Assessing Pre-service English Teachers' Perspectives on a "Good Teacher"

Sun—Young Kim · Bong—Gyu Kim*

(Mokpo National University)

Kim, Sun-Young & Kim, Bong-Gyu. (2014). Assessing Pre-service Teachers' Perspectives on a Good Teacher. *The Linguistic Association of Korea Journal,* 22(4), 59-97. Using the sequentially mixed design combining a quantitative-qualitative phase of analyses, this paper examines how perspectives on a "good teacher" held by pre-service teachers have changed over the course of the teaching practicum with respect to the three domains of EFL teaching pedagogy (i.e., teaching approach, language use, and the quality of teaching). The results reveal that significant changes in perspectives are found in the 'teaching approach' and 'language use' categories while the perspective on the 'quality of teaching' remain stable over the practicum. More specifically, pre-service teachers' perspectives on a "good teacher" have been shifted toward a more teacher-directed mode of instruction and less use of English as an instruction-medium language. The findings show that the traditional EFL classes underlying the teacher-centered pedagogy serve as a key factor to influence the changing perspectives on a "good teacher." This paper argues that in order to facilitate the perspective change process in synergic ways, teacher training programs for pre-service teachers need to pay attention to how they incorporate a collaborative mode of instruction into the traditional EFL class during the practicum.

Key Words: perspectives on a good teacher, teaching practicum, learner-centered teaching approach, teacher training program

1. Introduction

Understanding what constitutes good teaching has been regarded as one of

---

* The first author is Sun-Young Kim, and the corresponding author, Bong-Gyu Kim.

the most essential parts of maximizing the effectiveness of second language teaching and learning (Chang, 2010; McCollin, 2000). It involves teachers' decision making process such as preparing for and evaluating teaching itself, and enhancing in-service professional development. According to Heimlich and Norland (1994), a teacher's teaching style represents more than pedagogical implications which are indicated not only by learners' language development but teachers' educational goals and practical teaching methodologies. A teacher's teaching style can be interpreted as a barometer of evaluating the effectiveness of an educator's behavior in educational settings with the use of various teaching techniques and methods (Genc & Ogan-Bekiroglu, 2004).

Many studies have shown that students' perceptions on a "good teacher" are closely related to teaching styles shaped by various factors, such as individual and socio-cultural variables (Mascolo, 2009; Weimer, 2002). According to McCollin (2000), a teacher's distinct teaching style could be influenced by the characteristic of learners, the situation that a teacher encounters, and the structure of the academic curriculum. An evaluation of teaching styles was introduced by Conti (1989), indicating seven important factors directly related to teachers' qualities and characteristics, the Principles of Adult Learning Scale (PALS); learner-centered activities, individualizing instruction, previous teaching experience, considering learners' needs, learners' participation, teaching atmosphere and flexibility of personal development. In addition, Medley and Shannon (1994) introduces three dimensions of teacher quality: teacher effectiveness, teacher competence and teacher performance, all of which are the key elements of making teaching and learning successful and meaningful.

This indicates that the practicum experiences could influence pre-service teachers' perceptions on good teaching, especially when they feel the mismatch between learning experiences and practical teaching practices. Though the importance of the student teachers' perceptions on a good teacher has been addressed in the literature (Cheng, Cheng, & Tang, 2010; Gebhard, 2009), little attention has been paid to their changing perspectives on a "good teacher" during the pre-service teaching practices in the context of EFL classrooms. Such perspective changes should be considered as an essential part of teaching practices since how pre-service teachers perceive a "good teacher" is likely to shape their teaching styles throughout professional development of their

teaching careers.

From the socio-cultural tradition (Flower, 1994), this study attempts to explore the role of the teaching practicum in influencing perceptions on a "good teacher" held by pre-service English teachers. This study assesses pre-service teachers' perspectives on a "good teacher" and then examines the changing dynamics in a good teaching perspective during the teaching practicum. For this purpose, the researchers developed the survey to measure the participants' perspectives on a "good teacher" with respect to the three areas of the teaching pedagogy, emerging from the literature and theory. Specifically, the three pedagogical categories of a good teacher included in the survey are a) the teaching approach (i.e., learner- or teacher-centered mode of instruction), b) language use (i.e., L1 or L2 as an instruction-median language), and c) the quality of teaching comprising subject knowledge, teaching skills, and student evaluation.

Using the sequentially mixed design that combines a quantitative-qualitative phase of analysis (Cresswell, 1994; Stringer, 2004), this paper examines how a group of pre-service English teachers in an urban university perceive a "good teacher" and how these perspectives change over the course of the teaching practicum. In particular, this study explores the role of the practicum in perspective changes by focusing on identifying the specific pedagogical areas of a "good teacher" and analysing individual and socio-cultural variables leading to such changes. Hence, the research questions are posed as follows:

1. To what extent do pre-service teachers' perceptions on a "good English teacher," measured on a 5-point Likert-scale survey, change during a one-month teaching practicum underlying a teacher-directed mode of instruction?
2. How does, if any, the teaching practicum influence teaching perspectives held by pre-service English teachers in terms of the three pedagogical areas (i.e., teaching approach, language use, and quality of teaching) of a "good teacher"?

2. Literature Review

The notion of good teaching cannot be articulated in a simple process since it comprises various aspects of individual and social contexts. It is widely agreed that a view on good teaching is closely connected to the values, beliefs, and behaviors specific to a particular culture (Cortazzi & Jin, 1996; Hammond & Gao, 2002; Littlewood, 2007). In this respect, prior studies on good teaching are conducted in a narrowly defined areas (i.e., teaching perspectives, language use, and the quality of teaching) of pedagogy.

2.1 Teaching Perspectives

Studies on learners' beliefs of effective teaching have been conducted to show differences between learner-centered and teacher-centered teaching styles (McKay, 2001; Nunan, 1991; Weimer, 2002). Teacher-centered teaching styles can be seen as rather traditional and formal instruction using more isolated language forms (Fotos, 2010). In this circumstance, the instruction of teachers is more controlled and focused on establishing an environment which encourages learners' target behavior (Dupin-Bryant, 2004). In recent years, the need for a paradigm shift to a learner-centered approach has been illustrated to bring a more constructivist view of learning and teaching, as well as learners' active involvement in a second language learning setting (Conti, 1989; Pillay, 2002; Weimer, 2002).

According to Liu and Liu (2004), the learner-centered approach brings more active learning and has immense significance for individual development. Hart (2003) also defines language learning as a series of behaviors which not only stimulate the convention of language but construct knowledge with the engagement of a substantial amount of activities rather than memorizing lists of language forms (Kain, 2003; Mascolo, 2009). As for the advantage of adopting the learner-centered approach, learners may be able to develop their own language competence and self-management skills required in collaborative work. This is achieved by being exposed and experiencing more target language oriented activities like problem-solving tasks when considering learners' individual learning strategies (Kim, 2012).

In a learner-centered approach, there are a number of desirable behaviors from the teacher to meet the learner's expectations and achieve successful learning, such as being facilitators and evaluators at the same time, providing active feedback and rich responses, stimulating learners to be engaged in learning with divergent questions, allowing learners to choose their own tasks or activities, presenting ample examples and rules of the target language, and providing more space for learners to control their learning with more responsibility (Conti, 1989; Hancock, Bray, & Nason, 2003). In this respect, Dupin-Bryant (2004) claims that instruction in a learner-centered approach tends to be receptive, collaborative, problem-based, and autonomous, all of which stimulate individual learning.

However, despite all the positive factors of the learner-centered approach, Kim (2012) shows a number of practical difficulties in implementing the teaching method, such as preparing for an appropriate grading system, organizing teacher training programs, and reformulating school curricula and so on. In terms of non-visualized learning in teaching styles, Conti (1985) suggests a number of teaching techniques as ways of personalizing learning to meet the individual needs of each learner with the use of collaborative activities which can be regarded as traditionally less implemented by instructors (Liu & Liu, 2004). Dunn and Dunn (1979) assumes that teachers generally have a tendency to teach their learners in the way they learn best and use teaching strategies that have been taught in their previous learning and teaching environment. Therefore, many researchers have suggested that teachers need to modify their own teaching styles and provide a wide range of effective learning strategies to learners as a certain type of teaching style may not fit for some students (Callahan, Clark, & Kellough, 2002).

