English Language & Literature Teaching, Vol. 21, No. 1 Spring 2015

Learning to Be a Writing Teacher: A Case Study of Two In-service English Teachers*

Eun-Ju Kim
(Hanyang Women's University)

Kim, Eun-Ju (2015). Learning to be a writing teacher: A case study of two in-service English teachers. ***English Language & Literature Teaching, 21*****(1), 131-151.**

This case study explored the experiences of two Korean in-service English teachers in an intensive English composition course at a graduate school. The course was designed for the participants' development both as learners and teachers of English writing. What two secondary school English teachers brought to, developed in and obtained from the 16 week long academic journey were examined, and the meanings of their experience were interpreted from the perspective of teacher knowledge building (Johnson, 2003, 2009; Kennedy, 1999). Data included two teachers' weekly journal entries, portfolios, and interviews along with their writing samples. Following the principles of qualitative data analysis (Dörnyei, 2007), data were coded and categorized until the core categories emerged. The findings showed that both teachers came to class with the strong identity of learners of English writing. Influencing and being influenced both by thier attitude toward the class and perception of their institutional context, however, the two teachers' learning was somewhat differently constructed and the difference was explained in terms of knowledge building. The findings conceded the substantial influence of personal and institutional context on English writing teacher's professional development. The findings were discussed along with the implications and suggestions for writing teacher education programs and future research.

[English composition course/teacher knowledge building/in-service English teachers]

I. INTRODUCTION

In the field of Korean English education, improving practical communication ability of English learners has been the focus of many English education programs including school

* This work was supported by the National Research Foundation of Korea Grant funded by the Korean Government (NRF-2012S1A5A8022725). The early version of this paper was presented at The 11th Asia TEFL International Conference.

English classes. Even though developing communicative competence through the balanced development of different language skills has been promoted, however, writing skill has not been paid much attention. Schools, for instance, hire native teachers mostly for English conversation class; English native speaker teachers are asked to focus mainly on improving learners' English speaking skill, rarely writing skill (Ministry of Education, 2011).

Consequently, English writing and its instruction have not been the major interest of either teachers or researchers. Supporting this argument, Park & Jang (2014) report that studies in relation to English writing and its instruction started relatively recently. Their review also points out that the research topics are in need of being extended given that the topics of previous English writing studies have been limited to the areas of feedback, teaching methods, and text analysis (p. 421). Few studies have dealt with the topics of English writing teachers and their education (Shim, 2010; Yoon, 2014), and this has become the motivation for the current study of English writing teachers' professional development.

Acknowledging the critical roles teachers play in English instruction, the current study explores the experiences of two in-service secondary school English teachers in an intensive reflective English writing course with regard to teacher knowledge building (Johnson, 2003, 2009). Given that learning and teaching of writing is situated practice (Lee, 2013b), this study is also interested in the sociocultural factors influencing the participant teachers' knowledge building. Three research questions this study posts are as follows;

1. How do two in-service English teachers experience the English composition course?
2. How is their knowledge as writing teachers constructed and/or reconstructed through the English composition course?
3. What are the factors influencing their knowledge construction during their participation in the English composition course?

II. LITERATUER REVIEW

1. Teacher Learning of Teaching as Building Expertise

In this study, teacher learning or teacher professional development is referred to as teacher knowledge building. As learners of teaching, teachers are expected to make efforts to develop as teaching professionals through various channels including participation in teacher education programs. While these endeavors for teacher professional development are made, teacher knowledge and its structure are expected to undergo certain transformation when needed (Johnson & Golombek, 2003).

According to Kennedy (1999), teacher knowledge is categorized as *expert* knowledge, *experiential* knowledge, and *expertise*. *Expert* knowledge is one which is "propositional, written down, codified in textbook, and publicly accepted as a principled way of understanding phenomena within a particular discourse community" (as cited in Johnson, 2003, p. 1). Since this knowledge is often presented and verified by academic communities, *expert* knowledge is regarded as authoritative and legitimate. Teachers are exposed to *expert* knowledge through theory-based or text-based lectures in teacher training programs. The shortcoming of this knowledge is that it is context-insensitive; that is, *expert* knowledge does not take into account who teachers are and where they teach. In spite of this weakness, *expert* knowledge is still important in that it enables teachers to express their under standing of the practices they are engaged in (Johnson, 2003). On the other hand, *experiential* knowledge is mostly based on teachers' field experience both as learners and teachers. Kennedy (1999) thus calls this knowledge *craft* knowledge (p. 31). Due to the lack of intellectual support, however, *experiential* knowledge is often regarded as too personal to have persuasive qualification. Lastly, when *experiential* knowledge and *expert* knowledge are linked and when *experiential* knowledge is "organized around and transformed through", so called, *expertise* emerged (Johnson, 2009, p. 15).

