieve the goals stated in the lesson plan, which was particularly valued in the model class that Bohee taught as a representative student teacher. Along with classroom management, this object also functioned as the rule of this activity system imposed by Mr. Baek through the practicum activities (e.g., conferences) and required by the practicum.

Another prominent rule was related to the one embedded in typical Korean English classrooms such as pupils’ limited participation and L2 use since they were socialized into learning L2 through L1 as passive learners. Furthermore, covering the textbook for exams was a noteworthy rule as stressed by Mr. Baek and the English division. The last rule of this activity system was meeting Mr. Baek’s expectations which included some rules represented in this activity system (classroom management and completion of the stated goals in lesson plan) and some others specified in his mentoring (e.g., attempting new interesting activities). Although Mr. Baek supported his student teachers’ trying out new ideas, his authority as a major evaluator of student teachers’ practicum experiences still remained.

The mediational tools of the practicum activities (conferences, observations, and journal) and other instructional tools enabled her to achieve the outcome, namely,

---

14 Interestingly, despite Mr. Baek’s emphasis, school exams did not influence Bohee’s instruction as clearly as for team A student teachers. She only used them to get her low-proficiency pupils’ attention. This was inferred from Jubin’s observation of Bohee’s lesson (“말이 들리기 힘들어, 시험에 나올 거라고 한 말도 학생들은..."
pupils’ increased participation and interest. The practicum activities allowed her to understand the norms of English lessons in the school context and to what extent she could implement her own vision of teaching. Korean and English were important tools as the medium of instruction for Bohee’s lessons. While her dominant language was L2, she also used Korean for low level pupils’ understanding and participation. Also, the textbook was an important artifact because her lessons were based on the textbook sections. However, school exams as an instructional tool were only used to get the attention of low-proficiency level pupils (Jubin–Journal, May 16), implying that school exams did not influence Bohee’s instruction as greatly as they did for team A student teachers.

In addition, since she noted pupils already learned the content of the textbook from cram schools, she frequently used authentic materials to facilitate their learning (Journal, May 8). Moreover, lesson plans allowed her to organize her lessons in advance. While most of the time she used them flexibly, she particularly adhered to the one in her model class to show the community her ability to complete what she planned for the class successfully.

The division of labor of the activity system was less hierarchical than that of the team A student teachers, and Bohee mostly functioned as a facilitator for her pupils’ learning. The community of this activity system consists of pupils whom Bohee taught and Mr. Baek whom she worked with while planning and reflecting on her lessons. Also, it included mentors and peers in their own and other teams, since mentors showed model lessons and advice, and student teachers, including Bohee and peers, exchanged lesson

집중시키는 데 도움이 된 거 같다 (I think it was helpful to keep pupils focused when Bohee asked them to underline some parts and said that those parts should be on exam)” (Jubin–Journal, May 16).
ideas, observed each other’s lessons and/or gave feedback. However, specifically for the event of the model class, the community was more expansive than that of other student teachers and included university professors who observed and discussed the model class.

Overall, an analysis of this instructional activity system shows how Bohee’s teaching was influenced by multiple factors, which include not only her individual beliefs and experiences in ELT, her sensitivity to her pupils, and Mr. Baek’s mentoring, but also expectations from other community members and the practicum institutional context.

6.2.3. Understanding and Enacting the Curricular Reforms

The next two sections explain more about the instructional activity system from Bohee’s perspectives. Just as with the team A student teachers, the results of the grounded analysis offer the sources and complex nature of the instructional activity system wherein Bohee was the subject. Moreover, the emerging inner contradictions within the activity system and the resolution process would depict to what extent she embraced the current educational policy in her teaching context.

This section specifically uncovers six themes that show Bohee’s understanding and enactment of the curricular reforms. These include: 1) She wanted to use English as much as possible; 2) She functioned as a facilitator of her students’ learning and supported their engagement in communicative activities; 3) Although she believed having pupils use English was essential and attempted it, she sometimes found it difficult to support in her teaching context; 4) While teaching the model class, she experienced situated perceptions of the curricular reforms; 5) She attempted to develop her students’ communicative competence extensively.
6.2.3.1. Teachers’ Maximal Use of English

Bohee maintained that the teachers’ use of English inside and outside the classroom would improve their pupils’ English-speaking ability. The journal entry below shows such beliefs about L2 use:

어제 물 마시는데에 아이들이 몰려 있어 한 아이에게 “Can I have that cup, please?”라고 했더니 다들 “영어 선생님이세요?” 하며 시끌벅-notification. 몇 명의 아이들은 “Hi”하며 인사도 해주었다. 그런데 나도 참백했는데 오늘 한아이가 지나가면서 나한테 먼저 영어로 인사를 하는 것이었다. 그랬더니 주위 친구들이 “우와. 너 저 선생님 알아? 너 방금 영어 썻어?”하며 지나갔다. 교실 안 말고도 가끔 교실 밖에서 영어를 써주면 영어가 더 친근하게 느껴지고 자연스럽게 영어 사용이 가능해지지 않을까 생각된다.

Yesterday I saw many pupils gathered at a water fountain. I asked one of the pupils, “Can I have that cup, please?” Then, all of them looked surprised and asked me, “Are you an English teacher?” Then some pupils greeted me saying “Hi.” Today, one pupil passed me greeting me in English, even before I said “Hi” to him. Then, his friends around him asked him, “Wow, do you know the teacher? Did you speak English?” If (teachers and students) often use English outside the classroom in addition to inside the classroom, I think pupils would feel more familiar with English and come to use English more naturally.

This excerpt indicates that she was willing to communicate with her pupils in English outside the classroom and her use of English in this case was well received by the pupils. This instance confirmed her beliefs about the need for more frequent L2 use while teachers and students communicate in daily conversation as well as in classroom interactions.

Bohee’s beliefs about teachers’ L2 use led her to monitor her own, her mentor teacher’s, and her peer student teachers’ use of English (Journal, May 1-4, 9, 12, 15-18). In particular, she expressed her concern over some of her peers’ frequent use of Korean in the advanced class and how it might encourage pupils to speak Korean and avoid speaking English (Interview, June 8). Thus, with her advanced pupils, she mostly or exclusively used English particularly in the model class, where using only English was
expected. Since she felt more comfortable speaking in English than in Korean, her pupils also noticed this and felt her use of English was actually more natural (Interview, June 8)\(^\text{15}\).

Conversely, she felt conflicted about using English with the low level pupils. She justified her speaking English with the lower-level pupils because she also used gestures and visuals to ensure they understood her English (Interview, June 8). However, the mentoring advice she received from Mr. Baek combined with her low level pupils’ lack of participation when she used English (Journal–May 17, Data Excerpt 6.9), led her to use Korean more frequently.

Overall, Bohee had firm beliefs about the importance of teachers’ natural and frequent use of English in the classroom. However, the institutional constraints within the practicum setting led her to consider how she might balance the use of English and Korean depending on the pupils’ proficiency level. Thus, while her use of English for upper-level pupils is consistent with the teaching English through English policy, with her low level pupils, their lack of participation led her to use English less.

**6.2.3.2. The Teacher’s Role as Facilitator**

Over the course of the practicum, Bohee functioned as a facilitator and a monitor for her pupils’ language learning. She considered her pupils’ affect and proficiency levels, so as to promote their motivation and classroom participation. She also encouraged her

\(^{15}\) A relevant excerpt is as following: 영어를 쓰다가 중간에 한국말을 이렇게 한번씩 해요. 지번에 한번 무슨 일이 있었냐면, 예들이 한국말 (하니까) 몇 명이 웃어요. 선생님, 막 한국어 쓰는 게 어색해요. 뭐 이리는 거예요. 영어 쓰세요. (While I mostly use English, I speak Korean once in a while. The other day, when I spoke Korean, the pupils laughed. They said, “Your Korean sometimes sounds awkward. Why don’t you just speak in English?”) (Bohee–Interview, June 8).
pupils to cooperate with one another and feel responsible for their work, especially through small group activities.

She believed in the importance of considering pupils’ affect for their motivation. She gave positive feedback to the pupils for their participation even when the results were not as good as she expected. Thus, she always accepted their ideas and opinions. She even suggested that teachers should give encouragement by using diverse expressions (e.g., *fantastic, excellent*) with an exaggerated or excited tone (Bohee–Journal, May 12). Another example of her consideration of students’ affect is her different strategy of praising and reprimanding them, as noted below:

아이들이 혼낼 때도 class 앞에서 소리 지르는 거 보단 가까이 다가가서 ‘OO 야, 그러면 안돼지’ 라고 속삭여 주는 게 효과적이지 않을까? 아이들 앞에서 public 하게 혼내면 아이의 자존심을 내리는 act 다. 혼낼 때 public 하게 청찬은 public 하게… 잘 조절할 줄 아는 선생님이 되자. When reproaching a pupil, isn’t it more effective to come closer to the pupil and say ‘OO [i.e., the pupil’s name], you might not want to do this’ with a soft voice, than saying it aloud in front of class. If a teacher reproaches a pupil in front of his/her peers publicly, this would hurt his/her pride. I’d like to become a teacher who can control myself well… so that I can reproach the pupils privately and praise them publicly.

Here, she remarked that while praise can be public so as to encourage pupils to do better, reprimands must be private to respect their self-esteem and save their face. This way she thought she could reinforce pupils’ good behavior and weaken their undesirable behavior.

In order to promote her pupils’ engagement in class (e.g., neither too quiet nor noisy), she frequently reflected on how they behaved in class and how she might improve their cooperation and response to her lessons. In particular, she often walked around the classroom, because she thought that this would have several advantages:

수업 도중 선생님의 go around the class의 장점들을 생각해 보았다: •More interaction …. •수업을 잘 따라가고 있는지 돌아다니면서 파악 •떼드는 아이들이 있는지 •선생님이 왔다 갔다하면서 아이들의 심리상 더 잘 보이고 싶어 더 집중하지 않음이 난가? … •아이들과 더 친해질 수 있고, 명찰을 보며, 이름을 불러주며, eye contact을 하면서 face to face하게 feedback을 줄 수 있다. … •선생님이 아닌 친구같이 friendly하게 친근감 있게 다가가자.
아이들도 선생님이 다가오면 거부감 느낌도 없도록 항상 웃으면서 대하자…. •교실에서 창피해서 질문을 못하는 아이들은 선생님이 다가오길 바라고 있다. 돌아다니면서 답을 못 푸는 아이들에게 먼저 다가가 도움을 주자.

I thought about the advantages of teachers’ walking around the class: •More interaction …. •I can see if they are following me •I can monitor if any students make noise •If I walk around the class, would they focus more on the class in order to impress me? … •I can get to know my students more. I can see their name tag and call their name, have an eye contact, and give my feedback via face-to-face [one-on-one] communication. … • I need to approach them in a friendly way. I need to smile at them when I come to them so that they do not feel rejected … •Shy students who may not ask questions in front of class are waiting for me to come to them. I need to walk around the classroom and go to help those students who have difficulty getting through the questions.

In the excerpt, she stated that caring for individuals while going around the class would allow her to effectively monitor and help her pupils’ learning. Most importantly, she was able to interact with individual pupils, check their understanding and give them individual help and feedback. In addition to individual pupils, she was willing to help groups of pupils who needed it. Since she noticed differences even among the advanced pupils, she stated that she had one group that consisted of rather weak pupils sit right in front of her so that she could give more help to the less capable group (Bohee–Interview, June 8).

She was aware that small group activities were helpful for her pupils because they enabled the students to play a more active role in their own learning. In the following, she reflected more on the benefits of small group work in her journal:

Data Excerpt 6.15. Bohee–Journal (May 11)

그룹으로 아이들을 앉혀 놓는 장점들: •cooperation •자기 생각, opinion 서로 share 하기. 맡하기, 서로 도와주기. … •그룹 내에서 돌아가면서 각 의무를 맡겨 꼽히, 아이들에게 책임감을 심어주고 그룹을 이끌어가는 leadership을 키워준다. … •그룹을 만들어 놓으면
The advantages of group seating arrangement: • cooperation • share their own and others’ opinion with one another, speak with one another, help each other … • I need to assign different roles for each group member at different times. It will develop their responsibility and leadership … • If I make them groups, I guess the number of sleeping students would be decreasing. … • If a student contributes to group points by guessing correctly, other group members will praise him, “Wow, how did you know that?” “You did a good job!” “You made us a winning team.” Then, would he feel much better and study and participate more? He would feel great if he receives such positive feedback from his friends, and not only from his teachers.

She noted that small group work allowed pupils to collaborate and take more responsibility for their own work. Specifically, she highlighted that pupils in the same team would help pay attention to the class, reinforce each other and encourage each other by giving positive feedback.

Overall, Bohee’s lessons showed learner-centered characteristics: she promoted pupils’ learning by considering their affect, monitoring their understanding, and engaging in lots of interactions. Moreover, she fostered encouragement, collaboration, and negotiation of meaning among pupils in small groups.

6.2.3.3. Supporting Pupils’ Engagement in Communicative Activities

Since Bohee had direct learning and teaching experience with project-based work and had a positive attitude toward activity-based instruction, she came up with a variety of communicative activities and used them in every one of her classes. By adopting interesting activities, she motivated her pupils and increased their classroom participation.

Bohee adopted different engaging activities according to both pupils’ proficiency levels and the skill sections of the textbook: overall, activities for the high-proficiency
class were more communicative. For the high level pupils, she taught warm-up, writing, and special activities classes and conducted writing and riddles by using external materials; she also frequently addressed cultural difference issues. On the other hand, she taught three reading lessons for the low level pupils. While she simply covered the reading text and words without activities, she conducted pre-reading and post-reading activities based on the textbook.

As shown in the table below, while in the first half of the practicum, she mostly used individual or whole class work, she increased the number of small group activities in the latter half of the practicum.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lesson Plans***</th>
<th>LP1</th>
<th>LP2*</th>
<th>LP3</th>
<th>LP4*</th>
<th>LP5*</th>
<th>LP6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dates for Class C, D</td>
<td>May 9, 10</td>
<td>May 16 (2 classes)</td>
<td>May 17, 19</td>
<td>May 18, 22</td>
<td>May 22, 25</td>
<td>May 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade (level)</td>
<td>8th (high)</td>
<td>9th (low)</td>
<td>9th (low)</td>
<td>9th (low)</td>
<td>8th (high)</td>
<td>8th (high)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textbooks/activities</td>
<td>Warm-up; Listening</td>
<td>Reading 1</td>
<td>Reading 2</td>
<td>Reading 3</td>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>Special Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small group work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>•Catch a mouse (spelling)* (Exc. 6.2)</td>
<td>•Experience in Korean culture (writing)* (Exc. 6.4-6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual/Whole class work</td>
<td>•What country is it? (riddles)</td>
<td>•Global etiquette (cultural differences)</td>
<td>•Crossword puzzle</td>
<td>•Scoldings/complaints (pre-reading)* (Exc. 6.3)</td>
<td></td>
<td>•Tongue twister •Mini golden bell (riddles)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction/Exercise**</td>
<td>Vocab</td>
<td>•Vocab</td>
<td>•Vocab</td>
<td>•Vocab</td>
<td>•Vocab</td>
<td>•Reading</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Presented in classroom excerpts
** Coverage of the textbook or worksheets without instructional activities
*** For most lesson plans, Bohee taught two class sessions.

Due to Bohee’s desire to increase pupils’ participation and interest in her lessons, she preferred to adopt game-like activities. The spelling activity below is an example in which she was successful engaging pupils.
In order to help the low-proficiency pupils’ participation, she asked the pupils to work on related words in advance (lines 1-7) and put the words on the board during the activity (Interview, June 8). At the start of the activity, she explained the rules (lines 8-62) and provided an example (lines 71-92). Then she conducted the small group
competition (lines 93-180) in which pupils eagerly participated. Whereas Bohee received positive feedback from Mr. Baek, and she herself perceived this activity positively, she received some negative feedback from her peers who observed the class. The following journal entry shows the evaluation about this class by herself and her peers:

Data Excerpt 6.16. Bohee–Journal (May 18)

In order to have a game, I asked pupils to sit in groups of six. I taught reading classes for the past two days and (I) wanted the pupils to feel more relaxed today. So I conducted a “catch a mouse” activity. The pupils really liked it. Did we make too much noise? I was concerned that the pupils might feel the activity is too childish, but I appreciate it because they just followed the activity with so much enjoyment. … Many peer student teachers observed my class maybe because I will be teaching the model class. Probably they had been curious about my class. Their response to my class was like “It was too distracting”, “Was it an entertainment show?” But I’m satisfied with the class. I intended to create a game-like atmosphere today. I think it was much better than yesterday’s class in which pupils did not respond well. I just hope that my pupils learned words and expressions such as catch a mouse, bravo, oops, skip which enables them to know them.

Here, Bohee believed that the nature of this activity enabled her pupils to feel excited at the game and at the same time to learn. That is, she thought that the lesson was successful at engaging and entertaining pupils and also effective at teaching both spelling and expressions (i.e., bravo, oops, and skip). In contrast, her peers commented that the activity was more of a game than a real classroom activity. Moreover, her peers thought that the game made the pupils uncontrollable. In fact, she had to manage the pupils’ behavior when they made noise, especially when they observed other teams at the game (lines 66-70), and played with the language (lines 63-65). The noise issue created tension for Bohee in that she struggled to get her passive pupils to become more active (Bohee–
Journal, May 12, 15, 17; Bohee–Interview, June 8), but at times, she worried about the high level of noise from pupil engagement (Bohee–Journal, May 23). Ultimately, however, despite the noise, she was satisfied with the spelling activity because it enabled the beginner pupils to actively participate in class. While the pupils focused in this activity on spelling accuracy, they actively collaborated within their team, competed with others and actually learned to use several expressions appropriately. On the whole, since Bohee believed game-like and engaging communicative activities would facilitate pupils’ active participation in their learning processes and eventually foster their learning, she used these frequently in her teaching.

6.2.3.4. Attempting to Support Pupils’ L2 Use

Although Bohee was aware of the importance of encouraging pupils to use English, due to the contextual constraints such as pupils’ low proficiency and reluctance to speak English, she did not always get the pupils to be active L2 users. Thus, despite her own use of English and engaging activities, Bohee was able to create only limited opportunities for her pupils to use English. In addition, she sometimes prioritized increasing pupils’ participation in activities over their use of English.

The pre-reading activity\textsuperscript{16} for the low-proficiency pupils below illustrates how she wanted to enhance their engagement in class, even over having them use the L2. For the following activity, she modified an activity from the textbook about the most frequent scoldings from pupils’ parents and complaints about them:

\textsuperscript{16} Yuna conducted a similar activity in her high-proficiency class (Classroom Excerpt 6.10).
Classroom Excerpt 6.3. Bohee’s Lesson (May 16)
Scoldings & Complaints (“Before You Read”)
Low level, 9th Grade, Lesson Plan 2 (1st for Low Level)
((1-33: introduces activity; asks pupils repeat scoldings and complaints and check meanings))
((34-40: explains more about Part A and asks pupils to raise their hands to answer))

41→ Bohee: OK. OK. Uh Uh. 손, 손. Up. Hand

Hand, hand.

42→ P2: 한글로 말해요/
Can we answer in Korean?

43→ Bohee: 영어로 하면 더 좋구요. OK/ (xxx) (xxx) 줍게요.
It would be better if you could speak English. OK/ I have (treats) for you.


In Korean.

45→ P3: 한국말로요/
In Korean?

46→ Bohee: Yeah.

((47-100: Using Korean, P3 and P5 talk about the top five scoldings they get from their parents))

101→ Bohee: All right. Good job. All right. What about Part B?