In order to assess learners' individual needs, teachers are encouraged to let their students learn from their own preferred way. From this experience, teachers may be able to reconsider their own teaching styles, while feeling the need to modify and adjust teaching approaches which may enhance learners' learning satisfaction and achievement (Henson, 2004; Hou, 2007). In Zeeb's (2004) study, matching teaching styles of teachers with learning styles of learners could produce positive progress in academic performance. Moreover, it found that students encountering a teaching style that matched their own preferred

learning strategies show more positive attitudes in their learning and better competence to share the knowledge they acquire (Farkas, 2003). Therefore, a good teaching style should be understood as the process of adjusting teaching approaches in a way it successfully accommodates individual learner variables and situated social contexts.

2.2 Language Use: Use of L2 as a medium of instruction

As English has been widely used as an instructional language in many EFL college English classes, the role of the native language in teaching practices is often discussed in connection to the issue of good teaching. The importance of using target language as a medium of instruction in second language classrooms has been ingrained in the minds of many non-native instructors (Cook, 2001). Krashen (1982) asserts that learners' continuum of comprehensible target language input may result in mastery of the target language and increased intrinsic motivation because of the realization of the immediate usefulness of a newly acquired language. In a similar context, Swain (1985) also establishes theoretical rationale by suggesting that having interactions with the target language can be a crucial factor to foster the learning process of learners, whether it is spoken or written output. A direct correlation between target language development and teacher's use of the target language has been shown by many researchers (Lightbown, 1991; Liu, 2008). By using the target language, learners are naturally engaged in communicative language practice which enables learners to experience structured and authentic communication. This can be achieved with the tasks which involve various levels of unpredictability in terms of constructing meanings such as role-plays and group discussions (Littlewood, 2007).

Despite the necessity of using the target language, many researchers have claimed that the use of L1 should not be excluded from the classroom in order to enhance the quality of communication between participants (Cook, 2001; Macaro, 2000). In this respect, Macaro (2000) proposes that code-switching can be an efficient teaching technique in terms of supporting learners' knowledge building process, such as teaching grammar activities, delivering complex instructions, and dealing with learners' behaviors and maintaining personal

relationships with students.

The studies reviewed indicates that a "good teacher" needs to know the specific ways L1 and L2 are distributed during the teaching practices. Building up communicative competence would be not only the ultimate goal of language education, but the essential task in language classroom practice. In order to incorporate the target language as a medium of instruction into EFL or ESL classes, good teachers need to create various teaching methods and teaching materials, which can be relevant to other associated skills such as listening, speaking and writing (Nunan, 1989).

2.3 Quality of Teaching

2.3.1 Knowledge on English education

The quality of teaching is another area of evaluating a good teacher in terms of knowledge on subject matter and teaching strategies. Recently, increasing attention has been paid to providing quality education to all the students and identifying the field knowledge and skills teachers need to know in second language teaching and learning (Darling-Harmmond & Bransford, 2005). Aydın, Bayram, Canıdar, Çtin, Ergüay, Ödem and Tunç (2009) finds that learners prefer their teacher to not only have more knowledge of the subject and but present it effectively in order to achieve successful learning with regard to objectives.

Moreover, many researchers have shown different types of subject-matter knowledge which might be critical to effective teaching for all the second language teachers (Cochram-Smith & Lytle, 1999; Day & Conklin, 1992). According to Arıkan (2010), subject-matter knowledge helps to make teachers utilize audio-visual aids whenever possible, connect learners with various types of learning strategies, and maximize learners' progress in language learning. First, content knowledge is about what language teachers may teach as a subject matter as well as literary and cultural aspects of language (Hollon, Roth, & Anderson, 1991).

Second, pedagogic knowledge refers to generic teaching strategies, beliefs and techniques, including classroom management, motivation, and teachers' decision making (Newton & Newton, 2001). Third, pedagogical content knowledge refers to the specialized knowledge of how to adopt content

knowledge in various ways, the difficulties that learners encounter, and how to tackle these problems in terms of using speaking, listening, reading and writing skills. Shulman (1987) asserts that pedagogical content knowledge is the most crucial part of teaching a second language. This can be used for not only understanding topics and issues, but integrating learners' interest and abilities into the instruction. In addition, Nunan (1989) introduces two types of important declarative knowledge which includes all the information teachers should know regarding the target knowledge and procedural knowledge which includes the ability to manage the lessons with the instructional strategies and techniques which represent their professional expertise in the subject matter.

As discussed above, raising teachers' language awareness by extending subject knowledge can be one of the most important features in terms of developing an effective language teacher (Bartels, 2005). This can be achieved through not only conventional means, but through the engagement of texts, enhanced by the interactions in real life settings (Savova, 2003).

In teacher training programs, more discussion has ensued, especially what skills a professional teacher should develop and in what standards these skills and proficiency should be instructed (Cray, 2003; Larsen- Freeman, 2004). In this matter, Bartels (2005) points out the development of teachers' knowledge in language-related areas, such as lexical usage, syntactic structure, second language learning, phonological understanding, discourse analysis, pragmatics, socio-cultural-based understanding and so on. Moreover, more pedagogical components of knowledge should be taught and supervised in teacher training courses, including teaching methodology, material design, and assessment of learners as elements of subject-matter knowledge. Consequently, because of the better subject knowledge teachers are equipped with, the more successful the achieved results will be. (Shishavan & Sadeghi, 2009).

2.3.2 Teaching strategies

As mentioned above, pedagogical knowledge is related to teachers' skills and/or techniques which can be used for effective teaching and learning, incorporating teachers' guides for organizing learners, clarifying and explaining, motivating learners, sustaining interest, providing positive reinforcement, and

designing interesting materials with the help of technology and so on (Aydın et al., 2009; Shishavan & Sadeghi, 2009). In addition to this, Wong and Wong (1998) delineates the importance of using classroom management strategies in order to create an atmosphere in which effective learning and instruction can take place. This can be accomplished by lowering learners' affective filter, fostering individual motivation, and providing stress-free environments to reduce the fear of making mistakes.

Brown and Rodgers (2002) also suggest two blended aspects of second language lessons a "good teacher" should be aware of in terms of conducting the mechanical aspect and the mental aspect of the lesson. The former is the strategies that may be required for the content of the lesson to be delivered in the most effective methods for learners. The latter comprises the mental aspect of strategies a teacher may have regarding teaching and learning including a teacher's personality. Much research has been conducted to show the importance of teachers' emotional strategies for maximizing learning; building effective rapport with learners, showing patience and respect for learners, selecting appropriate lesson plans by designing effective tasks, and maintaining personal relationships with students in order to tackle learners' behavioral problems (Thompson, 2008).

As to more detailed teaching strategies, a number of techniques and skills of language teachers are reported to be developed and utilized in language classrooms. These components illustrated to be highly beneficial for a would-be language teacher are: communication and presentation ability, skills to motivate students for further learning, competence to select effective teaching techniques, capability to handle unpredictable situations, use of appropriate discipline, organizing learning activities and tasks, performing pedagogical reactions, showing a friendly atmosphere, and building knowledge about teaching strategies and theoretical concepts in English language teaching (Kalebic, 2005; Rockoff, 2004).

However, teachers are not likely to have confidence in their teaching performance because of several problems in classroom situations such as overcrowded classes, teachers' inefficient target language abilities, a lack of learners' understanding, and passive approaches to find useful teaching methods and so on (Chun, 2005; Lee, 2005). Therefore, Lee (2005) suggests that language

teachers should participate and be trained in long-term teacher training courses in order to successfully implement vast amounts of teaching related knowledge and theoretical concepts into real classroom situations.