When teachers undergo their professional development, they are expected to move toward building *expertise*. Since teacher learning should be viewed as not linear but as a dialogic process of transformation, simultaneously, their knowledge building should be considered dialogic as well (Johnson & Golombek, 2003; Kim, 2009). This means that even though a teacher shows *expertise* in one teaching area or context, the same teacher would show no *expertise* in different areas or different contexts. As such, knowledge building is context sensitive. It also influences and is influenced by where they teach and how they perceive their teaching contexts (Johnson, 2006; Kim, 2009). Regarding English writing teachers' learning of teaching, Lee (2013b) made a similar argument; since learning and teaching of writing is situated activity, "sociocultural dimension of writing pedagogies" (p. 436) should be considered in teacher learning of teaching writing. Complying with the dialogic and situated nature of teacher learning and knowledge building, thus, this study also considers teacher learning of English writing instruction as neither fixed or context-free (Johnson & Golombek, 2003; Kim, 2009).

2. EFL Writing Teacher Education

Attention to English writing teacher education has gradually increased (Cheung, 2011; Choi, 2010; Coxhead & Byrd, 2007; Han & Kim, 2008; Kim, 2014; Ko,

2009; Lee, 2010, 2013a, 2013b; Matsuda, Saenkhum, & Accardi, 2013; Park & Shim, 2014; Shim, 2009, 2010; Weigle, 2007). Some studies have suggested the teaching ideas for the certain components of English writing such as vocabulary, grammar, feedback, and genre-based teaching approach (Coxhead & Byrd, 2007; Ferris, 2007; Hyland, 2007). However, these early efforts for writing teacher education were often criticized due to the absence of empirical data supporting the arguments (Cheung, 2011). Some other studies then examined teachers' perception in relation to their awareness of learners' needs (Matsuda, Saenkhum, & Accardi, 2013), their competence (Kim, 2014; Shim, 2009), and how to assess students' work (Park & Shim, 2014; Weigle, 2007).

Among these, Lee's study (2010) is noteworthy in that it examines how four EFL writing teachers experienced a writing teacher education program in Hong Kong. In particular, Lee is interested in how the program "promotes teacher learning" (p. 143). Based on four teachers' manifestation, Lee suggests six areas that strongly trigger teacher learning of writing teaching in positive ways. Through problematization of conventional approach, first, teachers are believed to start searching for alternatives and resultantly "broaden their vision about writing and writing instruction" (p. 153). Being inquirers, second, teachers can do critical reflection and develop their own theories of writing and teaching. Lee next points out the reading academic literature followed by writing tasks contribute to developing teachers' ability of critical reflection, let alone their writing ability. As for writing teacher identity, Lee points out moving beyond the narrow concept of writing teaching -grammar and vocabulary teaching- is a road to be a writing teacher. In her other study, Lee (2013a) mentions that having strong identity as a writing teacher is important to sustain their transformation they perform in a teacher education program, so helping them to have strong teacher identity should be one of the major goals of writing teacher education programs. Lastly, by considering the reality of teaching, Lee asks teachers who have seen the "idealistic view" (p. 154) of teaching writing in the teacher education program to do their best to balance the good writing teaching envisioned and reality of class they face in their daily teaching context.

In Korean English education, a majority of EFL writing teacher studies have focused on improvement of writing ability of pre-service English teachers (Choi, 2010; Han & Kim, 2008; Ko, 2009) with the belief that enhanced writing ability would contribute to English writing teachers' professional development. Given that more confident teachers have higher tendency to adopt a writing-based instruction (Kim, 2014), improving teachers' English writing ability should be included as a main part of the English writing teacher education. However, the teachers in Shim's study (2009) point out the lack of resources for writing instruction and relevant

teacher training program as the hindering factors for their writing-based instruction, indicating that teachers' writing proficiency is not sufficient for adopting writing-based classroom instruction. Lastly, the same teachers also mention that no urgent need for teaching writing in their current teaching contexts is one of the reasons for their reluctance. This shows that contextual situation is also an important factor for teachers' decision making for writing-based instruction.

Even though the research topic regarding English writing teachers is slowly expanding, more studies are needed to understand what Korean English writing teachers know, need, and want. Pointing out the unbalanced focus of English writing research in Korea, in a similar vein, Park & Jang (2014) and Shim (2010) also call for more research on the various aspects of English writing. Both studies also indicate that since the previous studies of English writing in Korea mainly have adopted quantitative method framework, more qualitative methods are encouraged both for balanced research method and enriched and in-depth information. Acknowledging the gap in English writing research approach, thus, this study explored teachers' learning experience in a writing teacher education program through a qualitative research lens.