102 P6: 저요.
Me.

((103-131: P6 talks about the first complaint: give me more pocket money))

132 Bohee: One more/

133→ P6: 시-시간도 많이 (xxx) Free time (xxx)

More time

134 Bohee: Free time/

135 P6: 예.
Yes.

136 Bohee: What free time/ 자유시간을 더 많이 달라구요./

Do you mean “give me more free time”??

((137-156: Pupils make noise; Bohee asks them to listen to P6; P6 mentions 3 more complaints))

157→ Bohee: OK/ So do you guys all agree with P6/

((158-162: asks the same question in Korean; some pupils say yes, some no))

((163-228: shows two English sentences and asks if each goes under a scolding or a complaint))

229 Bohee: So what’s this? It’s just too easy. You (xxx). P7/ Do you wanna try this?

230→ P7: Don’t watch TV, don’t watch TV

231 Bohee: Don’t watch too much TV. Everybody, repeat after me. Don’t watch too

232 much TV.

233 P6: Don’t watch too much TV.

234 Bohee: What does this mean? Don’t watch too much TV. All right. So what

235 does this mean?

236 P7: TV를 보지 말아라.
Don’t watch TV.

237→ Bohee: 음 OK/ TV를 너무 많이 보지 말아라. Where does this go under?

Um. OK/ Don’t watch too much TV.

238 P6: Scoldings.

239 Bohee: Scoldings.

((240-279: works on two more examples))
Here, Bohee encouraged the pupils’ participation by accepting their answers positively (line 101) and giving treats to the pupils who presented in class (line 43). Yet despite her frequent use of English, since her pupils participated in class more actively when they were allowed to speak Korean (lines 41-47 and 157-162), she was not successful at getting them to use the L2. While one pupil tried to express an idea in English (line 133), except when they read aloud (line 230), most of the pupils used Korean. This created tension between Bohee and her pupils about using English in communicative activities. In addition, the pupils’ low proficiency level and reluctance to speak English discouraged her from expanding upon their ideas. Instead, she showed six examples and tried to engage them by determining which entry should go under a scolding or a complaint (lines 229-239).

Bohee believed that in order to enhance pupils’ English ability, English communication between teacher and pupils, and among pupils themselves are important. However, she found that the classroom realities only partially supported her beliefs, as noted in her interview:

Data Excerpt 6.17. Bohee–Interview (June 8)¹⁷
거기서 제가 하고 싶은 거는 좀 욕심일 수도 있지만 선생님과 제자들과 communicative 이게 가능하잖아요. 선생님이 영어로 물어봤더니 애들이 영어로 대답해라 이렇게 하면 또 가능은 한데, 그 수업 안에서 어떻게 아이들이 아이들끼리 영어가 안된다는. 제가 욕심인 거 같애요. 크게 좀 안알아서 조금 그랬던 거 같아요. {예에} 스프링반은 가능할 거 같거든요. {예 근데 그것을 시도는 해 보셨어요?} 아니도 시도는 못해봤어요.

As you know, L2 communication between teacher and pupils was possible in my class. I used English only and could ask my pupils to answer in English. But L2 communication between pupils in class did not occur in class. It would be my dream to have pupils to do this. {I see} But I think my advanced pupils could do that. {Have you ever tried?} No. I didn’t try it (in the practicum teaching).

¹⁷ The utterance in { } was made by the researcher.
She noted that her use of English enabled her pupils to communicate with her in English. However she realized that there was little communication between the pupils themselves. This created conflict within herself, and she regretted that she did not include more opportunities for this in her advanced-level classes.

Overall, despite her awareness of the importance of pupils’ L2 use, she did not have much success in getting the pupils to use English more actively. Most likely, this was, she believed, due to the way they were socialized into learning English through Korean. Nonetheless, she also believed that pupils’ participation in activities in English classroom would directly and/or indirectly help their learning as noted in her spelling activity (Excerpt 6.2).

6.2.3.5. The Model Class: Situated Perceptions of the Curricular Reform

As the selected representative student teacher, Bohee taught the model class (Lesson Plan 5). She combined the more normative ways of implementing the curricular reforms with her own approach to English language teaching. In particular, the collaborative planning\(^{18}\) and discussions about the model lesson exposed norms of an English lesson in the South Korean educational context and revealed the controversy surrounding enactment of the curricular reforms. The planning of the model class uncovered a conflict between herself and some of her peers about what constitute appropriate communicative activities, as noted in the interview below:

\(^{18}\) All the English student teachers had two conferences and planned what and how to teach the model class. Then Mr. Baek and Mrs. Ma advised how to improve the plan. She taught the class in the presence of all the English mentor and student teachers, administrators, and two university professors. All of the observers, with the exception of the administrators, discussed the class right after it ended.
When I planned the model class with the peer student teachers, there was a conflict. Some of the peer student teachers said, “How could you plan to conduct a golden bell [quiz show] when our professors will come to see your class? Maybe you need to show them what we learned from the coursework.” But Mr. Baek said, “Don’t’ think too much about professors. This is a class for your pupils, not for the professors. So think about your pupils and teach as you like.” So I had difficulty deciding what and how to teach.

Some peer student teachers felt that the model class should show department professors what they had learned from coursework and should be more than just game-like activities. Thus, although Mr. Baek encouraged Bohee to teach as she wanted, Bohee decided against doing a quiz show (involving vocabulary and reading comprehension) and instead did a writing activity.

The writing topic and writer’s position brought a conflict between student teachers and the representative mentor teacher, Mrs. Ma. The student teachers suggested that Bohee should conduct a writing activity which asked the students their opinion about cultural differences from the viewpoint of Koreans, with a focus on student’s identities. However, Mrs. Ma suggested Bohee provide a topic upon which pupils could write more extensively. Thus, Bohee had her pupils pretend to be a Korean immigrant returning to Korea and asked them to write about their experiences of cultural differences (Interview, June 8). Although Mrs. Ma felt this was not necessarily relevant to the pupils’ real-life

---

19 Bohee used the quiz show in the next class (Lesson Plan 6) and found the pupils were very excited at the activity (Interview, June 8).
20 While planning the lesson, the student teachers also considered the key premises of the curricular reforms such as L2 communication, cultural awareness, and communicative activities (Bohee–Interview, June 8)
experiences, it would allow them to use their cultural knowledge (English Division Conference, May 25).

The model class was composed of three sections: greetings across cultures as a warm-up pair activity, discussion of three instances of cultural differences between Korea and the U.S., and the writing activity in small groups. In the first excerpt from the model class below, she showed the greetings of eight countries or cultures including Korea and the U.S.:

Classroom Excerpt 6.4. Bohee’s Model Class (May 25)
Greetings (“Let’s Write”)
High Level, 8th Grade, Lesson Plan 5 (2nd for High Level)
((1-8: greetings; introduces today’s lesson about cultural differences and a writing activity))
((9-20: checks Korean equivalents of culture, difference, and cultural difference respectively))
21 Bohee: We’ll study um (xxx) among many countries and how they are different in greetings. Do you guys know what a greeting is? What’s greeting?
22 P1: Saying hello.
23 Bohee: Saying hello. Very good. All right. All right.
((25-102: asks pupils to focus on slides; they practice greetings in Korea, China, India & Spain))
((A slide shows a way of greeting in America, saying hello or shaking hands\(^{21}\))
((21-250))
103 Bohee: All right. Who do you see?
104 Ps: Hello.
105 Ps: America.
106 Bohee: Very good. America. Americans/ What’re they doing in the picture?
107 Ps: Hi.
108 Bohee: Hi.
109 Ps: Shaking hands.
110 P: Shaking your hand.
111 Bohee: Shaking your hand/ Shaking is this. What is this?
112 Ps: 혼들다. Wave.
113 Ps: Wave.
114 Ps: Waving.
115 Bohee: OK. Very good. Waving. OK. All right. And what do they say?
116 Ps: Hello.
117 Ps: How are you?

\(^{21}\) The slide consists of: (1) a heading in both English and Korean, “America (미국)”, (2) a figure of two people waving, and (3) explanation of a greeting method only in Korean, “만났을 때 “헬로우”하며 미소짓는다. 처음 만나는 사람과는 “하우 두 유 두”라고 말하며 악수를 한다 (When they meet, they smile, saying “Hello.” If they meet for the first time, they shake hands, saying “How do you do?”). There is a discrepancy between the prompt and the figure. So the pupils answer, focusing on the prompt first (shaking hands), and Bohee asks what the two people are actually doing in the figure (waving).
Bohee: Hello. Hi. How are you? OK. So, with your partners, let’s try the
American way of greeting.
Ps: Hi. ((pairs of students practice the greeting))
Ps: Hello.
Bohee: Say hi, Hello.
((123-179: Bohee and pupils work on greetings in France, Eskimo, and Hawaii))

Bohee used English throughout the class and although her pupils’ answers were short, there was a good deal of interaction (lines 22-24, 103-122). She always accepted her pupils’ answers positively (e.g., very good, right) and repeated their responses back to them. In addition, although she confronted her peers’ doubt that pupils would not respond, which indicates a contradiction between Bohee and the peer student teachers, she overcame their doubt and encouraged her pupils to engage in acting out all the greetings in pairs (lines 118-122).

After the warm-up activity, Bohee explained three cultural differences between Korea and the U.S. including the use of public bathhouses, eye contact, and how to address one another. Then, one of the three topics was assigned to each group of pupils to write a diary. As in the lesson plan, she introduced the activity, showed the model writing, and asked the pupils to do small group work. Since she intended a controlled writing, she particularly stressed that the pupils should include two structures they learned in the previous student teaching lessons (i.e., relative pronouns “who”/“which” and “I think that” phrase). The following classroom excerpt shows how the pupils were engaged in the small group work:

---

22 The details are as follow: (1) public bathhouse is popular in Korea, but not in the U.S. (2) While Koreans tend not to look directly at the older person who is scolding them, Americans commonly do eye contact. (3) Koreans address older people using special terms, whereas Americans may address them by their first name.
During this small group work, the pupils primarily spoke Korean. In particular, they talked about how to put their ideas into English (line 450) and asked Bohee for English words or expressions (lines 455, 463, and 466) and word spellings (line 485). After the small group activity, she asked each group to present it in English, as shown below:
Everybody. All right. P17, stand up. (xxx) your topic, all right/
((498-501: asks pupils to be quiet and listen to a presentation))

P17: ((reads loud what his group wrote)) Today, I arrived at Korea to visit my
family. I was very happy to meet my family. When I came out the gate,
there are the people who are grandparents. I only know their names. So I
called their names to say hello. But they didn’t look happy. I wondered
about that. In the car, my brother who was lived in Korea told me that in
Korea, there’s different ways to call one another. I think it’s hard, but it’s
the way to show respect to the old people.

Bohee: OK. So it’s very hard. But that’s how you show respect to older people.
((510-527: asks the other group to present; closing))

In this instance, due to the time limitation, only two groups presented. Although
one group revealed their limited understanding about addressing grandparents (e.g.,
addressing them by their first name; lines 503-508), most groups of pupils did express
their ideas about the given topic.

The model class contained several features of the curricular reform mandates.
Bohee used English exclusively as the medium of instruction and frequently interacted
with the pupils in English. In addition, she encouraged her pupils to engage in oral
practice rather than having them just listen to her lecture. Moreover, through her small
group writing activity, she had them write in English to express their ideas and she felt
satisfied with their writing.

During the debriefing session after the lesson, Bohee mostly had positive
feedback from the observers about the lesson content and classroom interaction, whereas
she also got some suggestions about time allotment, lesson flow, and activity
management. Interestingly, one of the foci of the discussion was pupils’ use of English.

First, professor Sohn who observed the model class expressed concern that there
were few instances of pupils’ authentic English use. In fact, most of the pupils’ use of
English was limited to single words and they spoke in Korean in the small group activity.

The interview segment below shows Bohee’s rationale:

**Data Excerpt 6.19. Bohee–Interview (June 8)**

저번에 손선생님께서 아이들이 스피킹이 전혀 없었다. 이런 식으로 평가해 주셨는데요. 일부러 그러자니요. 왜냐면 대표수업이고 하나같이 아이들이 그러려 하지 않자고 close question 을 쳤던 거예요. ... 그러면서 제가 아이들이 그것도 다 잘 알아야 되잖아요. (재반에) 반응도 반응도 써야 되잖아요. 그러면서 opinion 에 관련한 다른 제가 어떻게 (계산)할 수가 없어요. 그래서 다 close question 으로 해서 아이들의 반응까지 다 예측을 하기 위해서 그런 문제들을 다 만졌었던 거예요.

(In the conference after my model class), Professor Sohn critiqued the fact that students rarely spoke English in my class. I planned the class that way on purpose. Since it was the model class, I often asked them closed-ended questions. ... I had to predict and write the pupils’ responses [in the detailed lesson plan]. If I asked them their opinions, I couldn’t [guess] in advance. So I asked them closed-ended questions so that I could predict their responses.

Bohee justified her instruction in that she intentionally framed her pupils’ L2 use by asking closed-ended questions to predict the pupils’ responses and to ensure that her lesson was organized and completed in accordance with her lesson plan. Also, in order to achieve the stated lesson goals, she focused more on the writing activity than on speaking skills.

The other issue was related to other mentor teachers’ suggestions about less controlled writing in terms of the topic and structures. For example, Mrs. Doh suggested that Bohee give pupils freedom to pick their own topic through group discussion. In addition, Mrs. Cho pointed out the limitation of having the pupils write using specific structures in that it might inhibit the pupils from expressing their ideas and producing

---

24 Bohee had to give every observer a detailed lesson plan, in which the anticipated script of teacher’s and pupils’ talk, activities, materials, and teaching aids were written.
25 The lesson goals indicated in the lesson plan was “(1) Students can be culturally aware and able to know the cultural differences between Korea and America, (2) Students can write their thoughts about the cultural differences by being in the shoes of a foreigner visiting Korea. They will have to write in a daily diary form. Students should able to use “who, which” relative pronoun, and use “I think (that)…” structure in their writings” (Lesson Plan 5).
natural writing. Bohee defended her instruction to manage the activity (having each of the topics addressed by the same number of groups) and achieve the specific lesson goal (writing using two key structures) (Interview, June 8).

Through planning and teaching the model class and the discussion in the debriefing session, Bohee experienced different viewpoints about implementing the curricular reforms in a Korean classroom setting. In the planning process she was pushed toward more normative way of teaching the model class (activities should be rather serious and have extensive and tangible product, and the lesson should be well organized, managed, and completed). She accepted others’ opinions, yet she taught the way she wanted. Her activities were successful in engaging the pupils, but due to certain institutional constraints (e.g., pupils’ socialization into L2 use), pupils showed limited L2 use, especially few meaningful L2 negotiation between one another. Then, the focus of the debriefing session supported creating more opportunities and choices for pupils’ L2 use. The social activities related to the model class show not just whether curricular reforms are embraced in Korean classroom setting, but also how they might be implemented in ways that facilitate learning.

6.2.3.6. Extensive Attempts to Develop Communicative Competence

Bohee endeavored to develop her pupils’ communicative competence (Canale and Swain, 1980), the ultimate goal of the curricular reform mandates. In particular, she addressed sociolinguistic competence more extensively than the other student teachers in the present study. She also dealt with grammatical competence in her reading class and briefly covered discourse competence, yet she rarely addressed strategic competence.
Sociolinguistic competence was developed through activities related to cultural differences. She believed that teaching cultural awareness is important under the curricular reform mandates, and expressed satisfaction that her activities got her pupils to develop a deeper understanding of cultural differences (Interview, June 8). These activities included fill-in-the-blanks and discussions about cultural differences between Koreans and Americans (Lesson Plan 1, “Global Etiquette”\(^{26}\), the comparison of the two cultures, and a writing activity (Lesson Plan 5, Classroom Excerpts 6.4-6). In particular, when she prepared the model class, she was careful to select representative characteristics and examples and modified them to foster pupils’ understanding and interest. Specifically, she indicated that presenting too much detail and too complex information might confuse her pupils. For example, when discussing addressing people on a first-name basis in the U.S., she excluded some exceptional cases such as how to address teachers (e.g., Mr. Kim) (Interview–June 8). Thus, it was inevitable that one group misunderstood and assumed that grandparents were also called by their first names in the U.S. (Lesson Plan 5, Classroom Excerpt 6.6). Overall, however, Bohee clearly tried to address certain aspects of sociolinguistic competence in her lessons.

Bohee rarely taught grammar or structure explicitly, but she did teach word meanings, the pronunciation of words and sentences, and the translation of the reading text. This mostly occurred in the three consecutive reading lessons for the low-proficiency pupils. In this sense, she addressed certain aspects of grammatical competence, in particular those outlined in the curricular reforms.

\(^{26}\) The “Global Etiquette” activity was composed of ten Korean people’s behaviors that Americans find upsetting or peculiar (e.g., Ask personal questions—How old are you? Are you married? etc.) and five American people’s behaviors that Koreans find upsetting or peculiar (e.g., Wear shoes inside the house). Underlined parts were blanks for the pupils to fill in.
Aspects of discourse competence were covered, although to a limited extent, through Bohee’s reading instruction and small group writing activities. In the reading class, she briefly mentioned the genre of the reading text, that is, a newspaper article and different opinions about the article (Lesson Plans 2-4). In addition, a diary writing activity in the model class enabled her pupils to produce meaningful extended discourse about a specific topic within a specific genre (Lesson Plan 5).

Strategic competence was rarely addressed in Bohee’s lessons. Since she used English almost extensively, especially in her model class, she modeled certain communication strategies, such as repetition, paraphrasing, and gestures to enhance pupils’ understanding and participation. Thus, by example, she may have exhibited some aspects of strategic competence but she did not teach these explicitly.

6.2.4. Inner Contradictions in the Instructional Activity System

Within the instructional activity system in which Bohee was the subject, multiple inner contradictions (Engeström, 1986, 1993, 1999a) emerged and these are represented in figure 6.3.
6.2.4.1. Primary Contradictions

The most noticeable primary contradiction was between Bohee’s attitudes about teachers’ use of English and her perception about her pupils’ response to her use of English. She considered her frequent English use to be helpful to improve her pupils’ English ability; yet, she was also concerned that the lack of participation of low level pupils might be caused by her extensive use of English (Data Excerpt 6.9). Thus, she increased her use of Korean for low-proficiency pupils in order to enhance their participation.

Another primary contradiction appeared between her beliefs about pupils’ use of English between themselves and the reality in their language use. For the high level pupils, Bohee had positive attitudes toward pupils’ communication in English with one another while engaging in small group activities (Data Excerpt 6.17). However, she
noticed pupils mostly used Korean in the way they were socialized. Thus, she rarely asked them to try to use English between one another.

Lastly, Bohee experienced a primary contradiction when she sought to provide interesting activities for her pupils and at the same time, she was concerned about the level of the noise in her classroom. After experiencing non-responsive and quiet low-proficiency pupils in her reading class, she found interesting activities much better for her students despite the noise issues it caused because these made her lesson much more engaging for her and her students (Data Excerpt 6.16). Plus, she thought she could control the noise level through proper classroom management.

6.2.4.2. Secondary Contradictions

Manifold secondary inner contradictions occurred in this instructional activity system between (1) subject and community, (2) subject and rule, and (3) community and tool, and (4) community and rule.

First, an important secondary contradiction occurred between Bohee (subject) and her low level pupils (community) in terms of their use of English. Since her pupils were reluctant to express their ideas in English, but willing to do so in Korean, her attempts to encourage her pupils to use the L2 were not successful (Classroom Excerpt 6.3). This contradiction resulted in the way that Bohee allowed her pupils to use Korean as they were socialized into using Korean in English lessons. In this way, she prioritized pupils’ class participation over their use of the L2. This contradiction simultaneously uncovered other contradictions: (1) between Bohee (subject) and pupils’ socialization into learning L2 through L1 (rule), since she wanted to overcome the way pupils were socialized in
their language use, and (2) between pupils (community) and use of the L2 (tool) since they intended to maintain their familiar way of using Korean in English lessons.