To short, prior studies on a "good teacher" have addressed the importance of teaching in terms of teaching perspectives, the use of the target language as an instruction-medium language, and the quality of teaching. These studies, though producing contradicting results in teaching perspectives, tended to support a paradigm shift toward more learner-centered approach, more use of L2 in EFL classes, and higher quality of teaching. However, there has been little research dealing with the issue of a "good teacher" from the pre-service English teacher's perspective. In this respect, this paper attempts to examine how the perceptional differences in a "good teacher" can influence the ways pre-service teachers engage in teaching practices during the practicum.

3. Method

This study used a mixed-methods design combining two different methods under the quantitative paradigm (Freeman, 1996; Stringer, 2004). In the design that followed a quantitative-qualitative sequence, a survey research was conducted as a quantitative phase with the following interpretative analysis as a qualitative phase. Since two phases of analyses played a distinct but complimentary role in understanding students' learning behaviors in the field of English education, the use of a mixed-methods design has been validated on empirical ground (Creswell, 1994; Tashakkori & Teddlie, 1998).

3.1 Contexts and Participants

The context of this study was a four-year pre-service English language teacher education program at an urban university in Korea. In the program, the students took courses required for English language teaching in the first three years, and pre-service teachers engaged in a four-week teaching practice in the fourth year. The participants in this study were twenty seniors who were enrolled in the course of English Logic and Essay Writing as part of their

pre-service training, which was mandatory for all seniors. There were sixteen female and four male students; the age range was from 23 to 31. Eight student teachers were assigned to middle schools and twelve to high schools for the practicum, and the researcher was the instructor of the course.

3.2 Data Collection

The present study was conducted during the participants' four-week teaching practicum in their final year of study. Multiple methods were used to collect data, including questionnaires, interviews, and daily journals the participants wrote during the practicum.

3.2.1 Questionnaire

The questionnaire was administered two times: two days before the participants engaged in the practicum and immediately after the practicum ended in order to capture any changes of pre-service teachers' perspectives on "a good language teacher" through the teaching practicum. The quantitative data were collected through a questionnaire containing 36 items that measured the student-teachers' responses to good teaching on a five-point Likert scale (see Appendix A for a detailed information). The questionnaire was developed to assess students' perspectives on good teaching in the three pedagogical areas, drown from the theory and literature (Conti, 1989; Cortazzi & Jin, 1996; Kim, 2012). Specifically, the items in a survey were categorized into three areas of teaching: the teaching approach, language use, and the quality of teaching.

The instrument developed in this study mainly used the items validated on the empirical ground. Specifically, for the teaching approach category, 16 items were selected from the PALS survey (Conti, 1985, 1989; Miglietti & Strange, 1998). And the language use and the quality of teaching categories included 9 items and 12 items respectively, which were guided by empirical studies (Guthrie & Guthrie, 1987; Wigglesworth & Storch, 2012).

As reported in many other studies (Dupin-Bryant, 2004; Wilson, 1994), the construct validity for the instrument was established through two methods, or two separate juries of educators and field tests with practitioners. In addition,

the reliability of the survey was established by using the test-retest method, which retested the survey a week later. As an aside, Cronbach's alpha was used for testing the internal consistency of the instrument, and an alpha coefficient of .88 was considered to be sufficient in the field of English education.

As an aside, the purpose of the survey research was not specified to control the possible impact that the teacher research might have on the students' responses. Specifically, since they had no prior information on the direction for this study, they were not able to respond to the items according to the researcher's preference.

3.2.2 Interviews and Daily Journals

The daily journals were required as an assignment of the course. Keeping a journal for reflection has many advantages in that it can help promote pre-service teachers' awareness of 'becoming a teacher' and provide chances to look into the events, connecting their experiences and beliefs (Johnson, 1996; Shoughton, 2007). In order to trace this connection by describing their field learning experiences, and sharing their inner thoughts and feelings, the pre-service teachers were asked to write a journal on a daily basis. More specifically, in the journal, they delineated service teachers' ways of teaching, generated some questions on current approaches to teaching English and made hypotheses about what good teaching was. A total of 345 entries[1] were collected and analyzed.

Semi-structured interviews were carried out after the teaching practicum to investigate pre-service teachers' perspectives on "a good teacher" and their field experiences. Interview protocols had the questions on whether their original beliefs on a "good teacher" had changed in the teaching practicum and whether there were, if any, possible influencing factors. More specifically, pre-service teachers were asked to reflect on their field experiences and show their pre-established and newly established beliefs about "a good teacher." If their beliefs changed, they shared any personal and situational factors that influenced their beliefs. The interviews were conducted in Korean in order to ease the

---

1) Even though almost all the student teachers kept a journal every day during the practicum, 45 entries were not submitted and the total number of entries was only 345.

communication of their perceptions in their native language.

3.3.3 Analytic Approach

The data collected were analyzed according to the following procedures. With regard to the survey data collected to examine the pre-service teachers' perspectives on a "good teacher," the researcher coded the scores for each category, with 1 (valued at 'strongly disagree') and 5 (valued at 'strongly agree'). Using the descriptive statistics, an overall range of scores and the respective scores for three pedagogical areas were computed. Second, to analyze the changing perspectives on the "good teacher," an independent measures t-test was used. In particular, the mean differences in the perspective scores were tested to examine whether pre-service teachers' perceptions on good teaching changed over the course of the teaching practicum.

When it comes to the qualitative data, interviews with pre-service teachers and daily journals were used as secondary data to understand, if any, how their perceptions on a "good teacher" were reshaped during the practicum experience. For this purpose, the changes in perspective scores in the three pedagogical areas were subjected to an interpretative analysis emerging from the interviews with the pre-service teachers and daily journals. More importantly, the range of influential factors shared by the participants would be used as baseline data to explain the changing perspectives on a "good teacher."

4. Results

The role of the teaching practicum in shifting pre-service teachers' perceptions on a "good teacher" was examined, using survey research coupled with an interpretative analysis. The analysis of the survey was targeted at examining the pre-service teachers' perceptions on good teaching in the following three perceptional domains: (a) good teaching approach, (b) language use, and (c) the quality of teaching. This section presents the importance of the teaching practicum in influencing pre-service teachers' perspectives on these pedagogical domains of a "good teacher."

4.1 Perceptions on a "Good Teacher"

The analysis of the survey was targeted at examining the pre-service teachers' perceptions on a good teaching in the following three pedagogical areas: the teaching approach, language use, and the quality of teaching. An analysis of the first survey administered before the teaching practicum showed that the overall mean score on a "good teacher" was 3.63 out of 5.0 with a standard deviation of 0.68. In general, an overall perspective score range of 2.72 to 4.25 was skewed to the right end of the continuum, pointing out that the pre-service teachers possessed positive views on the items guided by the survey. Specifically, the pre-service teachers majoring in English education at a local university tended to possess a more learner-centered teaching approach, prefer to use the target language in class more, and value the quality of teaching. For an instance, an overall mean scores of 3.63 was greater than Conti's (1989) criterion value (3.2 out of 5 points) for distinguishing the learner-centered from teacher-centered approaches. Some descriptive statistics for the three categories, such as the mean scores with corresponding standard deviations, are reported in Table 1.

TABLE 1. Perspective Scores for Each Pedagogical Category from the First Survey

Categories	Items (N=36)	Mean	SD	Score Range for each category
Overall Perspective Scores	36	3.63	0.68	[2.72 ~ 4.25]
Teaching Approach	16	3.55	0.61	[2.50 ~ 4.25]
Learning-centered approach	4	3.64	0.59	
Personalized Instruction	4	3.56	0.71	
Assessment of students' needs	4	3.45	0.66	
Participation in the learning process	4	3.55	0.63	
Language Use	8	3.75	0.73	[2.83 ~ 4.25]
Teaching English In English	4	3.68	0.69	
Integrating 4 linguistic areas	4	3.83	0.72	
Quality of Teaching	12	3.64	0.68	[2.92 ~ 4.25]
Knowledge of English	4	3.58	0.69	
Teaching skills	4	3.66	0.71	
Students evaluation	4	3.69	0.76	

With regard to the teaching approach category of a "good teacher," the mean score was 3.55 with a standard deviation of 0.61, providing evidence supporting the learner-centered teaching approach. In case of the four sub-categories associated with the teaching approach, the pre-service teachers assigned a higher value for the *'learner-centered approach'* with the mean score of 3.64, as compared to the *'personalized instruction'* (3.56), with *'assessing students' needs'* (3.45), and *'participating in the learning process'* (3.55).