III. RESEARCH DESIGN

1. Context

The study was conducted in an English composition course at a graduate school of education in a university in Seoul. There were 12 pre-service teachers and three in-service secondary school teachers. With the interest in in-service teachers' learning of teaching writing, this study pays attention to the experiences of two in-service teachers in the course and reports the finding in the study. The class met once per week for 90 minutes and it lasted for 16 weeks.

On the first day of class, the needs analysis was conducted to investigate what the participants expected for the course. The result showed that they had strong identity as learners rather than teachers of English writing; that is, most course participants (13 participants) stated their goal was to improve their own English writing ability. Only two participants explicitly mentioned their desire for better teaching of English composition to students. Given that the majority of the course were pre-service teachers who were preparing for the teacher qualification test, it might have been natural for them to have the goal of improving their English composition ability.

In order to combine the results of the needs analysis and duties as a teacher preparation

institute, the researcher-instructor designed an intensive and reflective read-to-write English composition class. First, with the purpose to improve the participants' ability of English writing, the course was designed as an intensive writing class where the participants had plenty of writing opportunities. In the meanwhile, the course participants also had opportunities to experience the diverse instructional approaches and skills of English writing by engaging them in person. Then, by following the principles of reflective learning and teaching, the participants were asked to reflect on their course experiences in connection with their learning and teaching and share the reflection in their weekly journal. More specifically, for instance, the course participants read academic texts regarding English writing (e.g. *Writing* by Reid, 2001) or writing instruction (e.g. *Genre-based pedagogy* by Hyland, 2007). Each reading was connected to a writing activity. One week, after reading the book chapter, *Writing* (Reid, 2001), the class met and checked out each others' understanding of the text through a collaborative concept map drawing activity as a pre-writing activity. The class then learned how to write an English summary by covering the key features of English summary writing. Next, adopting a process-based approach, the course participants wrote multiple drafts of their summary. While writing the drafts, they were also engaged in activities such as writing conference, on-line feedback, and peer-feedback. At the end of the each class, the instructor introduced the relevant terms covered during the class hours and their features. The participants were then requested to reflect on their experience in their weekly journal in free style essays. During 16 weeks, the participants experienced various types of writings, including summary, comparison, opinion, and critiques; process-based approach, product-based approach in terms of timed essay writing were also introduced and adopted. Various writing instruction strategies and tips, including feedback, concept map drawing, and jigsaw reading, were introduced and experienced. Finally, at the end of the semester, the participants created self-assessed portfolios with brief reflective memos for each entry they selected as memorable event during the course.

2. Participants

1) Mi-Jung

Mi-Jung was the first participant teacher in this study and she had been working as an English teacher at a middle school for five years. Mi-Jung majored in English education at college and remembered that she took one English composition class where she mainly learned to organize a passage according to introduction, body and conclusion. Mi-Jung stated that what she was learning in the current course was thus mostly novel to her. At school, Mi-Jung was teaching English to second-grader students in high-proficiency classes.

At the time of the study, Mi-Jung was in the second semester at the graduate school. According to Mi-Jung, she chose the graduate school of education in order to learn some practical ideas for teaching: "I am here not to obtain the license but to learn something practical" (Interview 1). Before entering the graduate school, Mi-Jung took a TESOL certificate program as well. She had a plan for a study-abroad program in the near future because she wanted to be an English teacher-educator at the end.

2) Hye-Jin

The second participant of the study was Hye-Jin, a novice high school English teacher with one year and six month long teaching career. She majored in business administration and minored in English language and literature at college. She was teaching business English at a commercial high school. At the time of data collection, Hye-Jin just returned to the graduate program after a three semester-long break. It was her last course work semester.

Like Mi-Jung, Hye-Jin also took an English composition class when she was an undergraduate student. She remembered the class as being large with the main focus on grammar error correction in sentences produced by students. Hye-Jin said that she did not have prior experience of writing long English passages (Interview 1). What Hye-Jin expected from the course was to improve herself as a competent English writer. In particular, she mentioned that she wanted to have chances to apply the principles of English writing she had known perceptually into actual writings (Interview 1).

3. Data Collection

Primary data for this study came from participants' weekly reflective journals, course final portfolios, and interviews with the researcher-instructor. First, all course participants were required to write weekly reflective journals where they were asked to reflect on the week's class activities in relation to their own experience of teaching or learning of writing. For those who do not have an issue to reflect, several English writing-relevant questions were provided in the name of 'food for thought' as a way to motivate them to write. They were asked to submit minimum of 8 entries. Either Korean or English could be used for their weekly journal; Hey-Jin submitted a total of 6 entries in her weekly journal in English whereas Mi-Jung submitted 11 entries among which 10 were written in English.