When the model class was planned and discussed, several noticeable contradictions emerged. A contradiction arose between Bohee (subject) and some of her peer student teachers (community) in terms of pupils’ participation in a warm-up activity of the model class. While her peer student teachers were suspicious about pupils’ participation, Bohee believed that having her pupils participate in a short pair exercise included within a whole class activity would make the lesson more engaging and interesting. This contradiction led her to encourage pupils’ participation, which was successful (Classroom Excerpt 6.4). Thus, she was able to overcome her peers’ perceptions about pupils’ limited participation and stimulated their participation in class. As a result, this contradiction is related to another contradiction between Bohee (subject) and pupils’ low participation (rule).

Unlike Bohee’s challenges over the community (peers) shown above, the next two contradictions reveal the power of her community for her, and her acquiescence to the norms of her community. The next contradiction appeared between Bohee (subject) and her peer student teachers (community) over what communicative activities should look like. While Bohee believed interesting game-like activities could enhance pupils’ participation and learning (e.g., “catch a mouse”, quiz shows), some of her peer student teachers believed communicative activities should be more serious with more tangible outcomes (writing activity). When Bohee planned the model class, her fellow student teachers’ perceptions became more influential than her own preferences. Thus, the contradiction was resolved only because she complied with the more normative ways of
conducting activities in a Korean classroom setting. This contradiction also revealed another contradiction between peer student teachers (community) and game-like activities (tool) since they did not think these activities would be appropriate in the classroom context.

Moreover, another secondary contradiction occurred between Bohee as one of the student teachers (subject) and Mrs. Ma (community) about appropriate writing topics and the positioning of pupils in their writing. The student teachers wanted to have the pupils express their own opinions about cultural differences, adhering to the “authenticity” of pupils’ identities as writers. Yet, Mrs. Ma recommended that a particular topic and stance be given to the pupils (a Korean U.S. immigrant’s experiences of cultural differences in Korea), so as to ensure that the pupils produce more extensive writing. The resolution of this contradiction was that Bohee followed Mrs. Ma’s suggestion seemingly due to a combination of valuing the mentor teacher’s experiences in teaching in the school context and complying with her because of the power differential.

During the debriefing sessions after the model class, three additional contradictions were found. The contradiction between Bohee (subject) and Professor Sohn (community) occurred when the latter suggested the teacher should create more opportunities for pupils to speak English. Also, the contradictions between Bohee (subject) and Mrs. Cho (community) and between Bohee (subject) and Mrs. Doh (community) were apparent when the mentor teachers proposed more choices for pupils about writing structure and topics. Since the suggestions by Professor Sohn and the mentor teachers were made after the model class at the end of the practicum, they did not

---

27 During the debriefing session, Sora asked a question related to this by using “authenticity” of writers’ identities and Mrs. Ma answered her question.
influence Bohee’s instruction. Thus, these contradictions were not really resolved, but Bohee justified her instruction by pointing out that she had met the requirements of the model class including proper classroom management and achievement of stated lesson goals. It seems that while conducting the model class, she chose to be safe and she demonstrated more controlled ways of implementing the curricular reforms. These contradictions simultaneously uncover another contradiction between professor Sohn, these mentor teachers (community) and the practicum teaching requirements (rule), since they suggested Bohee give pupils more freedom that would challenge some rules of this instructional activity system.

Overall, the contradictions in this activity system indicate Bohee’s careful consideration of pupils’ engagement in the instructional activities, her compliance with several contextual constraints, the power of the community for her, and her willingness to attempt to overcome some of those constraints and the power relationship. Most of the contradictions emerged through a collection and analysis of the model class and the debriefing conference. These contradictions were beyond whether the curricular reforms were implemented or not, but what kinds of teaching methods or techniques, both of which were mostly advocated by the curricular reforms, could enhance learning of particular groups of students. Since the curricular reforms recommended teachers use those techniques in controversy appropriately according to learners’ proficiency level and/or classroom context, the discussion about the model class was related to how to effectively foster the learning of particular groups of pupils in the classroom.
6.2.5. Summary

Due to her experience studying abroad and favorable learning and teaching experiences with communicative approaches, Bohee spoke English fluently and showed positive attitudes towards the CLT-based curricular reforms. Consequently, her instruction was mostly consistent with the curricular reform mandates: she used English extensively, conducted interesting and engaging activities, functioned as a facilitator for student learning, and addressed several components of communicative competence. Nonetheless, an examination of the instructional activity system from Bohee’s perspective and the resolution of the inner contradictions revealed how she struggled with the contextual constraints and the power of community over her, and how her agency played a role in attempting to overcome these while aligning her instructional practices to her ideals of the curricular reforms and English language teaching.

Her vision of teaching English was encouraging pupils’ engagement in interesting communicative activities, which she believed could stimulate pupils’ L2 use. This vision had been developed through her learning and teaching history (e.g., English camps) and she intended to transfer this vision and relevant instructional practices into the practicum teaching context. Thus, she made efforts to overcome pupils’ socialization into low classroom participation, learning English through Korean, and limited L2 use. By using English extensively in the classroom and communicating with her pupils in English, she was able to challenge her pupils’ socialization patterns of learning L2 through L1. However, her pupils used English sparingly, especially in small group activities, they rarely spoke English and relied instead on Korean. In addition, in order to enhance pupils’ engagement, she at times used Korean herself and allowed pupils’ use of Korean,
especially when she found her own use of English and having the pupils use English restricted their participation (specifically in low-level classes).

Particularly in the model class, pressure to complete the immediate practicum teaching requirements (classroom management and completion of the stated goals in lesson plan) mandated by the community (e.g., mentor teachers) at times constrained her from carrying out her ideals of ELT related to creating more opportunities for pupils’ L2 use. Also, the collaborative planning for the model class had her comply with the normative way of English teaching in Korean classroom settings. However, she was given license to actually teach as she wanted and thus was able to regain her agency and confidence in teaching. Moreover, discussions after her model class exposed her to various ways in which the curricular reforms might be enacted. As such, the practicum experience allowed her to contextualize her ideals about the curricular reform mandates, and overall despite contextual constraints, she was able to embrace several concepts of the curricular reforms within the context where her teaching was situated.

### 6.3. Jubin

Just as in the previous section on Bohee, this section addresses the second research questions of this study by examining how Jubin, a second student teacher in team B, comes to understand the curricular reforms and how she attempted to enact them in her practicum teaching. The present section describes her prior experiences in learning and teaching English and her practicum experiences (see Section 6.3.1), and then the configuration of the instructional activity system from Jubin’s perspective (Section 6.3.2). Six themes emerged from the data exploring her development as a teacher, focusing on
her perceptions of the curricular reform mandates, and her efforts to implement them (Section 6.3.3).

6.3.1. Previous English and Practicum Experiences

Jubin was educated in schools where English was the primary medium of instruction and, like Bohee, she spoke English fluently²⁸. Jubin was born in Korea and when she was in the 3rd grade, her family moved to Indonesia. She considers Korean to be her native language, but in academic settings she feels more comfortable using English. Overall, though, she has no problem using both languages in everyday life and educational contexts. She recalled that she frequently experienced group and project based work in her international schools.

Like the other student teachers, Jubin learned about the curricular reform mandates and a variety of teaching methods and theories through her university coursework. She found courses such as Educational Curricula and Teaching Materials in English Language Education helpful because they taught her about the current educational policy. The former course showed her how these reforms were located within the historical context of Korean national curricula, and the latter enabled her to analyze the textbooks published under the policy. In addition, the Methods of Teaching English as a Foreign Language course provided her with opportunities to learn various English teaching methods as well as demonstrate a lesson for a group project about CLT that was well received by her professor and peers. Moreover, in addition to learning how to produce and use multimedia materials, the course Educational Technology, which she

²⁸ The description of Jubin’s experiences in this section was mostly from the interview with her (Interview, June 8).
took in the same semester as the practicum, allowed her to learn how to plan a lesson and collaboratively reflect on video-recorded lessons. On the whole, she found university coursework helpful and she expressed her desire to conduct her lessons by utilizing the teaching methods that she learned in her coursework (Journal, May 1).

Just like Bohee, Jubin had teaching experiences prior to the practicum and found them useful during the practicum. She taught English by telephone (*Telephone English*) and tutored English to secondary school pupils. In addition, she observed an English language camp and learned multiple ways to teach English communication skills. Then while she actually taught advanced secondary school pupils in another camp for a month, she used debates and public speaking activities. However, she found these teaching experiences were not directly transferable to her practicum teaching due to the different instructional context (e.g., large class size, relatively low-proficiency and low motivated pupils). Despite this, she found her previous teaching experiences were helpful and wanted to apply some communicative activities she used in the English camps to the practicum classroom (Interview, June 8).

Jubin stated that throughout the practicum she gained confidence in both teaching in a large classroom setting and in increasing pupils’ participation and understanding. The journal entry at the conclusion of the practicum is an example of this:

처음에 했던 수업 두 세개는 내가 준비한 만큼 좋은 결과가 나오질 않아서 속상했던 때도 많았다--특히 둘째 주에는 수업이 끝나고 나오면서 좌절한 적도 있었다. … 다행히 셋째 주부터 수업을 하면서 마음이 편해지고 점차 더 여유로워졌다. 이제는 학생들 앞에 서도 멀리지 않고 이제는 재미있기까지 한다. 아이들이 내 수업에 잘 참여해 주고 또 원가 배우는 것 같을 때 정말 기쁘다.

*For the first couple of lessons, I was very disappointed because they didn’t go as well as I prepared. In particular, in the second week, I often felt frustrated after the class was over. … Fortunately, from the third week on, I came to feel more comfortable and relaxed. I was not that nervous in front of the pupils and I even felt excited. I was*
very happy when the pupils participated in my class actively and learned something from my class.

Here, Jubin mentioned that her disappointment with her initial lessons shifted as she became more comfortable and developed a sense of achievement. In addition, she was very proud of how much her pupils actively participated in her lessons and how much their learning improved.

Moreover, the practicum experience allowed her to feel very positive about becoming an English teacher. Though she considered the teaching profession to be challenging since teachers need to spend so much time teaching, and preparing classes and caring about pupils (Journal, May 11), in the end she found it to be a very satisfying job since she could support pupils’ learning and development (Journal, May 26; Interview, June 8). After graduation, she wanted to study in a graduate program in TESL in the U.S. and become an ESL or EFL teacher.

Since Jubin had direct experiences with communicative approaches in her schooling and prior teaching, she had a positive perception of CLT and wanted to adopt communicative activities in her lessons. Although she faced multiple institutional constraints, the practicum experiences enabled her to become a more confident teacher in the public school context and develop positive attitudes toward the ELT profession.

6.3.2. Configuration of the Instructional Activity System

Since Jubin and Bohee worked with the same mentor teacher and the same pupils, the instructional activity system where Jubin functioned as a subject looked similar to the one from Bohee’s perspective. However, Jubin’s beliefs, her orientation of certain objects,
her use of certain tools, and the extent of her adherence to certain rules generated a different range of instructional foci and contradictions than Bohee’s.

Figure 6.4. The Instructional Activity System from Jubin’s Perspective

The instructional activity system in which Jubin was the subject is represented in Figure 6.4. She had her own beliefs based on her experiences with communicative approaches in her schooling and previous teaching (subject) and intended to promote pupils’ L2 use and motivate them (object). Mediated by certain tools including the practicum activities, symbolic tools (Korean and English), and instructional tools (communicative activities, lesson plans, textbook, worksheets, exams, and supplemental materials), the object became transformed into the outcome, namely, enhanced pupils’ L2 use and participation.

Communicative activities were Jubin’s most principal tool since due to her firm beliefs about activity-based instruction, her lessons were mostly constructed around different kinds of activities. Although they were less explicitly or strictly imposed than in the team A practicum activities, the textbook and exams also functioned as tools in this
activity system. Jubin tried to cover the textbook sections that she was supposed to teach and develop communicative activities based on each textbook section. In addition, exams were used to garner her pupils’ attention to specific L2 knowledge (e.g., words and expressions) and her awareness of exams as a lesson goal led her to teach the reading section somewhat explicitly. However, unlike the team A student teachers, exams remained a peripheral instructional tool.

Just as the instructional activity system from Bohee’s perspective, the community of the instructional activity system was made up of Jubin’s pupils, peers and mentors in both within her own team and other teams. Specifically, Mr. Baek was an important community member who advised her lesson planning, observed her lessons, and gave her feedback. The rules of this instructional activity system were also similar to Bohee’s case. Norms of typical Korean classrooms such as pupils’ limited participation and L2 use were an important rule. Also, covering the content of the textbook for exams was a rule explicitly stated by Mr. Baek and implicitly imposed in English classrooms as well. Furthermore, the rules include completion of the practicum teaching requirements expected by the English division in the lab school, such as classroom management and completion of the stated goals in lesson plan. Meeting Mr. Baek’s expectations was also the rule of this activity system.

The division of labor in this instructional activity system is less hierarchical than the other student teachers in this study. Jubin frequently helped her pupils construct knowledge or meanings through communicative activities where they could write their own sentences and discourse, and express their ideas and opinions.
Overall, despite having the same mentor teacher and similar coursework and educational background, Jubin has different beliefs about ELT and used tools and rules differently from Bohee. For example, she had more flexible ideas about teachers using English and Korean, but more strong positions about using communicative activities in each lesson. Furthermore, although Jubin was also concerned about classroom management, she adhered less to micro-planning lessons and controlling or managing the pupils (rule) compared to Bohee who felt pressured to follow the expected rules specifically in the model class.

6.3.3. Understanding and Enacting the Curricular Reforms

The following grounded analysis uncovers more details about where each component of this instructional activity system comes from and how it looks. Moreover, the analysis also reveals both the present contradictions within this activity system and Jubin’s reactions to them, and consequently explicates how extensively she was able to implement the curricular mandates.

Six themes emerged from the analysis of Jubin’s data that elucidate her perceptions and enactment of the curricular reforms: 1) she used English and Korean flexibly; 2) she conducted communicative activities extensively; 3) she stimulated pupils’ L2 use; 4) she focused on fluency in pupils’ English use; 5) she helped pupils construct meaning in their learning process; 6) she consistently made efforts to enhance students’ communicative competence.
6.3.3.1. Teachers’ Flexible Use of English and Korean

Since Jubin experienced using English as the medium of instruction in her schooling and previous teaching, she spoke English fluently and had positive attitudes toward teachers’ use of English in the classroom setting. Her monitoring of other teachers’ language use in the practicum confirmed this belief. She observed successful lessons taught in English (Journal, May 2 and 3) and even gave suggestions to the native English speaking teachers’ communication classes about how to increase English input and interaction with pupils (Journal, May 4)\(^{29}\).

On the other hand, she recognized the need to be flexible about L1 and L2 use according to pupils’ proficiency levels: she found that low level pupils did not understand their teacher’s English very well (e.g., Bohee’s low level class), and she felt that using Korean would be more beneficial for them (Journal, May 16). Thus, whereas she attempted to use English more frequently in the advanced level class, she spoke Korean more frequently with the beginner level pupils. The interview excerpt indicates her rationale of her use of Korean for the low level pupils:

Data Excerpt 6.21. Jubin–Interview (June 8)

In the low level class, I mostly used Korean. If I had used English from the beginning, the pupils would have become overwhelmed and would not have used English at all. They are not confident in their English. ... So I just approached them in Korean at the beginning and used English for simple instructions such as “open your books.”

\(^{29}\) Like other student teachers, it seems that Jubin had higher expectations about L2 communications from English native speaking teachers’ conversation lessons than Korean English teachers’ regular English lessons.
Here, she thought that her use of English from the start in the low-proficiency class might have caused her pupils’ frustration and non-participation in class. Thus, she developed her own strategy in which, while she used Korean more, she spoke English in simple and repeated instruction. However, as the practicum progressed, Jubin realized that her use of Korean had been increasing due to the institutional constraint, as shown below:

Data Excerpt 6.22. Jubin–Interview (June 8)
저는 되도록이면 영어를 많이 사용하려고 했는데 수업을 하다보면 이렇게 한국어를 되게 많이 사용하게 되는 거 같아요. 저도 모르게… 애들이 더 잘 알아들고 반응이 더 있으니까. … 영어로 하면 약간 무표정. 알아듣는지 못 알아듣는지.

I wanted to use English as much as possible in class. But although I wasn’t aware of it, I think I came to use Korean more than I intended…. It looks like the pupils understood better and responded more actively if I spoke Korean…. To my English, it seems that they responded less. I wasn’t sure if they understood me or not.

In this excerpt, Jubin stated that since her pupils were more responsive when she spoke Korean than English, she found herself continuing to use Korean more than she planned. Thus, in the low level class, even for the high level pupils, it was observed that her use of Korean was slightly increasing as the practicum went on.

On the whole, due to her beliefs about and experiences in English learning and teaching, Jubin wanted to teach English through English. However, the contextual constraints created tension for her, so her pupils’ proficiency levels and reactions to her use of English made her choose L1 and/or L2 as the medium of instruction and flexibly use both English and Korean.
6.3.3.2. Extensive Use of Communicative Activities

Jubin’s experiences in and positive attitudes towards activity-based instruction enabled her to use various communicative activities in class in order to stimulate pupils’ engagement and use of English. She believed instructional activities to be essential and she used more than one activity in every class. She enjoyed using interesting activities because she felt it had a positive effect on her pupils’ learning (Journal, May 24).

Moreover, since she had no direct experience in Korean secondary schools either learning or teaching grammar, she felt more comfortable conducting activities than specifically teaching grammar as she stated, ‘제가 문법을 잘 못 가르치잖아요, 한국식으로. 그래서 더 그렇게 하는 것 같아요. (I don’t think I could teach grammar in the typical way it is taught in Korean classrooms. That’s why I focused more on activities.)’ (Jubin–Interview, June 8).30

Her preference of using activities persisted even when she taught the “study points” where key grammar, structures, expressions, words, and pronunciation were presented in the textbook. For example, while covering compound words, she did not use typical methods of teaching rules, meanings, and pronunciations (Lesson Plan 2). Instead, she conducted a small group activity in which the low level pupils worked in groups to put together two different words to make each compound word and had each group take turns telling about compound nouns they found. Moreover, Jubin’s activity-based orientation continued despite her awareness of the positive value of explicit instruction of grammar and reading sections, as recorded below:

30 Hanbi, a peer student teacher in Team B who was not focal in this study, mostly taught the grammar section. She was educated in the Korean public education system and familiar with English grammar instruction in Korean schools.
내일 형성평가를 위해서 (한비 교생선생님이 3학년 윌러반에서) 오늘 reading 본문 내용과 문법을 다시 정리해 주었다. 게임이나 activity 도 좋지만 가끔 이렇게 문법을 explicit 하게 제시해 주는 것도 필요하다고 생각한다. ... 내 생각에는 45 분 동안 문법 등을 explicit 하게 가르치는 것보다는 25분 정도 앞에서 다루고 남은 시간동안은 배운 활동을 직접 활용할 수 있는 activity 가 필요한 거 같다.

For the formative test tomorrow [in the 9th grade low level class, Hanbi] reviewed the content of the reading text and grammar. I think games and activities are very useful, but it might be also necessary to show grammar explicitly this way. ... In my opinion, rather than teaching grammar explicitly for the whole 45 minutes, it would be better to do so for the first 25 minutes and then for the remaining time, it’s necessary to conduct activities to make use of what they learned.