Regarding the response to how a "good teacher" uses the target language in English class, the pre-service teachers highly valued the use of English as an instruction-medium language. The mean score for the *'langue use'* was 3.75 with a standard deviation of 0.73, which was higher than the overall mean score of 3.63. In particular, the pre-service teachers strongly believed that English should be used as a class-medium language to integrate the four linguistic areas of language learning (listening, speaking, reading, and writing), as indicated by the corresponding mean score of 3.83 (SD=0.72). This category obtained the higher value than those for the other two categories, indicating the pre-service teachers' strong preference for using the target language in class. Taking a closer look at the item 20 (i.e., *'Indicate the appropriate distribution of English and Korean in your English class.'*) in the language use category, the majority of pre-service teachers (14/20 pre-service teachers) insisted that more than 50% of the teaching and learning practices should be delivered through the target language. Interestingly, no one responded to the *'English less than 10%, Korean 90%,'* the responses to the *'English less than 30%, Korean 70%'* and *'English only'* were one and five instances, respectively.

When it comes to the quality of teaching, the mean score was 3.64 with a standard deviation of 0.68. The pre-service teachers tended to perceive the quality of teaching as an essential part of a good teacher in terms of *'knowledge of English,' 'teaching skills,' and 'student evaluation.'*

4.2 Changing Perspectives on a "Good Teacher" during the Practicum

4.2.1 Change in Perspectives on a "Good Teacher"

To examine how practicum experiences influenced changes in perspectives on a "good teacher," the same survey was re-administered right after the

pre-service teachers came back from the practicum. The survey results indicates that, as compared to the first survey, the pre-service teachers assigned the lower values to two of three categories, even though these values differed across the pedagogical categories, as shown in Table 2.

In the second survey, the overall mean score was 3.33 with a standard deviation of 0.65, which was compared with the mean score of 3.63 in the first survey. To test the differences in the mean scores between the two surveys administered at the different times, the independent sample t-test method was used. The results showed that there was a significant difference in the mean values with －0.30 (t=-2.69; p<0.05). The notion of a "good teacher" perceived by the pre-service teachers seemed to be reshaped during the practicum in pre-service teacher education.

With regard to the three pedagogical categories, the changes in perceptions on a good teacher, however, differed widely across these categories. For the *'teaching approach'*, the participants assigned the lower value with the mean score of 3.22 (SD=0.69). Specifically, the perceptional difference was found to be significant with －0.33 (t=-2.74; p<0.05), indicating a perspective shift toward a more teacher-centered continuum during the teaching practicum.

The most significant change in perspectives on a good teacher was found in the *'language use'* category in that its mean score in the second survey dropped to 3.11 (SD=0.71) from 3.75 (SD=0.73) in the first survey. For the *'language use'* there was a significant difference in mean scores, which was －0.64 (t=-4.49; p<0.01). It indicates that the students' perception on classroom language appeared to shift to Korean relative to the target language.

TABLE 2. Change in Perspective Scores by Each Category

Categories	Survey 1		Survey 2		*Score* *Diff.* *(S2-S1)*	*t*-value
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
Overall Perspective Scores	3.63	0.68	3.33	0.65	-0.30	-2.692*
Teaching Approach	3.55	0.61	3.22	0.69	-0.33	-2.735*
Learner-centered approach	3.64	0.59	3.03	0.71	-0.61	4.351*
Personalized Instruction	3.56	0.71	3.22	0.68	-0.34	-3.183*
Assessment of students' needs	3.45	0.66	3.39	0.72	-0.06	0.481

Parti. in the learning process	3.55	0.63	3.25	0.61	-0.30	-2.792*
Language Use	3.75	0.73	3.11	0.71	-0.64	4.491*
Teaching English In English	3.68	0.69	2.99	0.66	-0.69	4.580*
Integrating 4 linguistic areas	3.83	0.72	3.23	0.74	-0.60	4.262*
Quality of Teaching	3.64	0.68	3.66	0.58	0.02	0.214
Knowledge of English	3.58	0.69	3.61	0.62	0.03	0.222
Teaching skills	3.66	0.71	3.66	0.64	0.00	0.001
Student evaluation	3.69	0.76	3.72	0.68	0.03	0.291

Note: '*' denotes $p<.05$ and 'S2-S1' measures the mean score differences between Survey 1 and Survey 2.

With respect to the *'quality of teaching',* the mean score was 3.66 (SD=0.58), compared with 3.64 (SD=0.68) in the first survey. No significant change was found in the quality of teaching (t=-0.21; p>0.10), though the mean scores slightly increased in the three sub-categories (i.e., knowledge of English, teaching skills, and student evaluation). This result indicates that the quality of teaching perceived by the student teachers was considered to be consistent over the course of the teaching practicum.

4.2.2 Role of the Practicum in Perspective Changes

An analysis of the survey research showed that the teaching practicum in a urban university in Korea influenced pre-service teachers' conceptualization of a good teacher especially in the domains of the *'teaching approach'* and *'language use'.* In the second phase of interpretive analysis, the researchers reviewed the sets of interview protocols and the practicum journals to understand the factors contributing to these changes. The following findings, emerging from the data, would help to understand the perspective- changing process pre-service English teachers experienced during the teaching practicum.

Perspective shift under situated socio-cultural context: The most common experience shared by the pre-service English teachers was that interactional opportunities available in classrooms in either junior high schools or high

schools were seriously constrained (Duff, 1995). While the participants perceived a classroom as a social place to negotiate expertise and difficulties through interactions, the classroom dynamics were not valued during the teaching practices. In other words, the pre-service teachers were exposed to the teacher-directed instructional environments where a teacher controlled the classroom procedures.

As Richardson and Krig (1997) argue, teachers should best meet the needs of their learners by adjusting their teaching approaches. If teaching approaches are not consistent with students' perceptions on learning, interactional opportunities are likely to diminish. In this respect, the pre-service teachers seem to recognize the importance of coordinating their perspectives on teaching approaches appropriate to students' learning behaviors (Fullan, Bennett, & Rolheiser-Bennett, 1990). The practicum experiences under the traditional classrooms would help reshape their perceptions on a good teaching approach, thus shifting their perspectives to a less collaborative continuum. The interview protocols and practicum journals repeatedly illustrated how the practicum experience restricted interpersonal dynamics in class and thus contributed to reshaping their views on a good teacher in line with the given situated sociocultural context.

> Before the teaching practicum, I developed my own teaching materials because I like to teach English using the communicative language teaching approach. I strongly believe that a teacher needs to help students develop communicative abilities. Based on my high school experiences, teaching vocabulary and grammar skills [traditional approach] does not seem to be realistic. But, during the teaching practicum, I was not able to teach my teaching materials at all because students had strong desires to learn problem solving skills. I just realize that a communicative approach does work in this class. (interview with pre-service teacher A, May 27, 2014)

> Because a teacher dominated the entire lectures, there was no room for interacting with students in class. In the teaching practicum, my job was to help students develop testing skills. Like a tutor, I just checked their homeworks every week and gave my written comments [corrective

feedbacks] during the practicum. (interview with pre-service teacher C, May 27, 2014)

In the interviews with pre-service teachers A and C, they expressed the conflicting views on teaching approach during the practicum by explaining how traditional teaching practices could conflict with a collaborative mode of instruction. However, they were able to understand why students provided support for a teacher-centered instructional teaching approach. The pre-service teachers seemed to recognize that an encapsulated instruction led by a dominant teacher might be appropriate to students' testing purposes, discouraging classroom dynamics they expected in the practicum.