The next main data were the self-assessed final portfolios Mi-Jung and Hey-Jin created at the end of the semester. As the course final project and self-assessment of their performance in the course, they were asked to construct a portfolio containing 15 works which were believed meaningful to them. Fifteen short reflective memos accounting for

each selection were followed and these memos and final course reflection in the portfolio became the data.

Lastly, two interview sessions with Mi-Jung and Hye-Jin provided the data for this study. The first interview was conducted on the 8th week, and the second one on the last week of the semester. The first interview lasted more than an hour for both participants, and the topics of the two participants' background, previous learning or teaching of English and English writing experience, the current course participation, and other relevant topics were explored. In the second interview, the participants talked about their final portfolio and it was followed by the researcher's clarifying questions regarding the first interview. The second interview lasted around 20 minutes for both participants. Most questions in interviews were asked in open-ended forms in order to avoid any leading questions. Interviews were conducted in Korean, recorded and transcribed verbatim. The interview excerpts presented in this study were translated into English, but the weekly journals and reflective memos were presented as they were written by the participants.

4. Data Analysis

Qualitative case study framework was adopted for data analysis. Following coding procedure of qualitative research approach (Dörnyei, 2007), first, the researcher repeatedly read the weekly journals, reflective memos, and interview transcripts of each participant. While reading the data, the researcher conducted initial open coding line by line. Categories were established through axial coding. In Hye-Jin's data, for instance, 'negative class experience,' 'positive class experience,' 'current priority,' and 'lack of connection,' were created as categories. These categories were then interpreted in the framework of socioculturally situated teacher knowledge building, and the interpretations were presented as findings in this study. Identical procedures were followed with Mi-Jung's data. The categories from two participants were cross-checked in order to compare the two cases.

As a way to improve the trustworthiness of the analysis, data triangulation was adopted; that is, different types of data were collected to improve the validation of the data. Member check was also conducted with two participants during the second interview in the form of clarification questions. By presenting the preliminary findings at an academic conference, the researcher also had the opportunity for peer-debriefing with colleagues. Lastly, English translation of the Korean interview data presented in this paper was reviewed by a colleague who is fluent in both Korean and English.

IV. FINDINGS

1. Mi-Jung's Participation: I Think I Can Now Teach English Writing!

Mi-Jung had a strong identity as a learner of English writing when she joined the course. She used to believe that producing English sentences with no grammar mistakes is the core qualification of a good English writer (Interview 1). Like other course participants, Mi-Jung wanted to improve her own English writing ability because she was not confident in her English writing ability and thus wanted to improve her writing skills.

Through the semester, plenty of Mi-Jung's reflections were made as a learner of English writing, and her growth as an English writer was observed in her reflections. In Excerpt 1 below, for instance, Mi-Jung talks about the misconception she used to have about English summary writing:

Excerpt 1>

I misunderstood summary writing when I completed this draft: **I considered a paraphrasing as a summary writing. After learning a summary writing, however, I realized that I had some problems with the concept.**

<Reflective Memo 1 in Portfolio>

In her first weekly journal, in addition to correcting her misunderstanding of the concept of English summary writing, Mi-Jung specifically articulates what she has learned about English summary writing from the class:

Excerpt 2>

When it comes to the summary, **I thought, before studying the handouts, it was limited to paraphrasing. I learned three things from class.** First, I should consider the readers: They are those who don't read the article...Second, an academic summary should contain writing conventions like introduction, body and conclusion. Lastly, I should follow only the opinion or conclusion of the author. – I thought that I should write a summary with my opinion and results. **Now I can say that I know what a good summary is.** How nice! <Weekly Journal 1>

As such, through course participation, Mi-Jung had the opportunities to amend her knowledge which was not correct. In addition to her improved understanding of the English writing genre, Mi-Jung also started analyzing her English writing patterns, especially the ones in need of enhancement. She furthermore set some specific plans. In her weekly journal, written right after a writing conference with the instructor, Mi-Jung writes:

Excerpt 3>

I usually produce sentences that are too complex to understand. But the organization of my writing is too simple that the writing probably seems bored. Now, I decide to struggle to combine simple sentences into more complex structure by using useful patterns and proper transition words. <Weekly Journal 7>

As the semester progressed, it was possible to observe the improvement Mi-Jung made in her English writing. While talking about the final draft of comparison essay, for instance, Mi-Jung states how her drafts have improved. Interestingly, Mi-Jung also articulates her improvement using terms specialized in the field of English composition (i.e. coherently, hook, topic sentence):

Excerpt 4>

M**y sentences seem to be simpler and connected more coherently**. **The hook also look related to the overall content and I produced a topic sentence.** As a result, this final draft is easier to read than the first and second ones.