Here, by observing lessons taught by Hanbi (another student teacher in team B), as well as Mr. Baek’s mentoring (Conference, May 15-16), Jubin came to see that it would be useful to teach grammar and reading explicitly in preparation for school exams as well as for more effective activities (Journal, May 15). However, she maintained that grammar instruction should be followed by instructional activities where pupils could put the L2 knowledge they learned to use.

In fact, the consciousness of testing issue led Jubin to reflect on her teaching and this created dissonance for her concerning how to teach the reading section more effectively, as indicated in the following journal entry:

Since I plan a lesson considering the formative test, it seems that the focus of a class has changed from doing activities into working on handouts. I think that from the beginning of my teaching, I just conducted too many activities in order to create a fun atmosphere. It would be possible to do an activity-based class in “Look and say” section, but I think I need to teach with handouts in the first reading class [for advanced pupils] and then conduct activities in the second reading class.
In this excerpt, she realized that her lessons mostly consisted of instructional activities and felt it would also be necessary to include some explicit coverage of the reading text using worksheets. Consequently she spent two thirds of the first lesson using worksheets for the reading text, focusing on listening and reading comprehension checks. However, during the rest of the reading lessons, she conducted five different communicative activities for reading comprehension, expressing opinions and making sentences and stories, most of which enabled pupils to use English. Ultimately, her actual two reading lessons illustrated how she did foster more meaningful engagement and L2 use using a variety of communicative activities, instead of simply counting on the grammar and translation method as in a more traditional reading class.

The following table indicates that Jubin consistently used multiple activities in every class. In particular, she constantly used small group activities throughout the practicum teaching supplemented by both individual and whole class activities as well.

---

31 The instruction included 1) filling in the blanks while listening to the three letters, 2) underlining the writer’s opinion and filling in the chart of name, place, and opinion of each writer while going through the passage, 3) checking the meaning of words and expressions, 4) reviewing comprehension questions, and 5) summarizing one letter of pupils' choice.
### Table 6.2. Instructional Activities in Jubin’s Lessons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lesson Plans***</th>
<th>LP1</th>
<th>LP2</th>
<th>LP3</th>
<th>LP4</th>
<th>LP5</th>
<th>LP6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dates for Class C, D</td>
<td>May 11, 12</td>
<td>May 11, 15</td>
<td>May 19, 22</td>
<td>May 20, 24</td>
<td>May 23 (2 classes)</td>
<td>May 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade (level)</td>
<td>8⁰ (high)</td>
<td>9⁰ (low)</td>
<td>8⁰ (high)</td>
<td>8th (high)</td>
<td>9⁰ (low)</td>
<td>8th (high)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textbooks/activities</td>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td>Study Points 2</td>
<td>Reading 1</td>
<td>Reading 2; Activities</td>
<td>On your own, Writing</td>
<td>Special Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small group work</td>
<td>• Shrek/Fiona (opinions; presentation)</td>
<td>• Crossword puzzle</td>
<td>• Draw &amp; write experiences of foreigners living in Korea</td>
<td>• Complete the letters</td>
<td>• Make sentences II**</td>
<td>• Crossword puzzle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Making a dialogue/presentation</td>
<td>• Compound words</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Scrambled letters and making sentences* (Exc. 6.7)</td>
<td>• Fill in the dialogues of a comic strip* (Exc. 6.10)</td>
<td>• Jumble story</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual/Whole class work</td>
<td>• Writing opinions (adjectives)</td>
<td>• Poem riddle (warm-up quiz)</td>
<td>• Jumble story* (Exc. 6.8)</td>
<td>• Make sentences I* (Exc. 6.9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction/Exercise**</td>
<td>Textbook Questions</td>
<td>Vocabulary</td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Presented in classroom excerpts  
** Coverage of the textbook or worksheets without instructional activities  
*** For most lesson plans, Jubin taught two class sessions. Concerning Lesson Plan 6, she developed it, but due to another schedule on the last day of the practicum, Mr. Baek taught the class.

Instead of small group work, she sometimes considered using pair or individual work, due to difficulties controlling the level of noise (Journal, May 11, 12, and 16).

Although this noise issue generated tension between herself and her pupils, she continued to use various types of small group activities for the reason stated below:

Data Excerpt 6.25. Jubin–Interview (June 8)  
저는 [Lesson Plan 1을 사용한] 첫수업 때는 너무 시끄러워서 문제였는데… 저는 그래두 편안했던 거 같는데, 인체 맞을 많이 한다가 참여도가 좋고… 뒤에 참관하시는 선생님들이 너무 정신없었더라고… 근데 오히려 시끄러운 게 (조용한 반보다) 더 나았단 것 같아요….  
[Lesson Plan 1을 이용한] 그 다음 저는 제가 처음에 good morning 하니까 아이들이 반응이 없고, 맞을 안하니까 홍이 깨져서 그 다음부터 수업이 좀 점도 함이 없고 그랬던 거 같아요.  
My first class [using Lesson Plan 1] was problematic as it was too noisy. … It was okay with me since the pupils spoke a lot and participated in my class actively. … But other teachers who observed my class said that the class was too noisy … But I think the noisy class would be much better [than a quiet class]. In the next class [with lesson plan 1], when I said “Good morning” to the pupils, they showed little response. Since the pupils didn’t talk much, I didn’t feel excited about the class.
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In this excerpt, although observers of her first class criticized lack of noise control, she judged that classroom noise was due to high levels of engagement in the class and thus outweighed their tendency for non-responsiveness. Moreover, she adopted several classroom management techniques that allowed her to cause less noise from pupils while carrying out small group activities. For example, since having pupils sit in groups from the start of the class created too much noise, she reserved activities for the end of the class and had pupils move minimally to make groups only at the start of an activity (Interview, June 8). This adjustment shows that she had the ability to identify alternative ways to meet her goals.

Overall, Jubin utilized communicative activities as the unit of each lesson. Despite her awareness of the importance of explicit teaching of grammar and reading sections, she believed communicative activities where pupils could use their L2 knowledge should still be the core of all English lessons.

6.3.3.3. Stimulating Pupils’ L2 Use

Despite being aware of the importance of creating opportunities for pupils’ L2 use through extensive communicative activities, Jubin experienced tension in her instruction due to the institutional constraints such as a large class size, difficulties with noise control, and the norms of pupils’ language use and classroom participation. The interview excerpt below shows one example of this:

Data Excerpt 6.26. Jubin–Interview (June 8)

제가 처음에 약간 debate 식으로 스프링반에서 할려고 했었거든요/ 토론 좀 하게/ 근데 애들이 너무 많고 너무 시끄럽게 떠드는 거에요. 2학년은 통제가 안되서 네 그건 안할려구.

… 한 20명 안 됐어도 가능했을 텐데

At the beginning, I wanted to conduct debates in the advanced class so that they could have discussions. But there were so many pupils and they made so much noise.
Since it was very hard to control the advanced 8th grade pupils, I didn’t try that…. It would have been possible if I had had about 20 pupils in a class.

Here, Jubin wanted to use a debate activity in the advanced class in her first lesson. However, she had difficulty controlling the noise level in a large class and she decided not to try it. She also realized as constraints the pupils’ socialization pattern into limited L2 use and classroom participation as shown below:

Data Excerpt 6.27. Jubin–Interview (June 8)
In the case of high-proficiency pupils, if I asked them questions [in English], some pupils answered (in English), but it seems that they didn’t use [English] very often. In group work, they continued using Korean, not English…. If I asked them questions, they answered in English, but in a short word, not in a longer sentence.

In this excerpt, she stated that the pupils typically used rather simple English when they answered her questions using only a word or a short sentence. Also, she found that the pupils used Korean whenever they engaged in small group activities. Moreover, as shown below, although Jubin wanted her pupils to present their outcome of group work in front of class, she realized the pupils were reluctant to speak English in front of class:

[For the post-reading activity in the high-proficiency class] I gave the pupils three more minutes to write sentences after they drew. Then I collected the drawings, and I showed and explained them to the pupils. It would have been much better if I had asked them to come out in front and explain them. But if I had asked them to speak in English, they would have spoken very quietly and the other pupils would not have listened to the presenters and would have made too much noise. But it is important
to give the pupils opportunities to come out and make a presentation. I couldn’t do that because I didn’t have much time. When I have more time in the next class, I should assign pupils to take on the role of “speaker.”

Here, she read the pupils’ writing out loud for her pupils, justifying this practice by stating that it would improve classroom management (e.g., noise control) and help her deal with time limitations.

While Jubin did try to create opportunities for pupils’ L2 use, she had limited success getting them to use the L2 for meaningful purposes. In particular, contextual constraints discouraged her from stimulating pupils’ oral communication in English. However, at times she encouraged the pupils to present their work and/or communicate with her English as a whole class. At other times, rather than in spoken forms, she utilized activities where pupils could use English in writing activities.

6.3.3.4. Focusing on Fluency in Using English

Jubin was aware of the importance of developing students’ ability to use the L2 in spite of the contextual constraints. Thus, she conducted writing activities where both high- and low-proficiency pupils could use English, using teaching techniques appropriate to their levels. The sentence- and story-making activities for the high-level pupils (Lesson Plan 4) are illustrated below and they showed that Jubin was successful at stimulating participation and having them use English at both the sentence (decontextualized) and discourse levels (contextualized). In particular, she valued fluency over accuracy of their language use.

In the first activity below, groups of pupils were supposed to order scrambled letters to make a word (12 words in total) and then make several sentences for each word.
She planned this activity because she felt that “스프링반에서 아이들은 단어의 뜻은 다 알고 있지만 막상 문장 안에서 어떻게 사용되고 있는지는 잘 모르는 거 같다 (the high-proficiency pupils do know what words mean, but don’t know very much about how those words are actually used in sentences)” (Journal, May 19).

Classroom Excerpt 6.7. Jubin’s Lesson (May 24)
Scrambled letters & Sentence-making (“After You Read”)
High Level, 8th Grade, Lesson Plan 4 (3rd for High Level)
((1-17: “complete the letter” activity, putting each sentence under the right letter out of three))
((18-27: introduces “sentence-making activity” in English, using an example of “friend”))
((28-108: class work on “suddenly”, “accident”, “publish”, “remember”, and “care about”))

109 P6: ((Jubin shows a flash card “ecsra”) Scared. I am scared of a ghost.
110 Jubin: I am (.) scared (.) of a ghost. ((writes on board)) OK. Anybody else who can make a sentence (xxx) “scare”?
112 P7: Me, me!
113 P8: ((points out P8 out of those who raise a hand)) I made him scared.
114 Jubin: I made him scared.
115 P9: I was so scared that I couldn’t open my eyes.
116 Jubin: I was (xxx) that 책에 나왔어요. (xxx)
It is from the textbook.
117 P10: I’m scared when I saw a murder.
118 Jubin: I’m scared when I saw a murder. ((writes on board))
((119-145: work on “bark” and “public”))
146 P11: ((shows a flash card “npoioin”) Opinion. In my opinion, you should
147 Jubin: You should what?
148 P11: Go to bed early.
149 Jubin: Go to bed early. ((writes on board))
150 Jubin: 누가 더 멋있는 문장 만들 수 있는 사람.
Can anyone make a more impressive sentence?
151 P12: 저요/
Me!
((152-159: one pupil read aloud the sentence he made “please listen to my opinion”))
160 P13: In my opinion, you should not play with your dog.
161 Jubin: In my opinion, you should not play with your dog. Ok/ ((on board))
162 그리고 이 그룹이
Then this group
163 P14: I have an opinion to a public newspaper.
164 Jubin: OK/I have an opinion to a public newspaper. ((writes on board))
((165-210: continue working on the activity with “mostly” and “lonely”))

In this activity, rather than just repeating sentences from the textbook (line 116), Jubin encouraged the pupils to come up with their own sentences (line 150), and the
pupils were able to produce two to four sentences for each word. Since her goal was to have her pupils engage in the activity, she did not necessarily focus on accuracy, but valued their attempt of using English. Thus, when her pupils made grammatically or pragmatically inappropriate sentences (lines 109-110, 117-118, 160-161, and 163-164), she did not correct them but accepted whatever they offered.  

The next activity for the high-proficiency pupils had the individuals use English at the discourse level, namely, to write and present a story in which they picked a character and a setting from the list and used words they learned in class.

Classroom Excerpt 6.8. Jubin’s Lesson (May 24)

Jumble Story (“After You Read”)
High Level, 8th Grade, Lesson Plan 4 (3rd for High Level)
((On board are the lists of characters, settings and lists of words learned from the textbook))
((213-223: introduces the activity in English; pupils ask questions about the activity))

Æ P16: 선생님 개인전이에요.
Teacher, is it an individual work?

Æ Ps: 개인전.
Individual work.

Æ Jubin: (xxx)
P17: 선생님 character 세번째는 뭐에요./
Teacher, what is the third character?

Æ P18: Musician.

Æ Jubin: (xxx)
P19: One day, one college student visited a library. When he was studying, a gang sat beside him. He was very scared. He said to gangs, “Go out. Here is the public place.” (xxx). Suddenly the gangs surrounded (xxx) and said “Care about your body” Then (xxx) ((some giggle)) there was a big accident. Until now, he doesn’t want to (xxx) that (xxx).

Æ Ps: 와.

32 More appropriate sentences might be as follows: I’m scared of ghosts or I was scared by a ghost; I was scared when I saw a murder; I don’t think you should play with your dog; I have an opinion about a public newspaper article.
33 Jubin listed seven characters and settings in the prompt. The seven characters were a new mother, a college student, a musician, a 93-year-old woman, an alien from outer space, a restaurant owner, and a homeless child. The settings include a party, an expensive restaurant, a shopping mall, a park, a college library, a concert hall, and an old farmhouse.
34 Jubin listed 10 words and three structures (“who/which”, “so—that”, and “I think”).
35 See Appendix H for the handout/worksheet.
The pupils actively engaged in the activity, initiating questions about the nature of the activity (lines 224-225) and meanings of words from the activity prompt (line 228). After working individually, three pupils had a chance to give a presentation based on their stories (lines 232-246). Although she was aware that the stories were rather awkward and pupils made grammatical mistakes, she gave positive feedback (lines 239 and 246) rather than pointing out errors. The excerpt below shows her intention behind the activity:

Activity 2에서 review 하고 문장 만든 단어들을 가지고 story 를 쓰게 만들었다. 그냥 쓰라고 말하면 막막할 거 같아서 characters 7 명, setting 7 개 중에서 골라서 story 를 만들 수 있게 했다. 시간을 한 15 분 정도 충분히 주니깐 정말 좋은 글들이 많이 나왔다. 문법이 퍼 둘러 아이들도 있었지만 한 페이지씩 채워서 글을 creative 하게 쓰는 아이들이 많았다.
I asked the pupils to write a story using the words that were reviewed and used to make sentences in activity 2. I thought they might not have known where to start if I had asked them to write freely. So I had them choose one each out of seven characters and seven settings and write a story. Since I gave them sufficient time, 15 minutes, they wrote very well. Although some pupils produced many ungrammatical sentences, many pupils wrote a creative story in a full length of one page.

This journal entry reveals that Jubin carefully structured the activity to facilitate pupils’ participation and use of English, and she felt satisfied with what they produced. Again, she praised her pupils’ efforts to make a story and focused on the aspect of fluency of L2 use, despite her recognition of grammatical inaccuracy of pupils’ writing.
For the low-proficiency pupils, Jubin also used writing activities similar to what she did for upper level pupils (Lesson Plan 4). The following two excerpts from one class hour (Lesson Plan 5) illustrate how she encouraged the beginner pupils to use English to make sentences (decontextualized) and dialogues (contextualized). Despite these pupils’ limited proficiency, they actively engaged in the activities, as shown in the classroom excerpt.

Classroom Excerpt 6.9. Jubin’s Lesson (May 23)
Sentence-making (“Let’s Write”)
Low level, 9th Grade, Lesson Plan 5 (2nd for Low Level)
((1-9: introduces the activity))
10 ⇒ Jubin: 자 stand in line 으로 문장 한번 만들어 볼 사람. Any volunteers?
OK. Does anyone want to make a sentence using stand in line?
11 ⇒ (…)
12 ⇒ Jubin: P1. 나는 지금 줄을 서고 있다.
P1. I am standing in line.
13 P1: I am standing
14 Jubin: I am standing ((writes on board))
15 P1: In line
16 ⇒ Jubin: In line. OK. 나는 줄 서는 걸 싫어한다.
I hate standing in line.
17 P2: I hate
18 Jubin: I hate 뭐에요. I hate (...) I hate
What?
19 P2: (xxx)
20 ⇒ Jubin: I hate standing in line. 다 적었어요. 여기다가 적으세요/
Did all of you write down these sentences? Write them down right here (on a worksheet).
((21-25: pupils ask questions about copying sentences and Jubin answer))
((26-53: pupils present four sentences using “crazy about”))
54 ⇒ Jubin: OK. Very good. OK/ (...) 이런 표현들이 시험에도 나올 수 있으니깐
As these expressions can be on the exam, (please remember them). ((pupils copy the sentences))
((55-72: Jubin and pupils make sentences using “and so on” and “birthday” respectively))
((73-81: introduce the small group work to make sentences))
((82-90: pupils work on “stand in line”))
⇒((91-110: “Many people are standing in line” and “Many people hate standing in line”))
111 ⇒ Jubin: 이거 말고 다른 문장 있는 사람. (...) 다른 문장 만든 사람 (...) 없어요/
Can anyone make other sentences than these? (... Anybody? (...)
Nobody?
112 ⇒ P7: I hate standing in line.
113 ⇒ Jubin: I hate standing in line.
((pupils are very noisy and Mr. Baek asks the pupils to be quiet))
In this activity, Jubin asked her pupils to make sentences using 3-4 expressions individually (lines 1-72) and then in groups (lines 73-146). When Jubin planned this activity, she was very concerned about the level of difficulty. Since she did not want the low level pupils to give up, she decided to use easier and a smaller number of words and expressions than she originally planned (Journal, May 22). In addition, the activity for the low level pupils was much more controlled, and their use of the L2 was much more limited than that of the high level pupils (Lesson Plan 4, Classroom Excerpt 6.7). Since they appeared to have difficulty making sentences (lines 10-12), Jubin offered Korean translations to facilitate the activity (lines 12 and 16) rather than having pupils make their own sentences freely. Also, due to the pupils’ limited L2 ability, when sentences in group work were produced without Jubin’s providing Korean equivalents, they were not new, but similar to those of the individual work (lines 91-110, and 112-113). Finally, she got them to copy the sentences on a worksheet to promote learning (lines 21-25) and in order to focus their attention, she warned them that the expressions could be on the exam (line 54).

The last activity for the low level pupils (Lesson Plan 5) was to make a dialogue using a comic strip as shown below.

Classroom Excerpt 6.10. Jubin’s Lesson (May 23)
Fill in the Dialogues of a Comic Strip (“Let’s Write”)
Low level, 9th Grade, Lesson Plan 5 (2nd for Low Level)
150→ Jubin: 시간이 10 분 남았는데 (..) 만화를 주겠다요.
151→ Ps: 와

10 minutes remaining before class ends. (..) I’ll give you a comic strip.

((152-154: distributes a comic strip for each pupil))
155→ Jubin: 우리가 배운 표현들로 대화를 채워보세요. ((pupils work in groups))
Please fill in the dialogues with the expressions we learned.

156 Jubin: OK. Everyone. Let’s look at the example. ((shows transparency))

157 ((Bell rings))

158 P2: (xxx)

159 ((Jubin reads aloud one group’s dialogue))

160 Jubin: Hey. OK When is your birthday? My birthday is October 7th. What’s your name? My name (.) is (xxx). Where are you from? I’m from Korea. I don’t have any friends. What is (...) your dog’s name?