A similar point was often addressed in the practicum journals the pre-service English teachers wrote during the teaching practices. In particular, perceptional differences in a teaching approach and some specific ways to accomodate such differences were discussed in the journals.

It seems to be exactly the same class I learned English in my high school about several years ago. They were still learning grammars and reading skills in the same ways. As a teacher, I want to teach to my students what I have learned in my university, but they need to take exams, like I did in my high school. My role was so limited in class since the classroom teacher delivered lectures all over the class time. In this classroom environment, I decide to give an individual lesson [personalized instruction] to help their preparations for the exam (practicum journal, pre-service teacher E, May 13, 2014)

I don't know what I need to do in class. I cannot support a teacher and also cannot help my students in this class. I feel like an outside observer simply monitoring a teacher and students. So, I gave an individual conference to my students after classes. In this conference, I could discuss what English learning I believed and talked about personal questions with my students. It really gave me an opportunity to learn about my students. (practicum journal, pre-service teacher B, May 15, 2014)

Under the teacher-directed classroom environment, the pre-service teachers struggled to find their own ways to engage in the learning process. Such an attempt to incorporate new teaching approaches, such as personalized instruction (pre-service teacher E) and individual conferences (pre-service teacher B) into the traditional English class, illustrates the importance of identifying a complementary role as a teacher in a real classroom. For the majority of participants, the teaching practices in the practicum served as a social place to recognize the importance of the teacher-centered learning approach and to accommodate their teaching perspectives appropriate to classroom settings. In this respect, the practicum tended to lead student teachers who were exposed to learner-centered learning environments to shift their perspectives on teaching approach toward a more teacher-centered continuum.

Perspectives on L1-L2 distribution: It is expected that the pre-service English teachers would prefer to use the target language as a medium of instruction since they have several years of learning experiences under the *'English only'* curriculum. However, the survey results showed that the most significant change in perspectives occurred in the language use categories. Specifically, the student teachers' perspectives on the language use shifted to a L1 use continuum, showing a higher preference for using the native language in class. The set of interview data conducted after the practicum provided useful information about why exposure to the target language was not appropriate to an English class underlying the grammatical syllabus. The following excerpts describe difficulties in using the target language during the practicum.

...
I think it was technically impossible to teach grammars and problem-solving skills using English in class. although students have sufficient communicative abilities, we don't need to teach them using English. I can teach better such things using Korean (interview with pre-service teacher F, May 29, 2014)

Similarly, some pre-service teachers illustrated the difficulties in providing *'valuable L2 input'* that should be modified and contextualized in traditional EFL

classes (Ellis, 1984). For instance, in interviews, pre-service teachers G and F addressed that, when teaching grammar skills the quality of L2 input was not ensured due to the lack of communicative competence.

In the practicum, I don't need to use English at all because students want to learn test-takin skills. (interview with pre-service teacher G, May 27, 2014)

I knew many students want to study English with a Korean and learn communication skills with a native speaker of English. I tried to speak to students in English, but I gave up at the first day of the practicum. I realized that the most difficult thing is to teach grammar skills in English. (interview with pre-service teacher F, May 28, 2014)

As the teaching practicum proceeded, the pre-service teachers seemed to recognize the role played by L1 as a tool of mediation. They stared to recognize that L1 could provide, through collaborative dialogue, an opportunity to acquire L2 in this discourse level, as Anton and DiCamilla (1999) argued. More specifically, since the teacher and the students have already acquired L2 proficiency, they are able to engage in meaning negotiation using their native language as a 'scaffolding' support (Cook, 2001). In the following journals, some pre-service teachers illustrated the importance of using L1 as a communication tool in class.

Before the practicum, I worried about how to develop classroom activities in English. Since I have worked here for 2 weeks, no one spoke English in class, and English was not encouraged in classroom activities directly or indirectly. But I found that they don't even speak Korea in class. In fact, it does not matter whether we use English or Korean in class, since the real challenge is to encourage my students to actively participate in classroom activities. (practicum journal, pre-service teacher D, May 13, 2014)

Today, I taught to my student how to perform the reading discussion. In

this group discussion, each group was supposed to criticise or support the author's argument after reading the article. Since they need to communicate each other in English, interactional activities were not productive as I expected. But, when they were allowed to discuss it in Korean, I realized that my students completely understood the point discussed in group work. (practicum journal, pre-service teacher H, May 20, 2014)

In these journals, pre-service teachers seemed to recognize that using L1 might not hinder L2 acquisition process. Rather, it could foster learners' comprehension as a positive addition in English classroom. In other words, when learners are not sufficient to produce L2, L1 can serve as a way to express meaning and allow them to initiate and sustain verbal interaction with peer students (Brooks & Donato, 1994; Turnbull & Arnett, 2002). The practicum experiences under the teacher-centered settings could help pre-service teachers negotiate their perspectives on L1/L2 use in accordance to the learning contexts where language is taught. Despite a short period of teaching practicum, the pre-service teachers were able to recognize the important role played by L1, shifting their perspectives to the left hand side of the L1-L2 continuum.

5. Discussions

The present study reveals that the perspectives on a "good teacher" held by the pre-service teachers may not be stable when they are exposed to the practices quite different from their learning experiences. As Borg (2009) argues, the significant changes in perspectives can take place in the teaching practicum in various ways if the pre-service teachers have expectations about teaching and learning that are not consistent with the realities of the field schools. In this study, the changes in perceptions on a "good teacher" were found to be significant in the two pedagogical categories. That is, participants tended to reshape their perspectives on the teaching approach and on the language use through the practicum.

The findings of this study provide important implications applicable to the

body of research and to classroom teaching. First, one of the findings is that pre-service teachers appeared to evaluate their teaching approaches as more teacher-centered contrary to their own evaluation before the teaching practicum. This result provides evidence for supporting works of similar studies (Clow, 1986; Gifford, 1992) in that changing perceptions of teaching approaches can pose a challenge to teaching and learning. The practicum could influence pre-service teachers' views on teaching approaches through various reasons, such as expectations about schooling, learning and teaching experiences, and teacher training. For instance, students in secondary school exposed to the teacher-directed mode of instruction over an extended period of time are likely to evaluate pre-service English teachers as more learner-centered. For the pre-service teachers, differences of perspective serve as obstacles to participate in the learning process.

Although the learner-centered approach is strongly encouraged in theory, a teacher-directed mode of instruction is still the dominant teaching approach widely accepted in the field of EFL English education. If an evaluation of teaching approaches by students is reliable and valid (Marsh, 1984), pre-service teachers need to find a way to negotiate such differences. In particular, instead of insisting collaborative learning during the practicum, pre-service teachers attempted to incorporate the traditional teaching approach into their instructional practices, thus contributing to shifting their views toward a teacher-centered continuum (Miglietti & Strange, 1998; Wang, 2004).

Second, recognizing the importance of narrowing differences in perspectives on a teaching approach, the pre-service teachers kept attempting to focus on learner-centered paradigm to traditional English classes over the course of the teaching practicum. With regard to *"learner-centered activities,"* pre-service teachers supported a collaborative mode of instruction by introducing a variety of group works. Some activities, such as pair or group work, reading discussion, and personalized instruction were incorporated into traditional classes to put more value on learner-centered pedagogy, though such attempts often turned out to be inappropriate in such classes. This indicates that learner-centered perspectives can be broadened in secondary school only when the existing mode of instructional practices is maintained, as reported in works of Miglietti and Strange (1998), and Wang (2004).

The process of negotiating differences in teaching approach should be bidirectional. More importantly, the pre-service teachers need to reinforce learner-centered perspectives in the traditional English class which are consistent with students' academic goals and disciplines at the secondary education level (Kim, 2012; Skillton-Sylvester, 2000). For instance, some pre-service teachers were able to incorporate communicative practices into the teacher-directed learning settings in the form of personalized instruction (i.e., individual conferences done out of class) or written communication channels (i.e., e-mail or school discussion board). Even in traditional classes where the teacher and students have a strong preference for the teacher-centered teaching approach, the assessment of student needs and participation in the learning process could serve as mediators to strengthen the existing mode of instruction. Through this process, pre-service teachers can obtain valuable student data and use it to coordinate their perspectives on teaching approach in line with learning contexts.