<Reflective Memo 4 in Portfolio>

According to Freeman (1993), when teachers rename their experience and reconstruct their practice, teacher learning is believed to occur. In that sense, Mi-Jung's adoption of terms and her reconstruction of her writing practice show her learning of English writing. Later, asserting the improvement in her English writing ability, Mi-Jung makes similar evaluation in her final draft of summary essay as well:

Excerpt 5>

When compared with the first draft, I could find out three improved aspects; my English sentences look less complicated, organization seems to be more logical and coherent, and the contents also get better. <Reflective Memo 10 in Portfolio>

Mi-Jung' learning was monitored not only from multiple draft writing practice, but also classroom activities such as peer-feedback and collaborative concept map drawing:

Excerpt 6>

I want to call the activity as WOW experience! I had a chance to read So-Hee's draft and felt inspired by her draft because she expressed every sentence in her own words. I felt that I need to do something to fix and improve my English sentences.

<Reflective Memo 1 in Portfolio>

Even though sharing her work with a classmate made Mi-Jung feel "tensed" (Weekly Journal 4), she was very satisfied with the feedback activity. Through the activity, Mi-Jung could see what she thought was a well written draft, confirm her weakness and then became determined to overcome the weakness in her writing.

Mi-Jung also compared this peer-feedback activity with the similar feedback activity she previously completed in another class; At the time, she was not given any guidelines such as a checklist, so she remembered that she just tried to find grammar mistakes in her partner's work. Given that the feedback she received in previous classes was mostly about grammar error correction at the sentence level (Interview 1), Mi-Jung had no choice but to do the same practices when she was put in the position of giving feedback. Mi-Jung especially perceives that peer-feedback guideline is quite useful, in that it would expand the scope of students' English composition beyond producing grammatically correct sentence (Interview 1). Later, Mi-Jung adapted the guideline and conducted this feedback activity in her own instruction:

Excerpt 7>

Performing peer-feedback activities encourage me not to merely read their compositions critically but also to examine mine carefully. Fortunately, I got ideas for my writing instruction from these activities. **I actually promoted my students to conduct a peer-feedback activity in my class and it was quite successful!**

<Reflective Memo 11 in Portfolio>

As seen in Excerpt 7 above, the most noticeable learning in Mi-Jung's case is that she took the first step toward building *expertise* as an English writing teacher by actually adopting what she thought was beneficial for her students. In fact, since the beginning of the semester, Mi-Jung has considered adapting the writing activities she did in this course for her own teaching class. While sharing her reflection in a concept map drawing activity, Mi-Jung mentions the potential application of what she learned in the course in her own teaching:

Excerpt 8>

Making a concept map was effective to understand the lengthy article and it was also supportive to write comparison writing. **It was an exciting activity and I am going to adjust this activity to my future writing class.**

<Reflective Memo 1 in Portfolio>

By the 10th week of the course, then, Mi-Jung took an action by developing a summary

writing lesson plan using the concept of guided writing which was dealt in the graduate course:

Excerpt 9>

These days, I am getting very excited about learning how to write in English... I studied a guided writing for my timed writing task... **According to the information, I designed a lesson plan for my class.** My students will be required to summarize their textbook instead of translation into Korean....**I am not sure if the lesson design will work well. However, I am very looking forward for next week when I can apply these samples to my class.** <Weekly Journal 8 >

In the next journal entry, Mi-Jung reports the result of the lesson where she also used the adapted materials from the course. She shared her reflection as follows:

Excerpt 10 >

I have been trying to improve my teaching according to writing section for two weeks and **I adjusted new concepts on writing instruction to my class**... I can't say they (=activities in lesson) were successful attempt but **it at least opened my eyes toward possibility of writing instruction in that way**...**I as well as my students had good chance to get out of our traditional writing method and we found the experience exciting.** My students felt enthusiastic for doing those activities and especially they seemed happy while working with partners for summary writing. <Weekly Journal 9>

From this experiment, like teachers in Lee's study (2010), Mi-Jung directly experienced the possibility of alternative writing instruction beyond what she called "traditional writing method." As a writing teacher, in fact, Mi-Jung had been concerned about how to teach English writing because she believed that her teaching was limited to the traditional writing method or correcting grammar errors:

Excerpt 11 >

These days, I have been thinking about what English writing is and how I can teach it to the students...Most of the students are good at English, so they did much better than I expected. **As a teacher, however, I felt frustrated because I couldn't do anything except correcting their grammar mistakes. Besides, I had no idea to help some of them who felt tired of writing in English.** I need some creative ideas so as to make them more interested in writing and help them get ready to be good writers.