163 Yeah, very good. OK. Everybody. Try to finish.

164 P3: 와 1등이다

Wow. Our group is the winner!

In this excerpt, groups of pupils made their own conversation consisting of eight turns represented in the comic strip. They were excited at the new material, the comic strip (line 151), and carrying out the activity. The journal note below reveals her reflections on the activity:


[3학년] Winter 반 학생들은 문장을 아직은 잘 못 만들고 또 worksheet 이나 blank paper 를 쓰여 쓰라고 하면 잘 안썼 거 같았다. 만화에 있는 대화 상자에 글을 자기가 야는 표현을 사용해서 쓰고 또 조금 더 재미있게 글을 쓸 수 있게 하였습니다. 10 분이라는 시간을 충분히 주고, 제일 잘한 거 같은 (group 에) OHP 를 채워 쓰라고 하고 학생들에게 보여 주었다. 이 수업을 통해 아이들의 글쓰기 실력을 확인할 수 있었는데 생각보다 많이 실패할 거 같다. 문법도 많이 틀리고 정확한 간단한 단어 철자도 많이 틀렸다.

I did this activity because the low-proficiency pupils [in the 9th grade] could not make proper sentences very well and if a worksheet or a blank sheet is given, they may be reluctant to write on it. I thought that with dialogue boxes in a comic strip, they would be able to enjoy writing using the expressions they know. I gave them sufficient time, 10 minutes, gave a transparency to [a group] that I thought did best and had them write their work in it. Through this class, I was able to check the pupils’ writing ability, which looks more problematic than I thought. There were so many ungrammatical sentences and incorrect word spellings.

Jubin used this activity with the low-proficiency pupils, because she felt using a comic strip would stimulate their interest in using English more than other typical materials. In addition, while she was aware of the importance of accuracy, she did not actually attempt to correct their mistakes.
Overall, Jubin’s instruction generated pupils’ English use for both high and low level classes, especially in written communicative activities rather than oral ones due to the contextual constraints. In particular, she placed her pupils’ efforts to use the language over how they used it correctly. With Jubin’s support, while some pupils could use English more creatively, some students did not yet have the skills to use English creatively due to their English ability and socialization into learning English in more traditional ways (e.g., learning about L2 knowledge rather than using the L2).

6.3.3.5. Helping Pupils Learn and Construct Meaning

Jubin’s instruction was particularly learner-centered in that she frequently helped pupils build their own knowledge and construct meanings in English. More specifically, she preferred conducting activities where pupils could use English more “creatively” without seeking specific accurate answers. While observing Mrs. Cho’s lesson at the beginning of the practicum, she confirmed this belief as below:

Data Excerpt 6.31. Jubin–Journal (May 2)

(조선생님의 1 학년 수업에서는) 학생들이 creative 하게 문장 5 개를 작문하게 만들고 앞에 세명이 대표로 나가게 칠판에 쓴다. 다 같이 읽고 고친다. 다른 학생이 쓴 글을 보며 학생들은 더 많은 것을 배우고 적극적으로 참여하게 되는 거 같다. ... Creative 하게 문장 만들기. 확실한 정답이 없는 게 좋은 거 같다. ...학생들이 창의적이게 글을 짓을 수 있도록 여러가지 가능한 예도 들어주고, 창의적이게 쓴 학생에게는 1 점을 더 주기도 했다.

[For the 7th graders, Mrs. Cho] asked the pupils to make five sentences creatively and called upon three volunteer pupils to write them on the board. Then she read the sentences and corrected them together. By looking at other pupils’ writing, the pupils seemed to learn more and participate more actively.... The activity was to have pupils make creative sentences. I think activities having no correct answers like this would be great to use. ... She showed some possible models so that the pupils could compose creatively. She also gave one point to those who wrote creative sentences.

She noted that this writing activity was helpful to increase pupils’ practice of their L2 use and also that of peer pupils who would observe each other’s writing. Additionally,
she realized the importance of the teacher role for guiding and promoting pupils’ using
the L2. Thus, as seen in the earlier section, she frequently used activities in which
students made their own sentences and expressed their opinions. She accepted pupils’
knowledge as legitimate and valued their creative attempts at using English.

Clearly, she functioned as a facilitator for pupils’ learning. She provided useful
materials to carry out activities and provided help if asked. In addition, she created a
comfortable atmosphere for the pupils to participate and some of her activities allowed
them to play with language (Lesson 2, “compound nouns”). Moreover, she promoted her
pupils’ learning by being sensitive to their proficiency levels, interests, and responses.
These considerations were already taken into account when she observed mentor
teachers’ lessons at the start of the practicum (Journal, May 3).

Jubin was sensitive to pupils’ proficiency levels. At the beginning of the
practicum, she stated that she should plan more challenging activities for the advanced
pupils, but keep the beginners interested in activities mainly due to their low motivation
and proficiency levels (Journal, May 4, 9, and 10). Overall, it was observed in her
teaching practices that the activities for low-proficiency pupils were more guided and
those for high-proficiency pupils were less guided, having them express their opinions
and ideas36. Specifically in writing activities, she encouraged high-proficiency pupils to
make more creative sentences (Classroom excerpt 6.7-8), whereas she scaffolded low-
proficiency pupils using Korean by getting them to make equivalent English sentences
(Classroom excerpt 6.9).

36 The activities included writing opinions about movie characters, people or objects (Lesson Plan 1), living
in Korea as a foreigner (Lesson Plan 3), and writing a story (Lesson Plan 4). 287
In addition, Jubin was clearly aware that it is important to consider pupils’ interests in the selection of activities and examples. For instance, she used various materials such as animation clips (from *Shrek*) and photos of celebrities (Lesson Plan 1), and used interesting activities such as drawing a picture (Lesson Plan 3), writing a story (Lesson Plan 4), and writing a dialogue in a comic strip (Lesson Plan 5).

Overall, Jubin did demonstrate a thorough understanding of how to create learner-centered instruction in accordance with the curricular reform mandates. She was sensitive to learners’ needs and rather than transmitting knowledge, she fostered their creativity in using English and helped them build their own knowledge and meanings.

**6.3.3.6. Consistent Efforts to Improve Communicative Competence**

In light of the curricular reform initiatives, Jubin dealt with developing grammatical, sociolinguistic, and discourse competence. However, like the other student teachers’ lessons, strategic competence was rarely addressed in her lessons.

While Jubin did very little explicit grammar instruction, she did teach word meanings and expressions, and word and sentence structures. Unlike team A student teachers who typically explained rules and then conducted repetition drills, she used small group activities where the pupils were expected to figure out how two words make up a compound noun (Lesson Plan 2) or make sentences using words and expressions (Lesson Plan 4, Classroom Excerpt 6.7; Lesson Plan 5, Classroom Excerpt 6.9).

When Jubin covered the communication functions (Lesson Plan 1) and cultural differences in the reading text (Lesson Plan 3), aspects of sociolinguistic competence were covered in a more expansive way. In the first lesson, she suggested alternative ways
of expressing the communication functions presented in the textbook\textsuperscript{37} and practiced them with some pupils as a whole class, and conducted small group activities where her pupils made sentences and dialogues using these expressions. In particular, she attempted to contextualize pupils’ language use by giving them specific contexts through movie clips and visual materials. In a post-reading activity, she promoted pupils’ cultural awareness by asking them to pretend to be foreigners living in Korea and draw, describe, and present their experiences.

Discourse competence was addressed in two different ways. First, in order to cover the genre of a letter, she had the students order sentence strips according to three different letter types from the textbook (Lesson plan 4). In addition, she had them make dialogues (Lesson Plans 1, 5) and write stories (Lesson Plan 4), all of which required them to use language beyond the sentence level. Thus, these activities were geared toward building their awareness of coherence in extended texts within certain genres (Ministry of Education, 1998).

Strategic competence was rarely the focus of Jubin’s instruction. Since she frequently used English in class, some pupils may have indirectly observed how she maintained communication in English. Nonetheless, since her pupils’ oral production was quite limited and they were allowed to speak Korean, they had little use for L2 communication strategies or opportunities to practice them.

\textsuperscript{37} The communication functions presented in the textbook is as follows:
- Making offers and acceptance or refusal–A: Do you want some more bulgogi? B: Yes, please/No, thanks.

The additional expressions proposed by Jubin are as follows: “Would you like some ~”, “Yes, please. I’m starving”, “Yes, please. I didn’t eat lunch yet”, “No, thanks, I have [an] allergy” “No, thanks. I’m full” “No, thanks. I have to sleep now.”
6.3.4. Inner Contradictions in the Instructional Activity System

Multiple inner contradictions emerged within the instructional activity system in which Jubin functioned as a subject. The four levels of contradictions characterized in figure 6.5 are explained in the following section.

Figure 6.5. Contradictions in the Instructional Activity System from Jubin’s Perspective

6.3.4.1. Primary Contradictions

A prominent primary contradiction appeared within the subject, Jubin, in terms of teaching grammar and the reading section and using communicative activities. Mr. Baek’s advice about teaching for exams and observations of her peer student teacher’s (Hanbi’s) explicit grammar instruction allowed her to consider the necessity of teaching reading and grammar more explicitly. However, she believed that communicative activities are essential for every English lesson. (Data Excerpt 6.23) As a result, while
attempting to teach the reading section more explicitly, she spent more time on carrying out several communicative activities (Data Excerpt 6.24; Lesson Plan 3-4).

Another primary contradiction was present in terms of Jubin’s language for instruction. She regarded her use of English helpful to improve her pupils’ English ability. At the same time, however, since she felt Korean would be useful to enhance low level pupils’ comprehension (Journal, May 16), she used Korean for them very frequently. Moreover, since she perceived that both levels of pupils were more responsive when she spoke Korean than English (Data Excerpt 6.22), she comfortably code-switched from English to Korean even in high-proficiency class.

### 6.3.4.2. Secondary Contradictions

Secondary contradictions emerged between (1) subject and community, (2) community and rule, (3) subject and rule, (4) tool and rule, and (5) community and division of labor.

Two prominent secondary contradictions occurred between Jubin (subject) and pupils (community) in terms of communicative activities and classroom management.

Firstly, at the start of the practicum, Jubin intended to conduct activities where pupils could exchange their ideas in English such as a debate (Data Excerpt 6.26). However, her pupils were too noisy and there were too many students to conduct these activities. This suggests that institutional constraints and classroom management issues discouraged her from carrying out some of the curricular reform directives.

Secondly, later in the practicum, she dealt with the classroom management issue differently. Although she wanted to conduct small group activities with proper classroom
management, difficulty controlling pupils’ noise level got her to think about switching these activities into individual or pair activities (Journal, May 9, 11, 12; Interview, June 8). The way she resolved this contradiction was to attempt to reduce pupils’ noise using new management techniques (Interview, June 8) in order to continue to use small group activities where pupils could collaborate with one another.

These two contradictions above simultaneously reveal other contradictions between pupils (community) and well managed class (rule) and between communicative activities (tool) and classroom management (rule), because while pupils engaged in communicative activities, the issue of classroom management or noise control emerged. Overall, the teacher gradually found the way to overcome classroom management issues and was able to continue to employ small group activities in her classes.

Two additional noteworthy secondary contradictions occurred between Jubin (subject) and community (pupils) in terms of L2 use. While Jubin wanted to have her pupils use the L2 for communication more actively, they used it in a very limited way (Data Excerpt 6.27). Thus, these contradictions reveal an additional contradiction between Jubin (subject) and pupils’ limited participation and L2 use (rule) since she wanted to overcome such norms and make them use English more actively.

First, while she wanted to have her pupils present their work in English in a more confident way, they were rather shy and reluctant. The resolutions of this contradiction were shown in two ways: at times she read their work aloud, especially when she did not have enough time to wait for them to do so (Data Excerpt 6.28), and at other times, she set aside time for the pupils to volunteer to present their work and attempted to communicate with them in English (Classroom Excerpts 6.8).
Secondly, in the writing activities, when Jubin asked her pupils to make new sentences using the words or expressions they learned from classes (Classroom Excerpt 6.7, 6.9), they often brought up ones from the textbook or similar ones. This contradiction was not really resolved, but she continued to encourage her pupils to produce more creative or impressive examples, and some pupils (mostly high level) did while some (mostly low level pupils) did not. This contradiction uncovers another contradiction between pupils (community) and division of labor of this instructional activity system in that despite the teacher’s support, pupils sometimes had difficulty building their own knowledge in English. As a result, a discrepancy arose between the rules and the division of labor in this instructional activity system. Although the rules included those of typical English classrooms such as limited pupils’ L2 use and participation, the division of labor was that the teacher helped her pupils construct their own meaning.

Overall, these two contradictions reveal how the norms of pupils’ class participation and language use (rules) can work against or change the way a teacher embraces the curricular reforms.

6.3.5. Summary

As a fluent English speaker who had learned and taught in learner-centered and task-based instructional contexts, Jubin had very positive attitudes toward the CLT-based curricular reforms. Thus, her instruction had many features that aligned with the curricular reform initiatives. She was very sensitive to her pupils’ proficiency levels and interests. More importantly, she frequently overcame the way her pupils were socialized by fostering pupils’ L2 use and meaning-making in writing activities. Also, she made
efforts to improve several components of students’ communicative competence. In particular, the way in which she was able to resolve the relevant secondary contradictions indicates her struggle with the institutional constraints and the overall success at sustaining her beliefs and practices that were consistent with the curricular reform initiatives.

Jubin’s vision of teaching English developed through her teaching and learning history was to have pupils use the L2 in communicative activities. She clearly had firm beliefs about communicative activities as shown in a primary contradiction resulting in positioning them over explicit grammar and reading instruction. Furthermore, the way that relevant secondary contradictions were resolved indicated how she made efforts to apply her ideals to the practicum teaching. At the beginning of the practicum, she intended to directly transfer the communicative activities (e.g., debate) that she used in her previous teaching experience (e.g., English camps) to the practicum teaching. Due to problems controlling noise and the big class size, she decided not to use it. Instead, since she became aware of pupils’ difficulty in using the L2 in oral communication, she conducted writing activities where pupils could use English more actively, specifically focusing on fluency rather than accuracy. Thus, in her attempt to carry her conceptions of teaching and instructional practices established in her previous teaching site to the practicum teaching, she gradually modified the practices to fit the practicum context while attempting to maintain her beliefs about good teaching.

Jubin’s data shows the impact of institutional constraints such as classroom management issues and pupils’ socialization into limited participation and L2 use (rules of the instructional activity system from Jubin’s perspective) in enacting the curricular
reforms and her vision of teaching. At the start of the practicum, she could not apply her ideals due to such constraints. However, as the practicum teaching progressed, she wanted to surmount them, and despite limitations, overall she succeeded in applying her ideals of teaching to her instructional context. Nonetheless, she still could not overcome the deeply rooted rule of this instructional activity system that limited pupils’ use of English in oral communication specifically between themselves.

In conclusion, over the course of the practicum, the contextual constraints appeared to inhibit Jubin from enacting the ideals of the educational reform in the case of her flexible use of Korean and limited oral communicative activities. However, Mr. Baek’s flexible advising manner and Jubin’s firm beliefs about CLT enabled her to overcome some constraints and enact most of the curricular reform directives. Moreover, specifically through writing activities for both high and low level pupils, her conceptualization of teaching English as creating opportunity for pupils’ L2 use was adapted in accordance with her practicum teaching context. Overall, in spite of institutional constraints, Jubin was able to enact several curricular reform concepts over the course of the practicum experience.

6.4. Conclusion

This chapter offers evidence of the challenges these student teachers faced in the context of their practicum teaching and of how they coped with them while extensively embracing the current educational policy.

The practicum provided Bohee and Jubin with their first teaching experiences in the Korean public school system and enabled them to adjust their conception of teaching.
to this specific setting. Unlike Mrs. Ma in team A, Mr. Baek was quite open with his
student teachers and allowed them to try out new ideas and activities. Despite this, rules
of the instructional activity systems in which Bohee and Jubin functioned as subjects,
namely, the mentor teacher’s suggestions, the institutional constraints (pupils’ restricted
participation and L2 use) and the practicum teaching requirements (classroom
management and completion of stated goals in lesson plan) all influenced the student
teachers’ instruction. For example, they increased their use of Korean to enhance
participation from low level pupils. This clearly contradicts the claims of the Ministry of
Education and other literature (Choi, 2000; S.-Y. Kim, 2002; Li, 1998; Liu et al, 2004;
Nunan, 2003) that teachers’ own low speaking ability is the cause of their not teaching
English through English since these two student teachers who spoke native-like English
frequently employed Korean to teach the low level pupils. In addition, neither student
teacher could fully overcome the way the pupils were socialized into using Korean in the
English classroom: thus, despite frequent L2 communications between the teacher and
the pupils, the pupils’ use of English was limited and almost non-existent during small
group activities.

The findings also reveal the fact that the student teachers’ individual experiences
and beliefs about language learning and teaching were influential in the extent to which
and/or in what ways they were able to embrace the curricular reforms. Since Bohee and
Jubin had positive learning and teaching experiences with, and attitudes toward
communicative approaches, they made concerted efforts to embrace those approaches in
the classroom\(^38\). Thus, each mostly functioned as a facilitator and a resource supplier to

\(^{38}\) Unlike Sora and Yuna, Bohee and Jubin may not be usual representative student teachers in the public
English language education system in Korea in that they were educated abroad in elementary and/or
students’ learning and attempted to increase student motivation and classroom participation by using a variety of communicative activities.

On the other hand, in spite of their similarity in their own schooling, and previous teaching experiences, university coursework, and the practicum activities, the focus on enacting the curricular reforms was different for each teacher. In terms of language use, while Bohee had strong beliefs concerning teachers’ exclusive use of English, Jubin comfortably added Korean, but held firm beliefs about having both high and low level pupils use the L2. In addition, Bohee and Jubin had somewhat different conceptions of what constituted a good activity. Bohee, except in the model class, mostly used interesting game-like activities in which pupils could actively engage while seeking answers and learning expressions. Conversely, Jubin believed that activities should be included in all lessons and were needed to stimulate pupils’ use of English while pupils expressed their ideas and made creative discourse. Moreover, the practicum teaching requirements were more influential on Bohee since she taught the model class where she felt she had to both match the norms of the practicum teaching and satisfy the observers’ expectations. Lastly, while Bohee experienced more contradictions within herself and with other community members, largely due to her model class assignment, Jubin experienced fewer conflicts since she did not teach a model class and thus, her lessons were commented on far less than those of Bohee’s.

secondary schools where English was the medium of instruction and they spoke English very fluently. Nonetheless, the two participants may still represent a certain portion of future teachers, as student teachers who have studied abroad and speak English fluently have increased within English language departments. In particular, those who have similar educational backgrounds as Bohee and Jubin do exist in English language departments due to the department admission system which allows those who resided in foreign countries for more than certain years to apply for the openings only reserved for them. Moreover, since the new government proposed that they will recruit teachers who are fluent English speakers and educate them so that they could teach English through English in Korean English classrooms, there may be those who have similar educational background and English ability to Bohee and Jubin.
In learning to teach English in the practicum, the two student teachers represent teacher development at a similar point of transformation but with different concentration. Both of them intended to align instructional practices to their instructional vision. Additionally, they wanted to carry the vision and instructional practices from their previous teaching context to the current practicum context. However, the contextual constraints (pupils’ limited participation and L2 use) led them to modify their instruction to the specific setting. While Bohee’s conception of teaching was to have pupils engage in interesting L2 communicative activities, the constraints at times led her to prioritize pupils’ engagement over their language use. On the other hand, Jubin’s vision for teaching was engaging pupils to use English, and the constraints led her to implement more writing than speaking activities where pupils can use English more actively. In other words, whereas Bohee thought engaging activities could generate pupils’ L2 use, which at times got her low level pupils to continue to use the L1, Jubin’s writing activities directly aimed to create pupils’ L2 use for both high level and low level pupils, but pupils mostly used the L1 for oral communication.