Third, the language use is another issue that should be discussed in the teaching practicum. After the practicum, pre-service teachers showed strong preference for using L1 as an instruction-medium language, shifting their perspectives toward more L1 use. As indicated by the findings, the main reason was that the use of L2 in class seriously constrained interactional opportunities available to students. As opposed to pre-service teachers' expectations, the use of English could serve as a barrier to restrict communicative learning practices, especially for the EFL students with low communicative competence. For instance, when the lecture was delivered in English, most of the students withdrew from the L2 interaction, passively participated in classroom activities, and often ended up with describing simple aspects of the subject matters.

This problem was addressed in many prior studies (Anton & DiCamilla, 1999; Cook, 2001; Macaro, 2000), providing important implications applicable to instructional practices in EFL English classes. In the context of bilingual education, the effective way to teach traditional EFL classes in connection to English instruction should be discussed. Even in traditional classes, an English-spoken environment could provide a place to communicate difficulties and expertise through well designed-classroom activities. For instance, English can be connected to Korean in class by summarizing the lecture at the end of the class, by following a particular group work in English, or by communicating

in writing. Since the distribution of L1/L2 in EFL English classes has impacts on shaping perspectives on language use for both the pre-service teachers and students, the roles played by English in Korean-spoken classrooms need to be discussed in future research.

Finally, another pedagogical issue is closely related to the training program for pre-service English teachers. The perspectives on a "good teacher" can be considered valuable sociocultural assets pre-service teachers have established through individual and social dimensions of learning practices (Flower, 1994). However, pre-service teachers revealed that their views on teaching approach and language use could be unstable when experiencing different learning contexts in the teaching practicum. More specifically, pre-service English teachers may not know the specific procedures to adopt teacher-centered teaching styles without appropriate professional practicum training programs available to them. For pre-service teachers who have been cultivated under the learner-centered pedagogy, a well- designed practicum training could serve as a means to develop a more collaborative mode of instruction appropriate to learning contexts. For example, when their students are accustomed to traditional ways of teaching, pre-service teachers need to know how to align a collaborative instruction to the teacher-centered approach. In this respect, the practicum training comprising different learning contexts and situations should be considered as an essential part of teaching practices.

6. Conclusions

This study explored how perspectives on a "good teacher" held by pre-service English teachers could change over the teaching practicum. In the survey analysis measuring the perspective on a "good teacher" in terms of teaching approach, language use, and quality of teaching, the significant changes were found in the two pedagogical areas. In particular, pre-service teachers tended to perceive that a "good teacher" supported more teacher-centered mode of instruction and less use of English as an instruction-medium language during the teaching practicum. On the other hand, pre-service teachers' views on the quality of teaching were quite stable over the course of the practicum, though

their overall perspectives shifted to a less cooperative continuum.

Traditional EFL classes underlying the teacher-directed teaching approach served as a key factor that influenced the perspective changes, leading the pre-service teachers to reshape their prior perspectives. This raises the issue of how the pre-service teachers applied a learner-center teaching perspective in the practicum in the way it facilitates more effective teaching and learning. To negotiate such difficulties, the synergic ways of incorporating L2 interaction into school-based learning should be discussed, though the use of English as an instruction-medium language is context-specific. As Duff and Polio (1990) argues, the particular ways L2 is allocated in a given L1-spoken environment are linked to classroom-external variables, L2 proficiency, the teachers' expertise, or the school policy. In this respect, such pedagogical issues should be taken as essential elements of the teacher training program for pre-service English teachers.

As this study involves a group of pre-service teachers in a urban university, the findings may not be generalized across different contexts. More importantly, the results should not be used as conclusive evidence supporting perspective changes in a "good teacher" as a whole. Since perspectives on a "good teacher" can widely differ even at the same university level, research on the teaching practicum is context-specific. In addition, the ways pre-service teachers engage in the teaching practicum are likely to be learner-specific. In this respect, practitioners should not generalize the possible impact the teaching practicum may have on changing perspectives on a "good teacher." Since perspective changes can be influenced by many other factors, such as individual and sociocultural variables, it still remains unsure whether the changing perspective can be sustained in the future.

This paper provides directions for further research. First, for identifying diverse roles that the teaching practicum plays on influencing the teaching perspective, implications of this study would have to be reproduced in different learning contexts. Second, the survey research involving larger sample can help to generalize the findings across contexts and situations. Finally, research on the teaching practicum needs to address some pedagogical issues not addressed in this study, such as the differences in perspectives on a "good teacher" and the development of the teacher training program for pre-service English teachers.

References

Anton, M., & Dicamilla, F. J. (1999). Socio-cognitive functions of L1 collaborative interaction in the L2 classroom. *The Modern Language Journal*, *83*(2), 233-247.

Arıkan, A. (2010). Effective English language teacher from the perspectives of prospective and in-service teachers in Turkey. *Electronic Journal of Social Sciences, 9*(31), 209-223.

Aydın, B., Bayram, F., Canıdar, B., Çtin, G., Ergüay, O., Ödem, Z., & Tunç B. (2009). Views of English language teachers on the affective domain of language teaching in Turkey. A*nadolu University Journal of Social Sciences, 9*(1), 263-280.

Bartels, N. (ed.) (2005). *Applied linguistics and language teacher education*. New York: Springer.

Brooks, F., & Donato, R. (1994). Vygotskian approaches to understanding foreign language learner discourse during communicative tasks. *Hispania, 77,* 262-274.

Brown, J., & Rodgers, T. (2002). *Doing second language research*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Callahan, J. F., Clark, L. H., & Kellough, R. D. (2002). *Teaching in the middle and secondary schools* (7th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill Prentice Hall.

Chang, Y. C. (2010). *Students' perceptions of teaching styles and use of learning strategies.* Master's thesis, University of Tennessee, Tennessee.

Cheng, M., Cheng, A., & Tang, S. (2010). Closing the gap between the theory and practice of teaching: Implications for teacher education programs in Hong Kong. *Journal of Education for Teaching: International Research and Pedagogies, 36*(1), 91-104.

Clow, T. L. (1986). *Difference between teacher professed collaborative teaching mode and adult student perception of collaborative teaching mode*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Missouri, Columbia.

Cochram-Smith, M., & Lytle, S. L. (1999). The teacher research movement: A decade later. *Educational Researcher, 28*(7), 15-25.

Conti, G. J. (1985). Assessing teaching style in adult education: How and why. *Lifelong Learning. 8*(8), 7-11, 28.

Conti, G. J. (1989). *Assessing teaching style in continuing education*. In E. R. Hayes (Ed.), Effective teaching styles (pp. 3-16). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Cook, V. (2001). Using the first language in the classroom. Canadian *Modern Language Review 57,* 402-423.

Cortazzi, M., & Jin, L. (1996). English teaching and learning in China. *Language Teaching, 29*(2), 61-80.

Cray, E. (2003). Knowing grammar for what it is: a critical approach to pedagogic grammar. In D. Lui & P. Master (Eds.), *Grammar teaching in teacher education* (pp. 11‒240,. Alexandria, VA: TESOL.

Creswell, J. W. (1994). *Research design: Qualitative and quantitative approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Day, R.R., & Conklin, G. (1992). *The knowledge base in ESL/EFL teacher education*. Paper presented at the 1992 TESOL Conference, Vancouver, Canada.

Duff, P. (1995). An ethnography of communication in immersion classrooms in Hungary. *TESOL Quarterly, 29*, 505-537.

Duff, P., & Polio, C. (1990). How much foreign language is there in the foreign language classroom? *The Modern Language Journal, 74*, 154-166.