<Weekly Journal 2>

During the semester, Mi-Jung was teaching high-proficiency classes in her school and her students were very good, translating textbook texts into Korean which was too easy for them (Interview 1). Thus, in her institutional situation, it would have been necessary for Mi-Jung to seek tailored teaching ideas for her high-proficient students. Fortunately, she seemed to find some solutions from this course:

Excerpt 12>
What I really like (about this class) is to connect reading and writing...classmates agreed with me and **my students seem to like it. So, I think connecting the two is very important.** <Interview 1>

In short, through the participation in this intensive reflective English composition course for English teachers, Mi-Jung experienced improvement both as a learner of English writing and its teaching. Since she perceives, "being a competent English writer increases the possibility to be a well-prepared writing teacher" (Reflective Memo 11 in Portfolio), her improvement as a learner are closely related to her improvement as a teacher of English writing. Interestingly, then, what made her experience different from most of her classmates was that Mi-Jung actually externalized what she internalized from the graduate course, experienced the success in the field, and consequently became competent about adopting new activities or approaches of writing instruction in her class:

Excerpt 13>
During this semester, I actually tried to carry out writing classes with my students, following how I learned in this course.... **I think I've become a little bit competent. I think I can now teach English writing.** <Interview 2>

Given that teaching is situated activity (Lee, 2013b), it is impossible to assert that Mi-Jung would continue being competent in and positive about integrating English writing in her classroom instruction. However, considering the purpose of this course is to assist English teachers to experience professional development by connecting their learning and teaching, Mi-Jung's experience is worth paying attention to.

2. Hye-Jin's Participation: Wednesday is So Distressing to Me!

Hye-Jin's participation in and experience of the current intensive reflective English composition class for teachers was considerably different from those Mi-Jung had, revealing the noticeable influence of personal and institutional factors on teacher learning experience. Hye-Jin started teaching English in a full time position at a commercial high

school two years before this study. In order to pay full attention to her school work, Hye-Jin, a novice teacher, took time off from the graduate program for three semesters. Hye-Jin did not think she was ready to resume her graduate study, yet she had no choice but to return to school because further extension of her leave of absence was not permitted (Interview 1). At the time of data collection, thus, Hye-Jin was under stress due to both her school duties and graduate coursework. While talking about her guilty feeling over the current course, Hye-Jin expressed the difficulty she was encountering:

Excerpt 14>
Right now, (because) this is my second year at school, **I have overwhelming workload. In addition, I should handle this (=graduate course work),** So, being honest, I think- I just skim (texts) and manage to do assignments because submission itself is important to me...So, I feel shame. <Interview 1>

In spite of her desire to do well in the course, Hye-Jin missed classes in the beginning of the semester and sometimes came to class late due to her school work; consequently, during the first 7 weeks of semester, she sometimes misunderstood assignments and submitted the wrong work or came to class without being ready. Even though Hye-Jin felt proud when she realized the improvement she made in her writing (Reflective Memo 6 in Portfolio), overall, she felt anxious in this class:

Excerpt 15>
I like learning (English) but, at the moment, it is so stressful. (In this class,) I have this kind of a thought, 'Oh my! There is another homework. Oh, the due is soon, too.' So, **Wednesday is so distressing to me.** <Interview 1>

As one of her expectations for this course, Hye-Jin expressed the wish to read some well-written writing samples so that she could apply what she learns from the sample writing later in her own writing (Interview I). Regarding her writing as a very poor sample, Hye-Jin did not want to share her own writing with her classmates. While talking about peer feedback session, Hye-Jin states that she felt very embarrassed during a peer-feedback session:

Excerpt 16>
I am a person of great self-respect. **So, when showing my papers to strangers – well not strangers - but you and the classmates for feedback, I felt so stressed.** My ego gets bruised because I know my writing is miserable. Due to the stress, my motivation for writing becomes even lower and I want to avoid this situation.
<Interview 1>

Unlike Mi-Jung who was inspired by the feedback activities both as a learner and teacher of English writing, Hye-Jin was rather stressed due to the same activities, revealing that the same activity in a class can be perceived very different depending on who the learners are. This made her even more demotivated in the writing course. Even though she was not satisfied with her poor participation, thus felt high stress with growing negative attitude toward this course, however, Hye-Jin did not seem seriously concerned about not keeping up her classmates.