To conclude, over the course of the practicum Bohee and Jubin were able to achieve the curricular reform mandates more extensively than the team A student teachers. This was due to their positive learning and teaching experiences with communicative approaches and Mr. Baek’s open mentoring style (in spite of his insufficient guidance), while individual differences in beliefs about language learning led to individualized approach in how they enacted the curricular reforms. At the same time, the findings show that institutional constraints, particularly students’ socialization into language use (e.g. limited spoken L2 communication or learning English through Korean)
persisted even in communicative classrooms. For student teachers who have less authority over the classroom and pupils, it would be hard to change the norms that have been established by their mentor teachers and thus, represent the status quo in the typical English classroom in Korea. This implies that educational reforms should consider various institutional constraints already in place which appear to be influential in framing the extent to which pre-service teachers are able to teach according to these reforms.
CHAPTER SEVEN

DISCUSSION

Several significant findings emerged from this investigation of student teachers’ practicum experiences within the CLT-based curricular reforms in a South Korean middle school. This study used sociocultural theory and activity theory as the theoretical lens through which to trace all four participating student teachers’ various degrees of development in terms of the internalization, reconceptualization, and recontextualization of the concepts embedded in the curricular reform efforts. This chapter discusses several issues related to their concept development as well as a cross-case analysis of both practicum teams. Since each individual’s development was largely depended on their language and schooling biographies, the nature of their participation in the practicum activities, and the institutional context in which the practicum was situated, such individual, social, and institutional factors are discussed first. Then the interplay between everyday and scientific concepts and the challenges of enacting the concepts embedded in the curricular reform by the student teachers are discussed. This chapter concludes with a discussion of a sociocultural analysis of teacher learning in the context of curricular reform.

7.1. Conceptual Development of Student Teachers

An analysis of the curriculum manual revealed that the basic tenets of the curricular reforms which the Ministry of Education attempted to impose on English teachers in Korea include (1) communicative competence as a learning goal, (2) English
as a means of classroom communication, (3) communicative activities and task-based instruction, and (4) learner-centered instruction. This study indicates that the four participating student teachers showed uneven and nonlinear development in their understanding and internalization of these concepts.

Sora and Yuna, the team A student teachers, seemed to develop several pseudoconcepts of the curricular reform concepts. Although they displayed a general sense of what constituted each concept, they did not really understand the concept at a deeper or higher cognitive level, nor were they able to enact it. Although Sora and Yuna intended to enact learner-centered instruction using various instructional activities, they were found to teach in a teacher-controlled way, stressing grammatical accuracy, and focusing on teaching knowledge about the L2. While they expressed a concern to teach for the students’ benefit, in reality, they were found to cover the content of the textbook with the goal of obtaining pupils’ high test scores. In so doing, their pupils were usually considered as passive participants in the process of learning who should be carefully nurtured and controlled by the teacher rather than active agents, using the language on their own behalf. Furthermore, when the team A student teachers attempted task-based instruction, they typically followed the procedures of mechanical drill and practice that emphasized accuracy over communication. Consequently, their classroom practices suggest that Sora and Yuna did not fully internalize the concepts embedded in the curricular reforms and the goals of developing learners’ communicative competence through L2 use were not fully enacted.

Despite some similarities, these two student teachers showed different degrees of internalization. Sora expressed a conscious understanding of what the curricular reforms
were, but had not internalized them nor was she able to enact them in her instructional practices. Because her initial attempts to enact the curricular reform concepts failed at the beginning of the practicum she was found to return to traditional teaching approaches and continued to teach non-communicatively throughout the remaining practicum. In contrast, Yuna appeared to have begun the process of internalizing some of these concepts, for example, the use of English as the language for classroom communication, but ended up minimizing it due to the more immediate goals of teaching knowledge about the L2 for school-based exams.

In contrast, the team B student teachers, Bohee and Jubin were able to internalize the concepts more deeply than the other student teachers: they enacted various communicative activities, centering on pupils’ language use and participation, and functioned as facilitators for students’ learning. As a result, they were able to enact the curricular goals of developing learners’ communicative competence and supported their use of English more extensively than the team A student teachers.

However, Bohee and Jubin showed differences in the extent of their development. Bohee taught communicatively with enthusiasm and confidence from the beginning of the practicum. However, when required to teach a model class in front of the other teams and her mentor teacher, she altered her instructional practices to be more like those expected of the members of this practicum community. Despite this tension between what the community expected of her and what she had experienced as a student of English outside of the Korean schooling system, throughout the course of the practicum, she was able to regain her confidence as she began to become more self-regulated in her ability to enact the concepts of the curricular reform in her own instructional practices.
other hand, Jubin was able to teach following the principles of the communicative approach with relative consistency. She embraced a strong sense of autonomy as she devised successful strategies to engage students in communicative activities. The instructional practices of these two student teachers demonstrate the individual nature of concept development within the context of curricular reform. Bohee focused more on the teacher’s use of English and pupils’ participation through interesting game-like activities, whereas Jubin invented communicative activities such as writing activities which directly targeted pupils’ use of English.

Overall, these student teachers showed varied stages of internalization of the concepts of the curricular reform initiatives. The factors that were found to influence their different developmental paths are discussed in the following three sections: student teachers’ previous experiences and beliefs (ontogenetic domain), day-to-day practicum activities and mentoring (microgenetic domain), and a range of contextual factors (sociocultural domain) (Lantolf, 2000; Wertsch, 1985).

7.1.1. Student Teachers’ Beliefs and Prior Experiences

The variability in each student teacher’s concept development was largely dependent on their starting point at the beginning of the practicum; they brought to this experience the sum of their biographical history including previous experiences and beliefs in language learning and teaching. Both teams of student teachers were informed by similar notions concerning CLT from their coursework prior to entering the practicum. However, their prior beliefs and experiences influenced how they perceived and enacted the curricular reform concepts during the practicum experience.
Sora and Yuna in team A were educated in the Korean public school system and primarily had experienced non-communicative approaches to achieve the main lesson goal of traditional English classrooms, namely, preparation for exams. They were found to teach in ways that they had been taught rather than enacting the concepts proposed by the Ministry of Education. This finding provides a very clear example of the impact of the apprenticeship of observation (Lortie, 2002). However, these two student teachers’ beliefs differed, thus for example, in the case of using English as the medium of instruction. Yuna frequently used English due to her positive attitude toward teaching English through English, whereas Sora chose to speak Korean due to her belief in the benefits of using Korean as the medium of instruction. Also, whereas Yuna felt some inner conflicts about using traditional approaches with her high level pupils, Sora felt comfortable teaching in a very traditional manner for both levels of pupils.

In contrast, the team B student teachers, Bohee and Jubin, were educated in schools where English was the medium of instruction and spoke English fluently. They also had frequent experiences with communicative approaches when they learned English. They drew on these substantial previous experiences in order to produce creative activities that simultaneously engaged students and increased students’ L2 use, although their instructional focus differed (teacher’s use of English and pupils’ engagement in activities vs. pupils’ L2 use).

The influence of student teachers’ beliefs and experiences prior to entering their teacher education program supports the results of numerous previous studies (Borg, 2005; Johnson, 1992, 1994; Lortie, 2002; Pajares, 1992; Street, 1999). The findings of this study
also confirm that teacher beliefs are often quite resistant to change throughout their teacher education program (Johnson, 1994; Pajares, 1992).

Furthermore, the results of this study revealed that student teachers’ previous beliefs and experiences often outweighed what they learned in their university-based coursework. Sora and Yuna noted the gap between the theory that they learned from the coursework and practices that they experienced or were experiencing during actual teaching (Hodges, 1982; Hollingsworth, 1989; Richards & Crookes, 1988; Ross, 1987, 1988; Staton & Hunt, 1992). They perceived the concepts of the CLT-based curriculum as unfeasible in the institutional context of the actual practicum and felt that this theoretical knowledge could not be applied to their instruction, which indicates the difficulty of taking student teachers from “idealized conception of teaching to the hard realities” in pre-service teacher education (Lo, 1996, p.41). Conversely, in the cases of Bohee and Jubin, different perspectives were evident. When they found what they had learned from the coursework was similar to what they believed and had personally experienced, they held positive attitudes towards these concepts and were more willing to enact them in their classroom instruction.

The impact of the student teachers’ prior experiences and beliefs on their concept development can be explained through the notion of *ontogenesis*, the development of an individual (Lantolf & Thorne, 2006). According to sociocultural theory, the personal histories and past experiences of the subjects of the activity system should be understood first for a more complete understanding of their present practices and development. In this study, the four student teachers’ prior experiences and beliefs were the most powerful force in their development and greatly influenced their instructional practices during the
practicum. These findings also revealed how what the subject bring with him/her to the activity system is critical. While the typical activity system model (Engeström, 1987, 1993, 1999a) assumes the importance of the subject, the model could be improved by making the ontogenetic nature of the subject more explicit.

7.1.2. Practicum Activities and Mentoring

The practicum activities, including conferences, classroom observations, and journaling, were designed to support student teachers as they attempted to enact the curricular reform mandates in their teaching. However, this study indicated that these activities mainly exposed student teachers to the mentor teachers’ version of the curricular reforms, which at times advocated more traditional teacher-directed approaches to teaching English. As a result of participating in the practicum activities and mentoring experience, the student teachers were found to become socialized into the normative ways of teaching English in this institutional context, which in essence reflected very little focus on the implementation of the curricular reforms.

The findings reveal that student teachers’ successful implementation of the curriculum reforms can be shaped significantly by the mentor teacher’s expertise, interest, and commitment to the implementation of the reforms. In other words, the role of mentor teachers as middle-level managers as well as grass-roots implementers\(^1\) was crucial in leading their student teachers to focus on the concepts of the curricular reforms and their enactment in their own classroom teaching. Although the mentor teachers in this study were supposed to take responsibility for preparing student teachers with the skills and

---

\(^1\) Policy makers, middle-level managers, and grass-roots implementers are regarded as the major three participants in the policy implementation (Wang, 2006). For more details, see section 2.1.2 (Implementation of Curricular Reform) in the Literature Review Chapter.
resources to enact these policies (Gross et al, 1971), they had difficulties meeting this
goal mostly because they had different lesson goals from those of the curricular reform
and needed to solve more immediate problems such as classroom management and exam
preparation. Moreover, since they understood and implemented the curricular mandates
in their own unique ways, in other words, adapting them to fit in the institutional context
of the practicum, the concepts embedded in the curricular reforms were filtered through
the mentors, thus resulting in ways which were inconsistent with the curricular reform
efforts (Lefstein, 2004).

Moreover, the two mentor teachers had very different mentoring styles. Whereas
Mrs. Ma acted more like a master to apprentices, Mr. Baek was more flexible in his
mentoring and created a relatively more reciprocal relationship with his student teachers.
In neither case, however, did they provide appropriate assistance to help their student
teachers internalize and enact the concepts underlying the curricular reform efforts.

Mrs. Ma recommended that her student teachers teach in the ways that she had
taught. Although she meticulously guided student teachers regarding what and how to
teach, her teaching practices were incompatible with the curricular reforms. This finding
is similar to the mentor teacher in Smagorinsky, Gibson et al (2004) who professed to be
student-centered, but actually was not and was found to apprentice her student teacher
into a more teacher-centered instructional approach. In team B, although Mr. Baek
supported his student teachers’ attempts to try out new ideas and activities according to
the underlying concepts of the curricular mandates, he did not have sufficient training or
expertise to guide them with specific ideas. Consequently, his mentoring was flexible, but
inconsistent with those of the curricular reforms. Bohee and Jubin received minimal
guidance from Mr. Baek, as is often the complaint by student teachers (Griffin, 1989; S. Lee, 2007; Livingston & Borko, 1989; Richards & Crookes, 1988; Richardson-Koehler, 1988). However, his appreciation and support of their teaching efforts demonstrated how positive interactions between the mentor and student teachers can foster a relatively more reciprocal and supportive mentoring relationship.

These findings suggest that the mentors’ understandings and implementation of the curricular reforms have a significant impact on student teachers’ abilities to appropriate, internalize, or enact the underlying concepts embedded in curricular reform efforts. More importantly, the results demonstrate the potential of the mentor role for creating an optimal environment for student teachers’ learning to teach where they can discuss their perspectives and instruction openly and experiment with newly emerging understandings during actual teaching rather than just imitating their mentors (Goodman, 1988; Magliaro & Borko, 1986; Shulman, 1987; Staton & Hunt, 1992).

Furthermore, the study results indicate that even though such practicum activities have the potential to provide the mediational means to support student teachers’ learning of the curricular reform concepts, they failed to enable two of the student teachers to successfully internalize and enact the basic tenets of the curricular reform efforts. Instead of providing classroom observations, mentoring meetings, and journaling activities that allowed the student teachers to focus on how the curricular reforms might be implemented, these activities focused more on how to manage their lessons so as to maintain control over students’ behavior and achieve high scores on school-based exams.
7.1.3. Historical, Cultural, and Institutional Context

In this study, the student teachers’ conceptual development was not only mediated by their individual biographies and interactions with their mentors, but also by the historical, cultural, and institutional contexts within which the practicum experience took place. An analysis of the instructional activity system where each student teacher functioned as the subject was found to have institutional rules that were not supportive of their development. This section specifically focuses on (1) pupils’ socialization patterns and L2 use, (2) the high-stakes nature of school-based exams, and (3) lesson plans as driving all instructional activities.

First, pupils’ limited L2 abilities and L2 use, and the ways they have been socialized as passive participants in English language instruction were found to constrain the student teachers’ attempts to enact the CLT-based curriculum. Even in Team B whose teachers had direct experience of learning English through communicative approaches and were committed to the curricular reform and invested in active student learning found it to be extremely challenging to alter the norms of the school culture and get their pupils to actively participate in their instruction. For example, rather than speaking English exclusively, they often relied on Korean because this seemed to ensure the most student involvement, specifically for lower proficiency pupils. Both team B student teachers found these institutional constraints significantly limit their ability to implement the curriculum reforms. However, at the same time, they did attempt to negotiate around these constraints (e.g., promoting writing activities) and were able to create several lessons that did in fact meet the curriculum reform requirements.
On the other hand, for the team A student teachers, these same constraints of pupils’ restricted L2 use and limited participation served as a justification for their reliance on more traditional ways of teaching. Even when they had the best intentions to implement the curricular reforms, Sora, for example became frustrated by the norms of schooling exhibited by her pupils and as a result she relied primarily on more traditional instructional activities.

Other institutional factors, such as norms for classroom management, for example classroom noise, constrained the Team A student teachers in terms of their ability to implement the curricular reforms whereas the Team B student teachers at least attempted to implement new instructional practices that were compatible with the curricular innovations. Nonetheless, both teams of student teachers were unable to completely overcome these institutional rules and norms, and thus, their instructional activities did not fully reflect the underlying principles of the curricular reforms (e.g., negotiation of meaning in English rarely occurred between pupils).

Other institutional constraints that inhibited these student teachers from enacting the curricular reforms were large class size, school-based exams, and the limited nature of the activities in the textbooks. Of these, the importance of school-based exams had an extremely powerful influence on the participating student teachers’ instruction. The importance of ensuring that students received high scores on school-based exams was supported by the English division of this particular lab school. In fact, each student teacher was required to produce a formative paper and pencil test based on the content of

---

2 For example, Bohee and Jubin frequently tolerated pupils’ noise regarding it as their active participation in activities.
Interestingly, the influence of the school-based exams on their instruction differed depending on each team and the individual student teachers. The ‘washback effect’ of such exams on their instruction was much more powerful to the mentor and mentees of team A than those of team B. The team A mentor teacher repeatedly emphasized the student teachers’ responsibility for pupils’ learning to be evidenced in high test scores. Consequently, Yuna gave priority to teaching knowledge about the L2 that would be on the test, and Sora justified her more traditional approach to teaching based on the importance of exam preparation. Given the high-stakes nature of the school-based exams, the institutional mandates for students to receive high scores, and their mentor’s emphasis on the importance of exam preparation, both student teachers in Team A were found to teach for the test and thus, narrowing the curriculum to what was expected to appear on the test (Alderson & Wall, 1993). This finding is in line with others that blame teachers’ tendencies to teach for the test as an obstacle to attempting new instructional practices (Chapman & Snyder, 2000). The team B mentor also emphasized the importance of the school-based exams, however, unlike the team A student teachers, the effects of the exams were somewhat minimized in Bohee’s and Jubin’s lessons. This may have been due to their mentor teacher’s more flexible mentoring style and the student teachers’ lack of direct personal experience with the washback effect of school-based exams in the Korean public school system. Thus, Bohee talked about the exams in an attempt to gain pupils’ attention and specifically for low level pupils, and Jubin felt that she needed to

---

3 The test that each student teachers submitted was composed of 13-14 multiple choice questions, 5-6 short (phrase-level) answer questions, and 1 longer (sentence-level) answer question.
prepare her students more explicitly for the exam in addition to doing communicative activities.

These findings clearly indicate that the implementation of any curricular reforms will most likely fail unless the teaching goals of the reforms match the tools the teachers have to assess for students' learning. For example, if the ultimate goal is for students to speak English, students should be assessed on their in-class participation and/or presentations or oral exams should be included in all school-based exams. Within the context of the Korean educational system, this goal of implementing an oral component to all school-based exams is inhibited by other institutional factors, such as large class sizes and the norms of participation.

Finally, the practicum emphasis on lesson plans driving all instructional activities, at times operated as a barrier to the curriculum innovation. Throughout the practicum, student teachers were expected to design their lesson plan within the fixed curriculum (i.e., the textbook) and accomplish all lesson goals within a designated time. These goals sometimes distracted the student teacher’s attention from the curricular reform goal of improving overall communicative competence. In the case of team A, in order to carry out all their planned activities the student teachers tended to not only value but reinforce quick correct responses from their pupils rather than any sort of negotiation of meaning in English. With little room for flexibility and/or ownership over the curriculum that they were expected to cover, these student teachers were unable to create lesson plans that allowed for more communicative uses of the L2 or more engagement on the part of their pupils in their instructional activities.
These findings that implicate the impact of the historical, cultural, and institutional contexts within which the practicum experience took place as having a negative impact on teacher learning is consistent with much previous research (Choi, 2000; Mak, 2004; Hong, 2006; E.-J. Kim, 2008). However, in addition to demonstrating their mitigating effects on student teacher learning, the findings of this study highlight the importance of teachers’ willingness to confront such constraints and seek out alternative instructional practices that might begin to change the classroom environment in order to more fully embrace the curricular reform efforts.

7.2. The Interplay between Everyday and Scientific Concepts

The four student teachers’ differing levels of internalization can be better understood through the notion of everyday and scientific concepts (Vygotsky, 1986). The findings of this study confirmed Vygotsky’s view of the interdependence of the two concept types: the development of scientific concepts is dependent on previously developed everyday experiences, and these spontaneously learned concepts mediate the learning of the new scientific concepts (Panofsky, John-Steiner & Blackwell, 1990; Robbins, 2003).

Team A student teachers’ everyday concepts regarding language teaching aligned with more traditional methods of English language teaching rather than with the scientific concepts of the curricular reforms they were exposed to during their university-based coursework. During the practicum, their everyday concepts were reinforced through the practicum activities mentored by Mrs. Ma. Also, many of the institutional constraints they faced served to justify their everyday concepts regarding L2 teaching and learning.
Consequently, they experienced tremendous tension as they attempted to internalize and enact the scientific concepts embedded in the curricular reforms in their instructional practices.