Dunn, R. S., & Dunn, K. J. (1979). Learning styles/teaching styles: Should they ... can they ... be matched, *Educational Leadership, 36*(4), 238-244.

Dupin-Bryant, P. A. (2004). Teaching Styles of Interactive Television Instructors: A Descriptive Study. *The American Journal of Distance Education, 18*(1), 39-50.

Ells, R. (1984). *Classroom second language development*. Oxford: Pergamon.

Farkas, R. D. (2003). Effects of traditional versus learning-styles instructional methods on middle school students. *The Journal of Educational Research, 97*(1), 42-51.

Flower, L. (1994). Literacy action. In L. Z. Bloom, D. A. Daiker, & E. M. White (Eds.), *Composition in the twenty-first century: Crisis and change* (pp. 249-260). Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.

Fotos, S. (2010). Shifting the focus on forms to form in the EFL classroom. *ELT Journal, 52*(4), 301-307.

Freeman, D. (1998). *Doing teacher research: From inquiry to understanding*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Fullan, M. G., & Bennett, B., & Rolheiser-Bennett. (1990). Linking classroom and

school improvement. *Educational Leadership, 47*(8), 13-19.

Gebhard, J. (2009). The practicum. In A. Burns & J. C. Richards (Eds.), *The Cambridge guide to second language teacher education* (pp. 250-258). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Genc, E., & Ogan-Bekiroglu, F. (2004). *Patterns in teaching styles of science teachers in florida and factors influencing their preferences*. Retrieved May 14, 2014, f   r   o   m http://www.eric.ed.gov/contentdelivery/servlet/ERICServlet?accno=ED490 781.

Gifford, N. K. (1992). The relationship of moral reasoning level of instructors to their teaching style and adult student perception of the learning environment (Doctoral dissertation, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, 1992). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 54*, 01-A.

Guthrie, L. F., & Guthrie, G. P. (1987). Teacher language use in a Chinese bilingual classroom. In S. R. Goldman & H. T. Trueba (Eds.), *Becoming literate in English as a second language* (pp. 205-231). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Hammond, S., & Gao, H. (2002). Pan Gu's paradigm: Chinese education's return to holistic communication in learning. In X. Lu, W. Jia, & D. R. Heisey (Eds.), *Chinese communication studies: Contexts and comparisons* (pp. 227-244). Westport. CT: Ablex.

Hancock, D. R., Bray, M., & Nason, S. A. (2003). Influencing university students' achievement and motivation in a technology course. *The Journal of Educational Research, 77*, 81-112.

Hart, I. (2003). The outsider's gaze: A learner-centred approach to language-teaching materials. *Educational Media International, 40*(3-4), 287-292.

Heimlich, J. E., & Norland, E. (1994). *Developing teaching style in adult education.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Henson, K. T. (2004). *Constructivist methods for teaching in diverse middle-level classrooms.* Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Hollon, R. E., Roth, K.J. & Anderson, C.W. (1991). Science teachers' conceptions of teaching and learning. In J. Brophy (Ed.), *Advances in research on teaching. Volume 2* (pp. 145‐185). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Hou, C. S. (2007). *A study on the relationship between teacher-student style match or*

mismatch and English learning achievements. Unpublished master's thesis. National Yunlin University of Science & Technology, Yunlin, Taiwan.

Johnson, K. E. (1999). *Understanding language teaching: Reasoning in action*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle Publishing Company.

Kain, D. J. (2003). Teacher-centered versus student-centered: Balancing constraint and theory in the composition classroom. *Pedagogy, 3*(1), 104-108.

Kalebic, S. C. (2005). *Towards the development of standards in foreign language teacher preparation*. Paper presented at 30th ATEEA (Association for Teacher Education in Europe) Annual Conference Amsterdam, Netherlands. Retrieved April 1, 2014 from www.atee2005.nl/download/papers/05_ab.pdf

Kim, S. Y. (2012). Teacher-student perceptions of teaching styles: EFL college classes. *English Language Teaching, 24*(3), 97-122.

Krashen, S. (1982). S*econd language acquisition and second language learning*. New York: Pergamon.

Larsen-Freeman, D. (2004). The nature of linguistics in a teacher education program. In Hawkins & Irujo (Eds.), *Collaborative conversations among language teacher educators* (pp. 69‐86). Alexandria, VA: TESOL.

Lee, S. W. (2005). T*eachers' and students'perceptions concerning teaching English through English.* Unpublished master's thesis, Keimyung University, Daegu. Korea.

Lightbown, P. (1991). What do we have here? Some observations on the influence of instruction on L2 learning. In R. Philipson, E. Kellerman, L. Selinker, M. Sharwood-Smith, & M. Swain (Eds.), *Foreign/Second language pedagogy research: A commemorative volume fro Clause Faerch* (pp. 97-212). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Littlewood, W. (2007). Communicative and task-based language teaching in East Asian classrooms. *Language Teaching, 40*(3), 243-249.

Liu, L. (2008). Co-teaching between native and non-native English teachers: An exploration of co-teaching models and strategies in the Chinese primary school context. *Reflections on English Language Teaching, 7*(2), 103-118.

Liu, R., & Liu, Y. (2004). A Paradigm Shift of Learner-Centered Teaching Style: Reality or Illusion? (Vol. 13) Retrieved April 21, 2014, from University of

Arizona Web site: http://w3.coh.arizona.edu/AWP/2006%20PDFs/Liu.pdf

Liu, R., Qiao, X., & Liu, Y. (2004). A paradigm shift of learner-centered teaching style: Reality or illusion? *Arizona Working Papers in SLAT*, 13, 77-91.

Macaro, E. (2000). Issues in target language teaching. In K. Field (Ed.), *Issues in modern foreign language teaching* (pp. 171-189). London: Routledge.

Marsh, H. W. (1984). Student evaluations of university teaching: Research findings, methodological issues, and directions for future research. *International Journal of Educational Research, 11*, 253-388.

Mascolo, M. F. (2009). Beyond student-centered and teacher-centered pedagogy: Teaching and learning as guided participation. *Pedagogy and the Human Sciences, 1*, 3-27.

Mckay, S. (2001). Teaching English as an international language: Implications for cultural materials in the classroom. *TESOL Journal, 9*(4), 7-11.

McCollin, E. (2000). *Faculty and student perceptions of teaching styles: do teaching styles differ for traditional and nontraditional students.* Annual Conference of Mid-South Educational Research Association. KY: Bowling Green. 3-32.

Medley, D. M., & Shannon, D. M. (1994), ''Teacher evaluation'' in T. Husén and T. N. Postlethwaite (eds), *The International Encyclopedia of Education*, (2nd eds), X, Oxford: Pergamon.

Migletti, C. L., & Strange, C. C. (1998). Learning styles, classroom environment preferences, teaching styles, and remedial course outcomes for underprepared adults at a two-year college. *Community College Review, 26*(1), 1-19.

Newton, D. P., & Newton, L.D. (2001). Choosing and judging teachers: What heads and student teachers think matters. *Research in Education, 66*, 54–64.

Nunan, D. (1989). *Designing tasks for the communicative classroom. Cambridge*, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Nunan, D. (1991). Communicative tasks and the language curriculum. *TESOL Quarterly, 25*(2), 279-295.

Pillay, H. (2002). Understanding learner-centredness: does it consider the diverse needs of individuals. *Studies in Continuing Education, 24*(1), 93-102.

Richardson, T. R., & Krig, J. P. (1997). Preferred teaching styles and modes of thinking among university students in mainland China. *Thinking Skills and*

Creativity, 1(2), 95-107.

Savova, L. (2003). *Grammar conversations: educating teachers about grammar discourses.* In Lui & Masters (eds.), 25 – 40.

Shulman, L. S. (1987). Knowledge and teaching: Foundations of the new reform. *Harvard Educational Re-view, 57*(1), 1 – 23.

Skilton-Sylvester, E. (2001). Electronic literacies and TESOL graduate students from Korea: New channels for navigating cultures of learning. *Pan-Pacific Associate of Applied Linguistics, 5*(2), 221-240.