Her attitude might have come from the goal she set up for the graduate school course works for the semester. Hye-Jin states that she hopes to pass the course work, but pursuing excellence is not her interest (Interview 1). To Hye-Jin, rather, caring for the students she was in charge of and managing her school duties were the most urgent tasks given to her:

Excerpt 17 >
It is so important to have time with them (my students). I usually do interview and counseling after school. That is the most important task in these days of my time.
<Weekly Journal 1>

Excerpt 18 >
Frankly speaking, **my students are my first priority now. Graduate school is just my personal business.** <Interview 1>

In Excerpt 18, Hye-Jin clearly separates her school work and her graduate study: that is, to Hye-Jin, the school she teaches and the graduate program she attends are two independent places with little or no connections. Confirming this disconnection, Hye-Jin states that she wants to improve her writing skills through this course but is not interested in learning teaching skills of English writing. When asked about the possible connection between the current course and her teaching at school, she substantiates the disconnection again:

Excerpt 19 >
Because **I am taking this class to improve my own writing skill, not to learn how to teach English writing.** In that sense, I am not in an urgent situation. <Interview 1>

With a strong learner identity, consequently, Hye-Jin viewed the course as a tool for the improvement of her own English writing skill. She was not interested in how to teach English writing at the moment. Thus, the course asking either to find the connections between the course and her teaching or reflect her learning and teaching in related to the

course activities might have not motivated her much. Rather, for Hye-Jin who barely managed to submit writing assignments, the reflective aspect of this course was too demanding.

Considering her institutional situation, this passive participation of Hye-Jin is anticipated. Since she was teaching at a commercial high school where English is not most students' major interest or passion, Hye-Jin acknowledged that teaching writing might be the last skill she might introduce in teaching (Interview 1). Therefore, she neither felt the need for making effort to reflect her process of learning English writing nor planned how she would teach writing. Hye-Jin's passive participation in and low motivation for this course do not mean that she is not motivated at all for her profession development or learning as an English teacher:

> Excerpt 20>
> There will be training for teachers who teaches business English at commercial high school this winter. **I think this program would be very useful for me.** Besides, it will be held during winter break. School also encourages me to take part in the program.
> <Interview 1>

Before Hye-Jin became a full time English teacher, in fact, she acknowledges that she also used to have a different attitude toward the graduate courses:

> Excerpt 21>
> When I was a (full-time) graduate student, I often thought from a graduate student's perspective. So, when I took this kind of class, I also used to think, 'I would try this activity when I become a teacher.' **But, now, from a teacher's perspective, 'why are there so many things required to do especially for English teachers?,'** I think.
> <Interview 2>

Now, however, Hye-Jin points out the gap between theory and practice by pointing out the unrealistic nature of graduate course assignments:

> Excerpt 22>
> Sometimes I think, 'professors seem so ignorant of the real situation of schools'...**What professors encourage us to do at schools are so difficult to implement at school**.
> <Interview 1>

Like some teachers who were not inspired by the writing teacher education program in Lee's study (2010), to Hye-Jin, this intensive and reflective English composition course

was not what she needed at the time and thus all the writings, relevant activities, and reflections were regarded as burdensome coursework requirements. For the novice teacher, in short, her school work and academic work at the graduate program could not be bridged.

V. DISCUSSION

When Mi-Jung's and Hye-Jin's learning experiences in the intensive reflective English composition course are viewed from teacher knowledge building, both acquired *expert* or content knowledge through the courses; during the semester, Mi-Jung and Hye-Jin were introduced to the history of writing instruction, writing genres, writing relevant research, and others as text forms. Provided that all of the reading texts are academic and research-based, the knowledge derived from the texts can be regarded as *expert* knowledge. Along with their *expert* knowledge of English writing and writing teaching, both participants also had the chance to gain *experiential* knowledge through abundant writing practice. Synthesized with the knowledge they previously had, both *expert* knowledge and *experiential* knowledge are constructed and reconstructed (in Mi-Jung's case) during the semester. While they underwent this knowledge building process, they became more competent English writers than before. Being stated by Korean English teachers (Choi. 2010; Han & Kim, 2008; Ko, 2009; Shim, 1999) and Mi-Jung (Excerpt 7), it is believed that their improved writing ability would contribute to their increased competence as English writing teachers.

When it comes to building *expertise*, however, Mi-Jung and Hye-Jin's experiences formulated differently. For Mi-Jung who was involved in writing-based instruction with her high proficiency middle school students, the course activities provided her the opportunities to question her existing beliefs of English writing instruction (Lee, 2010). By writing many drafts, being involved in diverse writing activities, and doing follow-up reflection, Mi-Jung had the chances to examine her students' needs and recognize the problems of her existing teaching approach. Not stopping at perceptual reflection, Mi-Jung attempted to find an alternative teaching approach of writing by moving beyond correcting grammar errors and tried a possible alternative model for good writing practice. Through her experiment, it was possible for Mi-Jung to reconstruct her practices (*experiential* knowledge) with the help of both *expert* and *experiential* knowledge she gained in the course. That is, Mi-Jung's *experiential* knowledge is now reorganized in connection with *expert* knowledge, creating *expertise*. With her own theory of English writing instruction, now, Mi-Jung is developing *expertise* as an English writing teacher and developing a writing teacher identity.