Conversely, the team B student teachers entered into the practicum with everyday concepts which were relatively in sync with the scientific concepts of the CLT-based curriculum. Despite the lack of explicit support from their mentor teacher, Mr. Baek, and institutional constraints, they were encouraged or left free to apply their everyday concepts to their instructional activities. Such consistencies between their everyday and scientific concepts enabled Bohee and Jubin to internalize the scientific concepts of the curricular reform to a greater extent in their instructional practices.

The influence of the student teachers’ everyday concepts on their learning in the practicum supports previous studies (Lantolf & Johnson, 2007; Smagorinsky, Cook & Johnson, 2003) in that L2 teachers typically start their career with everyday concepts based on their own past language learning and classroom experiences and that most of L2 teacher education programs “reinforce rather than challenge” teachers’ everyday concepts (Lantolf & Johnson, 2007, p.884). In fact, in this study, little time was dedicated to discussing the scientific concepts of the curricular reforms, particularly in ways that might have helped these student teachers to interweave their everyday and scientific concepts. One result was for these student teachers to rely on their everyday concepts when confronted with the immediate problems they faced during the practicum experience.

Although these student teachers presumably learned the scientific concepts of the curricular reform in their coursework, their everyday understandings about L2 teaching
and learning seemed to be “decreasingly guided by a formal concept and increasingly driven by the daily pragmatic concerns of teaching.” (Cook et al, 2002, p.400). Without explicit connections being made through dialogic inquiry, it is unlikely that student teachers will be able to fully internalize or enact the scientific concepts that are essential to the curricular reforms. Furthermore, as Karpov (2003) proposed, in order to master these concepts, teachers should be provided with descriptions of what the concepts are and how to use them, transfer them to other contexts, and finally use them autonomously and automatically.

In summary, these findings imply that rather than simply presenting new concepts to student teachers in abstraction as is common in university-based coursework, teacher education programs must enable student teachers to come to fully understand their everyday concepts about L2 teaching and learning while simultaneously connecting those concepts to the scientific concepts that are embedded in the curricular reforms they are expected to embrace and enact in their teaching practices.

7.3. The Challenges of Curricular Reform Implementation during Teacher Education

In many Asian countries including South Korea, western-based educational philosophies have been frequently viewed as more developed and desirable (E.-J. Kim, 2008). In the same vein, Kramsch and Sullivan (1996) argued that for many non-native English teachers and learners, terms and concepts such as ‘communicative approach’, ‘learner-centered’, and ‘group work’ have been perceived as progressive and modern. Influenced by this ideology which is dominant throughout the worldwide English
learning community, the South Korean Ministry of Education also assumes that western-based language teaching approaches (e.g., CLT) are more advanced than those have been employed in Korean English classrooms.

As a result, the key premises of the mandated curricular reforms⁴ are directly comparable with those of CLT as proposed in the context of western culture. However, researchers have found that CLT and the notion of communicative competence can be interpreted or employed differently depending on a host of social, cultural, and institutional factors (Berns, 1990; Kramsch & Sullivan, 1996; Sullivan, 2000). Thus, consideration of the local context of Korean English classrooms is critical in planning and implementing any curricular reform. In particular, it is essential to identify the ways Korean teachers and students have been socialized by their prior schooling experiences and how certain institutional constraints may interfere with the implementation of these reforms. Thus, in addition to focusing on what and how teachers should teach based on the principles of CLT, any curricular reform effort must consider the current realities of English classrooms in Korea. From this stance, teacher educators, mentor teachers and student teachers need to work together to gradually and appropriately adapt the principles of CLT to the unique needs, goals, and outcomes of Korean English language education. As the results of this study suggests, even though these student teachers understood and were excited by the curricular reforms, the realities of the instructional contexts in which they were learning to teach left them feeling frustrated by the obvious discrepancies between the theory of CLT and the curricular reforms and the practice of English language teaching in Korean schools.

⁴ Refer to Chapter 4 for the analysis of the curriculum manual.
Secondly, the findings uncovered that the participating student teachers’ prior experiences and beliefs about L2 learning and teaching were the main resource that they drew on in the practicum teaching, especially when their mentoring provided little guidance about how to embrace the curricular reform concepts in their actual instructional practices. These findings do not suggest an endorsement of employing native speakers of English and/or those who have prior experiences that may be more compatible with the CLT-based reforms. In fact, the findings indicate that having previous experiences and beliefs that are similar to the curricular reform concepts was not sufficient for student teachers to fully internalize these concepts and enact them in their instruction. Instead, the findings speak directly to teacher education programs and the need to make student teachers aware of their prior beliefs and experiences and help them move beyond the apprenticeship of observation by providing them with direct experiences in understanding and participating in the activities of CLT. If, for example, mentor teachers actually model CLT practices and if student teachers fully understand what these concepts mean, they would be more likely to be able to embrace the reforms in their classroom practices.

Thirdly, it seems obvious that since the concepts of the curricular reforms are still novel to Korean English teachers and teacher learners, more concrete specifications or guidelines for how to implement these reforms are needed in the curriculum itself and in the context of teacher education programs. Despite this, the results of this study indicated that the current curriculum as it is presented to student teachers and the nature of the practicum activities fail to provide appropriate guidance and mediational means for student teachers to fully embrace and enact the concepts embedded in the curricular
reforms. Without sufficient concrete examples of how to enact these concepts, and given
the institutional factors that negatively mediated these student teachers’ instructional
practices (school-based exams and pupil socialization patterns), it will continue to be
difficult for student teachers to internalize these concepts and enact them in their
classroom practices. A key factor that must be targeted in the context of this activity
system (practicum) is the mentor teacher’s ability to provide appropriate guidance,
concrete techniques and activities, and to establish classroom norms and practices that are
themselves consistent with the CLT curricular reforms. Asking student teachers to step
into classroom that are not already conducive to communicative, task-based activities will
make it extremely difficult for student teachers to enact these curricular reforms on their
own.

As the data have shown, team A student teachers, who learned about CLT in their
university-based coursework were unable to implement their idealized CLT curriculum in
their instructional practices. A lack of concrete and appropriate guidance from the
curriculum, unrealistic and sometimes contrary advice from their mentor (teach for the
test, keep students under control), left these student teachers to their own devices and thus
there is evidence that they relied on their pre-existing beliefs and experiences as the basis
for how they should teach. While the student teachers may have internalized
pseudoconcepts as shown in their attempts to implement task-based and learner-centered
language learning⁵, without concrete and/or feasible examples of communicative
activities and tasks and concrete examples of the basic techniques of learner-centered
instruction in the national curriculum and their mentor teacher instruction, they were
found to create their own interpretations of the curricular reform concepts.

⁵ For more details, refer to section 7.1 (Conceptual Development of Student Teachers) in this chapter.
The development of “true concepts” and how to enact these concepts in the classroom teaching throughout their pre-service teacher education is essential as it will most certainly shape how teachers implement this curriculum throughout their careers. Again, Karpov (2003)’s proposal for learning a concept may be useful: concepts should be overtly taught along with related procedures. Thus, student teachers need to be provided with explicit instruction about the concepts and how to enact them for the successful implementation of any curricular reform. The curriculum, university coursework and practicum activities must become venues where such theoretical and procedural knowledge are presented, manipulated and enacted in actual classroom teaching.

Finally, the concept related to the TETE policy is extremely challenging for most of the Korean teachers of English who learned English through more traditional methods and are not fluent speakers of English. However, as the results of this study suggest, even when student teachers’ English language proficiency is near native, other mediating artifacts, such as the rules for student participation, and the norms and beliefs of the community within the school all work to inhibit these student teachers’ abilities to enact the concepts of the curricular reforms.

Moreover, critics and teachers have challenged the possibility and desirability of the exclusive use of the target language in language classrooms. Research has shown that the native language can be a useful cognitive tool for assisting with learning foreign languages and needs not be excluded from L2 classrooms (Atkinson 1987, 1993; Cook, 2001; Macaro, 1996, 1997, 2001; Wigglesworth, 2002). However, the current curriculum
disregards both the supportive function of using the native language and the realities of Korean English classrooms.

The participating student teachers in this study used English and Korean differently depending on their beliefs and experiences with their pupils. In the most extreme case, although Sora spoke English fairly fluently, she chose to use Korean as the medium of instruction based on her perception about the benefits of using Korean to promote classroom communication and pupils’ understanding. Moreover, although the curriculum (Ministry of Education, 1998) and the literature (Kwon, 2000a; Nunan, 2003) blame teachers’ low English proficiency for not implementing the TETE policy, this study indicated that even teachers with near native linguistic skills, including Bohee and Jubin, sometimes used Korean to increase student understanding, response, and participation of their pupils, specifically the lower level pupils. In addition, since many of the pupils were not socialized into teaching English through English, no less communicating with their teacher and peers in English, implementing English as the medium of instruction was extremely challenging. Thus, again, more realistic and appropriate guidance about the use of English is essential along with gradual adoption that is deemed appropriate given the many factors that surround teachers, pupils, and the institution where English is taught.

7.4. A Sociocultural Analysis of Teacher Learning in the Context of Curricular Reform

Using sociocultural theory and activity theory, the findings of this study traced the participating student teachers’ concept development over time by specifically examining
the environment in which their concept development is theoretically supposed to take place. Since activity theory is used to understand the systems these student teachers were functioning in, it helps us understand how their concept development was emerging, why it was emerging as it was, dimensions of that activity system that appeared to influence their development, and finally where and what needs to be changed within this activity system if the outcome of student teachers’ learning is to be the ability to teach in line with the mandated curricular reforms.

An analysis of each student teachers’ practicum experience through the analytic framework of Engeström’s activity system model (1987, 1993, 1999a) makes it possible to trace these student teachers’ concept development within the curricular mandates, and provides teacher educators and policy makers with an understanding of why certain curricular reform mandates were or were not enacted by these student teachers within the practicum. On the surface, team A student teachers’ lessons appeared to implement the basic concepts underlying these reforms, specifically in terms of the use of English by teachers (particularly Yuna), employment of several instructional activities, and concerns about pupils’ interests and participation. However, very little evidence of authentic L2 use and communication that might contribute to improving pupils’ communicative competence was found during these student teachers’ actual instructional practices. Understood within the activity system of the practicum, the rules within the system were inconsistent with those proposed by the curricular reforms. For example, traditional classroom norms such as teacher-fronted instruction and pupils’ passive participation are contradictory to the concept of learner-centered instruction supported by the curricular mandates. In the case of team B, even though the student teachers embraced the
curricular reform concepts, they had difficulty enacting them due to the rules embedded
in the system, most significantly, pupils’ limited L2 use and the norms of participation.

More specifically, while the Ministry of Education expected student teachers to
embrace the curricular reforms and implement them in their instruction, these student
teachers were faced with multiple contradictions within the activity system of the
practicum. Engeström (1993) describes secondary contradictions as “moving force
behind disturbance and innovation and eventually behind the change and development of
the system” (p.72). These contradictions, specifically in the ways they are resolved, are
essential to transforming any activity system. Thus, contradictions in the activity system
gave clear clues as to why these individual student teachers may have been unable to
fully internalize and enact the concepts of the curricular reform. Since the principles of
the curricular reforms were inconsistent with student teachers’ beliefs and instructional
practices - which was the case of the team A student teachers - these principles created
secondary contradictions within this activity system. In order for these contradictions to
be resolved, the student teachers’ beliefs and teaching practices must be reoriented in
order to be consistent with the curricular reform initiatives, and ultimately working to
transform the activity system. Instead, the team A student teachers experienced tertiary
contradictions in which the goal of the “culturally more advanced” (Engeström, 1987,
Chapter 2, p.43) activity system of the governmental curricular reforms (e.g.,
development learners’ communicative competence) was rejected by and subordinated
into the existing forms of the activity system where the main goal was to help their pupils
master the content of the textbook and obtain higher exam scores.
The findings of this study show that in order for these student teachers to overcome both secondary and tertiary contradictions and reorient their teaching conceptions and practices toward the CLT-based curricular reforms, the broader macro-structures that exist in the activity systems within which they are learning to teach must change. Unless the nature of school-based exams (focused on grammar and translation) and the socialization pattern of pupils in schools (limited participation in classroom/L2 communication) are altered, these educational reform efforts will most likely have little impact on student teachers’ conceptual development or their instructional practices. The student teachers themselves can not be expected to change the norms and rules of the community within this activity system, which as the data suggest ultimately shaped the outcomes of the activity system in particular ways and constrained the development of even those student teachers who were trying their best to enact the reforms in their instructional practices. The results of this study clearly indicate that if the Ministry of Education wants teachers to enact their curricular reforms, they must transform the macro-structures embedded in the activity systems within which these student teachers are expected to learn to teach. More specifically, without substantive changes to the school-based exams, for example, to include an oral/aural component that assess pupils’ emerging communicative competence, enacting the CLT curricular reform are likely to have little success. Additionally, without sustained and significant changes in the ways in which pupils are socialized into acting and talking in English language classrooms in Korean schools, the ability of teachers to teach English through English or to fully utilize task-based, communicative-oriented activities will be severely limited.
While previous research has suggested that attention be focused on ensuring that new teachers fully understand the basic concepts embedded in the CLT reform efforts and/or that the oral language proficiency of the Korean English language teach force be improved (Kwon, 2000a; Nunan 2003), the finding of this study provide some contradictory evidence. Even when new teachers have near-native proficiency and fully embrace the concepts embedded in the curricular reforms, they still struggled in their ability to enact the curricular reforms in their instructional practices. Without addressing these broader macro-structures that shape the nature of activity within the context of “real” English language classrooms in “real” schools, the goals of the curricular reforms set by the Ministry of Education are sure to fall short of expectations.

Finally, while sociocultural theory enables us to more fully understand the extent to which the concepts embedded in the curricular reforms have been internalized by these student teachers and instantiated in their instructional practices, activity theory enables us to identify several dimensions of the activity system in which these student teachers were learning to teach that inhibited their concept development. More importantly, it points to the broader macro-structure that must be changed if student teachers are going to be able to implement the curricular reform efforts mandated by the Ministry of Education.
CHAPTER EIGHT
CONCLUSION

The final chapter of the dissertation addresses the implications of this research, followed by a discussion of the limitations of this study and suggestions for future research.

8.1. Implications

The findings of this study provide a range of implications for educational policy makers, teacher educators, and teachers. These implications are largely related to curricular reform implementation and pre-service teacher education, concluding that for successful curricular reform implementation, it is necessary to (1) understand teachers’ and students’ beliefs and the socialization patterns that exist in educational institutions as a result of the norms of schooling, (2) consider the broader macro structures that are embedded in and influence the nature of activity (teaching and learning) in educational institutions, and (3) create long-term collaborative partnerships among and between policy makers, teacher educators, and teachers. Additionally, the findings of this study suggest that in order to support successful pre-service teacher education within the context of curricular reform, it is essential to (4) build cooperative working relationships between universities and local schools, (5) create and support critical reflection and dialogic inquiry for pre-service teachers throughout their entire learning-to-teach experience, and (6) provide substantive and sustained professional development experiences for mentor teachers. Finally, the findings of this study offer suggestions in
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terms of (7) directions for teacher education programs under the context of curricular reform.

Initially, for the curricular reform to be successful, educational policy makers, teacher educators, and language teachers themselves must come to recognize, respect, and build upon teachers’ beliefs about language teaching and learning. Additionally, each of these stakeholders must recognize the normative ways of participating in schooling in any educational context. Building on these premises, educational reforms policies must grow out of the realities of schools and schooling rather than simply on the basis of theoretical ideals about the way L2 teaching and learning should “look” that may have been imported from elsewhere. As this study indicated, when student teachers’ beliefs and prior schooling experiences are inconsistent with the curricular reforms or they perceived these reforms as too idealistic or unrealistic within the context in which they are learning to teach, they will be unable, and in some cases unwilling, to take up and enact the core concepts of the curricular reform efforts. The recognition of the powerful impact that teachers’ beliefs and the norms of schooling have on the success or failure of any curricular reform efforts is an important first step towards building grass roots efforts toward the successful creation and implementation of curricular reforms.

Secondly, this study has exposed the broader macro-structures that are embedded in educational institutions that have the potential to work against the implementation of curricular innovations in classroom settings. The social and institutional constraints that mediated these student teachers’ conceptual development include large class size, school-based exams that focus on grammar and receptive skills, pupils’ limited L2 abilities and, the norms of schooling that are represented in limited student participation in
classroom/L2 communication. Without full recognition of and directly addressing these constraints as an integral part of any curricular reforms efforts, such innovations will most certainly continue to have limited success.

Thirdly, policy makers, teacher educators and teachers must work in consort with one another, identify the difficulties teachers may face as they work to implement curricular mandates and be given opportunities to provide critical and practical feedback on the processes and outcomes of the curricular reform implementation. Such dialogue must also be a central part of pre-service teacher education, since it will most likely be this emerging teaching force that will take on the responsibility of curricular innovation throughout much of their professional careers. Such open communication, collaboration, and information-sharing among and between policy makers, teacher educators and teachers must be substantive and on-going because it is in the process of implementation that all stakeholders face a variety of uncertainties (Hord, 1995; C.-L. Wu, 2003). The constant and dialogic reflection on and monitoring of policy implementation is crucial to ensure effective implementation and intended outcomes.

In order to construct a more effective and integrated practicum model, enhanced collaboration among university supervisors, school administrators, mentor teachers, and student teachers is critical. Inquiry-based models of professional development, such as, Professional Development Schools (PDS)\(^1\), which forge partnerships between university and local schools, may be most appropriate within the Korean context. PDS help to contextualize the knowledge, skills, and dispositions that pre-service teachers are exposed to in their teacher education coursework within actual classroom settings (Gebhard, 1998;

---

\(^1\) The Holmes Group (1986) developed the concept of PDS to facilitate the professional development of in-service and pre-service teachers, enhance knowledge and practice in teaching, and support the implementation of educational reforms.
Holmes Group, 1986). Key (1998) argues for the importance of providing student teachers with consistent structure, guidance, and feedback from both their mentor teachers and university supervisors. In line with the PDS model, student teachers need more time to observe classes and to practice teaching than the current four-week period which is typical in Korea. Similarly, such support, guidance, and feedback should be extended to student teachers throughout their initial years of teaching.

A striking finding of this study was the way in which all four student teachers gave up, to a greater or lesser extent, their idealized conception of CLT and TETE, specifically in low level classes and were instead slowly socialized into teaching in ways that matched the normative ways of teaching English in Korean language classrooms. As the practicum experience went on, specifically team A student teachers were found to use less and less English, relied on more teacher-directed activities, and became more controlling in terms of what they allowed their students to say and do. It seems obvious that the practicum experience must create sufficient time, opportunity, and support as novice teachers try out the new ideas they learned from the coursework and to do so in an environment which is conducive to the curricular reforms. Rather than an apprenticeship model, where student teachers end up conforming to the norms of schooling, a reflective model, in which they engage in sustained, critical reflection in consultation with their mentor teachers may lead to more productive learning and support their ability to actually enact the curricular reforms. While the structure was present in this practicum experience for the development of a communities of practice (Wenger, 1998), the nature of the activities that these communities were found to engage in did little to foster critical reflection,
position these student teachers as agents of change or knowledge construction but rather positioned them as passive recipients of the norms for how they should, act, talk, and teach English.

Another striking finding of this study was the influence that the mentor teachers’ interpretations of the curricular reforms had on the student teachers’ conceptual development and instructional activities. One implication from this is the need for mentor teachers to have the sort of sustained professional development opportunities that will enable them to consistently and appropriately enact the curricular reform efforts and develop mentoring skills that enable them to not only demonstrate the curricular reforms in their teaching but talk about them in substantive ways with their student teachers. When mentor teachers have fully embraced and can appropriately enact the curricular reforms in their daily instructional practices and in the way they talk about their teaching, this will most certainly have a greater impact on how student teachers come to understand and enact these curricular reforms as well.