Stoughton, R. (2007). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for grounded theory* (2nd ed.). London: Sage.

Stringer, E. (2004). *Action research in education.* Pearson: Merrill Prentice Hall.

Swain, M. (1985). Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development. *Input and Second Language Acquisition,* 235-254.

Tashakkori, A., & Teddlie, C. (1998). *Mixed methodology: Combining qualitative and quantitative approaches* (Applied Social Research Methods Series No. 46). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Thompson, S. (2008). Defining a good teacher simply! M*odern English Teacher, 17*(1), 5-14.

Turnball, M., & Arnett, A. (2002). Teachers' uses of the target and first languages in second and FL classrooms. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 22,* 204-218.

Wang, V. (2004). Full time adult credential students' instructional preferences at California State University, Long Beach: Pedagogy or andragogy? *Journal of Zhejiang University Science, 5*(3), 365-370.

Weimer, M. (2002). *Learner-centered teaching.* San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Wigglesworth, G., & Storch, N. (2012). What role for collaboration in writing and writing feedback? J*ournal of Second Language Writing, 21,* 364-374.

Wong H. K., & Wong, R. T. (1998). *The first days of school.* Mountain View, CA: Harry K. Wong Publications.

Zeeb, M. S. (2004). *Improving student success through matching learning and teaching styles.* Unpublished master's thesis. University of Phoenix.

Appendix

Survey on Good Language Teacher

The following questionnaire is designed for research on your perspectives on a "good language teacher." Please answer each question according to your own beliefs and learning and teaching experience in English education. All the data collected will be highly confidential and will be used for the research only. First, please fill in some personal information and then answer questions of the questionnaire. Thanks for your cooperation.

Personal Information:

Gender: Female / Male   Age: _____
Native Language(s): _____
Major: _____
Course name (one only please): _____

Questionnaire:

Directions: The following survey contains 49 items that a teacher might do in a classroom. For each item please respond to the way you most frequently consider your teacher's action described in the item. Your choices are Strongly Disagree, Somewhat Disagree, Undecided, Somewhat Agree, and Strongly Agree.

Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Undecided	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree
1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**

I. Teaching Approaches

1. A teacher should allow students to participate in developing the criteria for evaluating their performance in class.

           1   2   3   4   5

2. A teacher should help students find out the gaps between their goals

and their present level of performance.

<div align="center">

1   2   3   4   5

</div>

3. A teacher should allow students to participate in making decisions about the topics that will be covered in class.

<div align="center">

1   2   3   4   5

</div>

4. A teacher should have his/her students identify their own problems that need to be solved.

<div align="center">

1   2   3   4   5

</div>

5. A teacher should not stick to the course objectives in the syllabus that he/she writes at the beginning of a semester.

<div align="center">

1   2   3   4   5

</div>

6. In presenting his/her subject material to students, a teacher should use various teaching methods instead of lecturing as the best method for presenting his/her subject material to students.

<div align="center">

1   2   3   4   5

</div>

7. A teacher should arrange the classroom so that it is easy for students to interact.

<div align="center">

1   2   3   4   5

</div>

8. A teacher should get a student to motivate himself/herself by facilitating cooperative learning in the presence of classmates during group discussions.

<div align="center">

1   2   3   4   5

</div>

9. A teacher should plan learning activities to take into account students' prior experiences.

<div align="center">

1   2   3   4   5

</div>

10. A teacher should not use one basic teaching method because he/she has found that most students have a different style of learning.

<div align="center">

1   2   3   4   5

</div>

11. A teacher should let each student work at his/her own rate regardless of the amount of time it takes him/her to learn a new concept.

<div align="center">

1   2   3   4   5

</div>

12. A teacher should give all students in his/her class the different assignment on a given topic.

          1   2   3   4   5

13. A teacher should adjust his/her instructional objectives to match the individual abilities and needs of the students.

          1   2   3   4   5

14. A teacher should allow student to take periodic breaks during class.

          1   2   3   4   5

15. A teacher should allow students to participate in making decisions about the topics that will be covered in class.

          1   2   3   4   5

16. A teacher should identify subject matters students want to learn in class on the regular basis.

          1   2   3   4   5

II. Language Use

1) Teaching English in English Class

17. A good teacher should recognize an English only class as an essential part of English learning.

          1   2   3   4   5

18. A teacher should use English as a median of instruction in English class.

          1   2   3   4   5

19. A teacher needs to know a way to increase English exposure to students in English classes.

          1   2   3   4   5

20. Indicate the appropriate distribution of English and Korean in your English class you perceive.

        1) (English less than 10%, Korean 90%)

        2) (English less than 30%, Korean 70%)

3) (English less than 50%, Korean 50%)

4) (English less than 70%, Korean 30%)

5) (English 100%, Korean 0%)

21.　　How should a teacher use English in English class? (Note: multiple responses are possible.)

　　1) To summarize or review lecture at the end of the class

　　2) To involve students in interpersonal activities (i.e., group work, class discussion)

　　3) To ask questions and answer the questions

　　4) To review a previous lecture at the beginning of the class

　　5) To deliver a lecture

　　6) To talk about things that are not related to English learning (i.e., opening or closing comments, calling a students)

　　7) Others (　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　)

2) Integration of four linguistic areas (speaking, listening, reading and writing)

Strongly Disagree　Somewhat Disagree　Undecided　Somewhat Agree　Strong Agree
**　　1　　　　　　　2　　　　　　　3　　　　　　4　　　　　　5**

22. A teacher should perceive all aspects of language are inter-related each other.

　　　　　　1　　　　2　　　　3　　　　4　　　　5

23. A teacher should integrate four areas of language into teaching practices.

　　　　　　1　　　　2　　　　3　　　　4　　　　5

24. A teacher should instruct speaking in connection to listening.

　　　　　　1　　　　2　　　　3　　　　4　　　　5

25. A teacher should teach reading in connection to writing.

　　　　　　1　　　　2　　　　3　　　　4　　　　5

III. Quality of Teaching

Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Undecided	Somewhat Agree	Strong Agree
1	2	3	4	5

1) Knowledge of English

26. A good teacher should have a comprehensive knowledge on English learning and teaching.

    1   2   3   4   5

27. A teacher should have a communicative competence (i.e., ability to teach English in English) in English.

    1   2   3   4   5

28. A teacher should have hand-on experiences in various aspects of English (i.e., language, culture, and English literature).

    1   2   3   4   5

29. A teacher should have an ability to use various teaching methods to teach the same subject matter.

    1   2   3   4   5

2) Teaching Skills

30. A teacher should know how to plan, develop and implement lesson plans.

    1   2   3   4   5

31. A teacher should check her/his students during the lecture to use different teaching strategies if students do not follow the lecture.

    1   2   3   4   5

32. A teacher should know how to responses to students' needs or language behaviors they reveal during the classroom teaching.

    1   2   3   4   5

33. A teacher should use various teaching materials other than the text to effectively involve students in the learning process.

    1   2   3   4   5

3) Student Evaluation

34. A teacher should provide a clear guideline to evaluation criteria.

        1   2   3   4   5

35. A teacher should always check whether her/his students understand subject matter after delivering lecture.

        1   2   3   4   5

36. A teacher should value a student's response (encouraging or giving corrective feedback).

        1   2   3   4   5

37. A teacher should evaluate the presence of individual differences by finding a way to value personal improvement in learning.

        1   2   3   4   5

Sun–Young Kim

Department of English Education

College of Education, Mokpo National University

1666 Yeongsan-Ro, Cheonggye-myeon

Muan-Gun, Jeonnam, 534-729, Korea

Tel: +82-61-450-2541

Email: sunyoung0412@mokpo.ac.kr

Bong–Gyu Kim

Department of English Language & Literature

College of Humanities, Mokpo National University

1666 Yeongsan-Ro, Cheonggye-myeon

Muan-Gun, Jeonnam, 534-729, Korea

Tel: +82-61-450-2127

Email: bgk033@mokpo.ac.kr