Finally, the findings of this study suggest that any curricular reform effort must begin from the ground up. It must begin with the realities of classroom life and address both macro and micro issues that will impede and/or support any curricular innovation. Teacher education, from university coursework to the practicum experience to the initial years of teaching must support teachers as they are resocialized into new ways of thinking about and enacting the curriculum. Throughout the process of doing so may also help to reorient teachers’ beliefs about L2 learning and teaching. Teacher education needs to create instructional contexts in which student teachers can have direct experiences with enacting the curricular reforms, while simultaneously reflecting on, thinking about, and
critically analyzing their own teaching practices. Furthermore, teacher education needs to help teachers recognize that their classrooms can and do function as sites for their own learning (Johnson, 2006) and encourage teachers to experiment with adapting, adjusting, and altering their instructional practices in ways that are appropriate for the educational context in which they are teaching while simultaneously meeting the core goals of the curricular reforms.

8.2. Limitations

Several limitations must be mentioned for the present study. As multiple case studies that focused on four student teachers coupled with two mentor teachers in one lab middle school in South Korea, the generalizability of the findings of this study is somewhat limited. Investigations of mentor teachers, student teachers, and pupils in other instructional settings may possibly yield different results.

Secondly, this study examined the student teachers in the activity system of the practicum experience but did not examine their participation in other related activity systems such as their coursework, other subject matter classes at the lab school, or their interactions with mentors and peers in other subject matter divisions. Such examinations might have offered a more comprehensive understanding of how a variety of activity systems impact on the central activity system, in this case the practicum from student teachers’ perspectives.

Finally, despite having an important role in the activity systems in which the participating student teachers functioned as the subject, the pupils were not examined directly in this study. Instead, they were observed somewhat collectively rather than
taking their individual perspectives and activities into consideration. Such investigations might examine their level of English language proficiency, their English learning experiences, their participation in English classes, and their perceptions about these classes, specifically focusing on the curricular reforms (e.g., the TETE policy).

8.3. Suggestions for Future Research

The findings and limitations of this dissertation research provide direction for future studies. Initially, studies are needed to investigate other secondary school English classroom contexts with other mentor teachers, student teachers, and pupils. Multiple studies that attempt to trace student teachers’ concept development within the context of curricular reform might provide more extensive insights and implications for both pre-service teacher education and the implementation of the mandated curricular reforms.

While this study focused on teachers’ self-report about their university-based coursework experiences, studies that trace student teachers’ experiences throughout the entire pre-service teacher education program, including the coursework, the practicum, and perhaps their initial teaching experiences would most certainly provide a more comprehensive understanding of how they learn to teach and the development of their identities as English language teachers. Research on their coursework experiences might include what kinds of concepts were covered, how consistently they were presented, and what sort of mediational means were provided to enable them to understand and enact those concepts. Also, future studies should investigate the long-term effect of pre-service teacher education, especially how student teachers carry their newly emerging concepts and instructional practices into new instructional settings. In all, research that traces
student teachers’ concept development throughout their coursework, practicum, and initial teaching experiences would help to uncover the outcomes of teacher education programs and the state of English language education in South Korea today.

In 2008 the Korean government announced in that the TETE policy will become obligatory for all elementary and secondary school English classes (H. Kang, 2008; Rho & Y. Kang, 2008). Furthermore, the government plans to create immersion programs in the public education system (Eom, 2008; Y. Kang & K. Lee, 2008), which have received intense public resistance (Ryu, 2008). However, several private elementary and secondary schools have begun to create immersion programs in which subjects other than English are also taught in English (J. Park, 2007). Thus, it would be very interesting to examine the effects of such national and institutional policies on teachers’ and pupils’ use of English during English and/or other subjects matter classes. Additionally, the government has proposed a host of innovative teacher education programs to prepare teachers to teach English through English (H. Kang, 2008; Rho & Y. Kang, 2008). Thus research on the effectiveness of such teacher education programs will be invaluable.

Finally, the government announced that a new English proficiency test for Korean learners has been considered as a possible replacement for the English test in the college entrance exam from 2015 (H. Kang, 2008; Rho & Y. Kang, 2008). This test is designed to evaluate all four skills area including listening, reading, writing, and speaking. Given the washback effect of high-stakes assessments on classroom instruction, future research should examine how changes to school-based exams may influence teachers’ instruction and the content and outcomes of teacher education programs.
8.4. Concluding Remarks

Despite these limitations, the present research provides new insights into English language teacher education, and specifically into the practicum component of pre-service teacher education in South Korea. It suggests that much needs to be done before pre-service English teachers will be able to fully understand, embrace and enact the Ministry of Education’s curricular reform efforts. The current research demonstrates the power of both sociocultural theory and activity theory in recognizing individual, social, and contextual factors that shape the nature of teacher learning and their instructional practices. In particular, activity theory is helpful in exposing particular elements that constrained student teachers’ concept development and more importantly, helps to pinpoint the broader macro-structures that must be altered in order to successfully implement curricular innovations. Finally, this study provides insights into the dialectics and dynamics between educational policies and implementation, between theory and practice, and casts new light on the role of the practicum experience as a mechanism for teacher learning within the context of curricular reform.


Appendix A
Interview Questions for Mentor Teachers

Learning/Teaching History/Self-image/Teacher Learning

1. Describe your experiences as an English language learner.

2. Have you ever lived abroad or stayed abroad to study English? If so, how long? And how do you think these experiences influence your English and/or English learning/teaching?

3. Why did you choose to major in English language education? Describe your experiences as an English education major.

4. Why did you choose to become an English teacher? Describe your experiences as an English teacher.

5. How would you describe yourself as an English teacher?

6. What kinds of teacher education programs (e.g., workshops) have you attended and how do you think these experiences influence your teaching?

7. Describe any collaborative activities that you engage in with other teachers.

Learning/Teaching English in Korea/in Classroom

8. What do you think about the current state of English language education in Korea (e.g., policy, fever for English language learning)?

9. What do you think is the purpose of learning and teaching English?

10. Describe your typical English class.

11. What do you feel are the most important aspects of teaching English in your class?

12. What do you think your students enjoy the most or the least in your class?

13. What methods do you think are the best for learning and teaching English?

14. Describe an ideal English classroom (e.g., teacher, students, textbooks, instructional practices).

Practicum 1

15. Describe any changes that have occurred over the past few years in the practicum.

16. What have been your pupils’ reactions to the student teaching practica over the past few years?

17. How would you describe yourself as a mentor teacher?

18. What do you consider to be your student teachers’ greatest needs during the practicum?

19. What do you want your student teachers to learn during the practicum?
20. What do you think your student teachers have been learning or will learn from observing your classroom teaching sessions?

21. What do you think your student teachers learned or will learn from the model class taught by a representative mentor teacher and then the post-observation conference?

22. What do you think your student teachers will learn from their own classroom teaching and then the post-observation conferences?

23. What do you think your pupils (classroom students) will gain from having student teachers?

24. Describe an ideal practicum, an ideal mentor and an ideal student teacher.

Curricular Reforms 1

25. Describe how you understand and how you feel about the current curricular reforms (CLT, TETE).

26. What do you think an ideal English classroom looks like according to the current curricular reforms?

27. What impact do you think the curricular reforms have had on your teaching?

28. What impact do you think the curricular reforms have had on your pupil’s learning?

29. How are you implementing the current curricular reforms in your classroom?

30. What difficulties have you experienced in implementing the current curricular reforms?

31. What impact do you think the curricular reforms have on mentoring your student teachers?

Practicum 2

32. Describe your role as a mentor teacher during the practicum.

33. Describe the ways in which you have tried to meet the needs of your student teachers.

34. Reflect on the three most memorable episodes that occurred during the practicum.

35. What do you think your student teachers have been learning from their classroom teaching sessions, class observations, and the post-observation conferences?

36. What do you think your student teachers learned or will learn from the model class taught by a representative student teacher and then the post-observation conference?

37. What do you think your student teachers have gotten out of the practicum experience?

38. Which aspects of the practicum do you think have been the most or the least helpful for your student teachers?

39. What do you think your pupils (classroom students) have gained from your student teachers?
40. What strengths and weaknesses do you think the current practicum has?

41. What suggestions do you have for pre-service teacher education programs?

Curricular Reforms 2

42. Describe what you have done for your student teachers to help them implement the current curricular reforms (CLT, TETE) in their classroom teaching.

43. What difficulties do you think your student teachers have been experiencing in implementing the curricular reforms?

44. What impact do you think the curricular reforms have had on mentoring your student teachers?

45. What do you consider to be the barriers for your student teachers to implement CLT in their classrooms?

Research Participation

46. Describe your experiences in conducting or participating in the research related to English language teaching/learning, or teacher education including this one.

47. What impact do you think your participation in such research has had on your mentoring?

48. What suggestions do you have about the process of the researcher’s collecting practicum data?
Appendix B
Interview Questions for Student Teachers

Learning/Teaching History/Self-image/Future Career

1. Describe your experiences as an English language learner.

2. Have you ever lived abroad or stayed abroad to study English? If so, how long? And how do you think these experiences influence your English and/or English learning/teaching?

3. Why did you choose to major in English language education? Describe your experiences as an English education major.

4. How would you describe yourself as a teacher?

5. Do you want to become an English teacher in secondary schools in the future? Why or why not?

6. Describe your future plans after graduating.

Learning/Teaching English in Korea/in Classroom

7. What do you think about the current state of English language education in Korea (e.g., policy, fever for English language learning)?

8. What do you think is the purpose of learning/teaching English?

9. What do you feel are the most important aspects of teaching English in your class?

10. What methods do you think are the best for learning and teaching English?

11. Describe an ideal English classroom (e.g., teacher, students, textbooks, instructional practices).

Coursework/Practicum 1

12. How would you describe yourself as a student teacher?

13. Describe three things that you have learned about English teaching in your coursework at the university. How do you think these will/are influencing your teaching?

14. Describe the classes you took at your university prior to the practicum.

15. In terms of your own professional development, what do you want to get out of the practicum?

16. What do you think your mentor teacher wants you to learn from the practicum?

17. What do you think you have been learning or will learn from observing your mentor teacher’s classroom teaching sessions?

18. What do you think you learned or will learn from a model class taught by a representative mentor teacher and then the post-observation conference?
19. What do you think you will learn from classroom teaching and the post-observation conferences?

20. What do you think your pupils’ (classroom students) needs are for your English class? What do you think they will gain from you as a student teacher? What kind of classroom environment do you want to create for your pupils?

21. Describe what you think is ideal university coursework for preparing student teachers for the practicum and their future teaching experiences.

22. Describe an ideal practicum, an ideal mentor and an ideal student teacher.

Curricular Reforms 1

23. How did you learn about the current curricular reforms (CLT, TETE)?

24. Describe how you understand and how you feel about the curricular reforms.

25. What do you think an ideal English classroom looks like according to the curricular reforms?

26. What impact do you think the curricular reforms have on your student teaching?

27. What impact do you think the curricular reforms have on your pupil’s learning?

28. How will you implement the curricular reforms in your classroom?

29. What do you consider to be the barriers to implementation of CLT in the classroom?

Practicum 2

30. Reflect on three episodes that occurred during the practicum that you learned the most from, you struggled with or you were successful with.

31. What impact do you think your mentor teacher’s mentoring has had on your teaching?

32. What do you think you have been learning from classroom teaching sessions, class observations, and the post-observation conferences?

33. Do you think you have been learning what your mentor teacher wants you to learn from the practicum?

34. What did you learn or would you learn from a model class taught by a representative student teacher and then the post-observation conference?

35. In terms of your own professional development, do you think you have gained what you wanted to get out of the practicum?

36. Which aspects of the practicum do you think have been the most or the least helpful for you?

37. What did you enjoy the most or the least in your practicum?
38. What do you think about your relationship with your mentor teacher, peer student teachers and pupils? How do you think this has influenced your practicum experience?

39. Do you feel you have experienced any changes in your beliefs about teaching and/or your instructional practices as a result of the practicum?

40. Have you experienced any changes in your desire to become an English teacher in secondary schools as a result of the practicum?

41. What strengths and weaknesses do you think the current practicum has?

42. What suggestions do you have for pre-service teacher education programs?

Curricular Reforms 2/Classroom Teaching

43. Describe your typical English class.

44. Describe the ways in which you have tried to meet your pupils’ needs.

45. What do you think your students enjoy the most or the least in your class?

46. What do you think your pupils (classroom students) gained from having you as an English student teacher?

47. What impact do you think the current curricular reforms (CLT, TETE) have had on your teaching?

48. How have you implemented the curricular reforms in your classroom?

49. What do you consider to be barriers to implementing the curricular reforms in your classroom?

Research Participation

50. Describe your experiences in conducting or participating in the research related to English language teaching/learning, or teacher education including this one.

51. What impact do you think your participation in such research has had on your practicum?

52. What suggestions do you have about the process of the researcher’s collecting practicum data?
### Classroom Excerpt 5.1. Mrs. Ma’s Model Class (May 4)
Activity I–Putting sentences in order (“After You Read”)
High Intermediate, 9th grade

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>She took a dying woman to a hospital but they didn't want to take her.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>She became a nun.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mother Teresa was born in the Catholic family.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>She went into the Indian slums to live and help the poor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>She passed away in Calcutta, India.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>She went to Paris and received some training to help the sick and poor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Her mother took care of a poor widow in the neighborhood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>She was teaching at high school in Calcutta.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>She decided to devote her life to Catholic work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>She set up the Missionaries of Charity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>She received the Nobel Peace Prize.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D
Mrs. Ma’s Activity Material 2

Classroom Excerpt 5.2. Mrs. Ma’s Model Class (May 4)
Activity II–Correcting Any Errors (“After You Read”)
High Intermediate, 9th grade

1. Mother Teresa was born in India.
2. Her mother took care of the poor farmer with six children.
3. It was her family's honesty that made a great impact on young Mother Teresa's life.
4. At the age of 18, she became a nurse.
5. In 1946, she saw a woman crying in the street.
6. She took the woman to her house and helped her.
7. She went to London to receive some training to help the sick and poor.
8. She went into the Indian mountains to live and help the poor.
9. She took care of the many children who lived in the orphanages.
10. The children's clothes were torn and their faces were covered with tears.
11. She gave the poor children books and clothes.
12. Many people were interested and followed Mother Teresa.
13. Mother Teresa was a living angel and will be greatly missed.
### Appendix E
Handout in Sora’s Class

Classroom Excerpt 5.7. Sora’s Lesson (May 18)
Translation and Grammar (“Reading”)
High Intermediate, 9th Grade, Lesson Plan 3 (2nd for High Level)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3학년</th>
<th>Lesson 4. Communication Across Generations</th>
<th>Read and Think</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Class</td>
<td>Summer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**★ Structure**

An article about six girls

tooconserv@teen.net
worried@adults.com
needabreak@young.com
stillhopeful@parents.com

<1> An article - summary
→ Yesterday, (1) _____ girls were taken to the (2) _____ hospital from pop star HOD’s concert because they fell down from a (3) _____ after standing in line for (4) _____ hours. One mother who came to (5) _____ them (6) _____ said that it’s very hard to (7) _____ her daughter.

<2> Opinion 1 - tooconserv@teen.net

Vocab. + Expression-------------------------
*sth is wrong with~:
*these days: 오늘날 = n_______
*such as:

(1) Who is the writer?
→( a teenager / an adult )

(2) How is the attitude toward teens?
→( positive / negative )

(3) Why can the writer NOT understand some of his/her friends?

→Because...

1. They s _____ classes and s _____ so much time for their stars.

2. Some just want to become stars themselves only to h _____ e _______ _______

<3> Opinion 2 - Worried@adults.com

Vocab. + Expression-------------------------
*spend time ~ing:
*besides: 부. 게다가

(1) Who is the writer?
→( a teenager / an adult )

(2) How is the attitude toward teens?
→( positive / negative )

(3) How is the writer feeling about the young people in the country?
→He is _________.

(4) What are some things that the writer thinks is important and unimportant?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>important</th>
<th>unimportant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(1) Who is the writer?
→( a teenager / an adult )

(2) How is the attitude toward teens?
→( positive / negative )

(3) Who did the writer use to like when she was a teenager?
→

(4) Why did she worry her parents when she was a teenager?
→Because she wore

(5) Why is the writer NOT worried about the teenagers?
→Because she thinks that teens

(4) Which of the following is different from others?

① to have fun
② to do some silly things
③ to take a break
④ to go to a good college

 vocab.+expression----------------------------
*be different from: ~와 다르다
*unlike: ~와 같지 않은
*do harm: 피해를 주다
*look back on:
-----------------------------------------------
Appendix F
Handout in Yuna’s Class

Classroom Excerpt 5.10. Yuna’s Lesson (May 12)
Choosing Pizza toppings (“Look and Say”)
Low level, 8th Grade, Lesson Plan 2 (1st for Low Level)

Lesson 4. The Letters from foreigners in Korea

Look and Say 1,2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2학년</th>
<th>Lesson 4. The Letters from foreigners in Korea</th>
<th>Look and Say 1,2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Class</td>
<td>Winter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P 69. Look and Say 2
Let’s make pizza!

1. 여러분이 마음대로 토핑을 고를 수 있는 피자 가게에 갔다고 가정하고, 쪽과 함께 다음의 대화를 나누어 봅시다.
Ex> A : Do you want some ham? (햄 좀 드시겠어요?)
    B : Yes, please. (네, 부탁합니다.)
    A : Do you want some bacon? (베이컨 좀 드시겠어요?)
    B : No, thank you. I don’t like it. (아니오, 괜찮습니다. 그건 별로 안 좋아해요)

2. 옆 쪽과 함께 대화하면서 다음의 표에 대답을 써 봅시다.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Toppings</th>
<th>나의 대답</th>
<th>쪽의 대답</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you want some</td>
<td>Ham</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cheese</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bacon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Onion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pineapple</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Potato</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tomato</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. 쪽이 원하는 토핑이 무엇인지, 또 원하지 않는 토핑이 무엇인지 아래의 문장의 빈칸을 채우세요. (Write down what your partner wanted to have.)

Ex> Taehee wants Ham, Cheese, Bacon, Onion, and Tomato, but she doesn’t want pineapple, and potato.

___ wants ___, ___, ___, and ____, but he doesn’t want ________________.
Appendix G
Handout in Bohee’s class

Classroom Excerpt 6.6. Bohee’s Model Class (May 25)
Writing about Cultural Differences (“Let’s Write”)
High Level, 8th Grade, Lesson Plan 5 (2nd for High Level)

Let’s Write

Use these structures:
1. 주격 관계대명사 who/which
2. “I think (that)…”

Direction: Pretend that you’ve been living in America since you were 3 years old.
You are visiting your friend/relative living in Korea. Write your experience in your
daily according to your given topic.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>Day:</th>
<th>Weather:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Topic: ____________________________
Appendix H
Handout in Jubin’s Class

Classroom Excerpt 6.8. Jubin’s Lesson (May 24)
Jumble Story (“After You Read”)¹
High Level, 8th Grade, Lesson Plan 4 (3rd for High Level)

Writing a Creative Story

Name: _____________
Class: _____________
Date: _____________
Use the following words and expressions to write a creative story

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Character:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Setting:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Words and Expressions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>publish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mostly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>suddenly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>remember</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>care about</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>opinion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>warm-hearted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>who/which</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>so–that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Jubin listed seven characters and settings in the prompt. The seven characters were a new mother, a college student, a musician, a 93-year-old woman, an alien from outer space, a restaurant owner, and a homeless child. The settings include a party, an expensive restaurant, a shopping mall, a park, a college library, a concert hall, and an old farmhouse.
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