On the other hand, due to her learning goal, attitude toward the class and belief derived

from her institutional context, Hye-Jin did not advance her learning into building *expertis*e as an English writing teacher. Struggling with school work and duties as a homeroom teacher, Hye-Jin refused to connect her learning of teaching writing to her classroom instruction. Her rejection actually did not have any negative influence on her current teaching because Hye-Jin did not perceive any needs for implementing the writing-based instruction on hand. Based on her experiential knowledge of teaching writing - her instructional context does not need writing-based instruction, Hye-Jin merely perceived the course as one with lots of assignments that made her stressed.

Since teaching writing is a situated activity (Lee, 2013 b), however, the development of *expertise* should be seen as a dialogic and flexible process (Johnson & Golombek, 2003; Kim, 2009). If Mi-Jung and Hye-Jin had taught in different institutional contexts and had different learning goals, that is, their experience in terms of knowledge building as an English writing teacher could have turned out in different ways. This confirms that teacher knowledge building is turely a complex and dialogic process where personal, institutional and social factors interplay simultaneously (Borg, 2006; Johnson, 2006).

VI. CONCLUSION

This study examined how two secondary school teachers' learning of English writing and its instruction are constructed and reconstructed in the 16 week-long intensive reflective English composition course. The findings suggest that teacher learning in a teacher education program is situated activity as well. As the agent of their own classroom instruction, teachers do not mechanically internalize the knowledge and information they are exposed to. Instead, teachers view, filter, and personalize the knowledge and information through the lens of personal, institutional, and/or social situation they are functioning in. One of the implications from the findings is that more diverse and tailored forms of writing teacher education programs should be available anytime so that English writing teachers can have access to the resources, assistance and tailored tips in a timely manner. An on-line writing teacher education program can be a possible form to meet this need.

Only two in-service teachers' learning experience in this English writing teacher education program were reported. Even though there were more pre-service teachers who experienced the same writing teacher preparation course, their experience was not dealt in this study. Thus, future research can focus on pre-service teachers' experience of learning and compare their knowledge building with that of in-service teachers. The fact that the researcher was the instructor could have influenced the findings in spite of her efforts to reduce the possiblity. Notwithstanding the limitations, considering that it provides one

example of an English writing teacher education program, the current study is still believed noteworthy for teacher educators who design an English writing teacher education course. By dealing with writing teacher's voices using a qualitative approach, this study also expects to enrich the research of ESL/EFL writing and its instruction.

REFERENCES

Borg, S. (2006). *Teacher cognition and language education*. London, UK: Continuum.

Cheung, Y. (2011). Teacher training for effective writing instruction: recent trends and future directions. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences, 15*, 531-534.

Choi, Y. (2010). Effects of revision training on l2 writing. *English Teaching, 65*(1), 25-56.

Coxhead, A., & Byrd, P. (2007). Preparing writing teachers to teach the vocabulary and grammar of academic prose. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 16*(3), 129-147.

Dörnyei, Z. (2007). *Research methods in applied linguistics*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Ferris, D. (2007). Preparing teachers to respond to student writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 16*(3), 165-193.

Freeman, D. (1993). Renaming experience/reconstructing practice: Developing new understandings of teaching. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 9*(5-6), 485-597.

Han, M., & Kim, K. (2008). Teaching an ESP writing course collaboratively through a web community. *English Language Teaching*, *20*(4), 29-53.

Hyland, K. (2007). Genre pedagogy: Language, literacy and L2 writing instruction. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 16*, 148-164.

Johnson, K. E. (2003). Rethinking knowledge, knowing, and knowers. In J. Sharkey & K.E. Johnson (Eds.). *TESOL Quarterly dialogues: Rethinking issues of language, culture, and power* (pp. 1-5). Alexandaria, VA: Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages.

Johnson, K. E. (2006), The sociocultural turn and its challenges for second language teacher education. *TESOL Quarterly, 40*(1), 235-257.

Johnson, K. E. (2009). *Second language teacher education*. New York: Routledge.

Johnson, K. E., & Golombek, P. R. (2003). "Seeing" teacher learning. *TESOL Quarterly, 37*(4), 729-738.

Kennedy, M. (1999). Ed schools and problem of knolwedge. In J. Rath & A. C. McAninch (Eds.) *What counts as knowledge in teacher education* (pp. 29-45). Stamford, CT: Albex.

Kim, E. (2009). To transform or not to transform: An English teacher's participation in a teacher education program. *English Teaching, 64*(4), 223-248.

Kim, S. (2014). Korean secondary school teachers' competence in English writing and writing instruction. *Korean Journal of English Language and Linguistics*, *14*(1), 1-24.

Ko, M. H. (2009). Summary writing instruction and student learning outcomes. *English Teaching, 64*(2), 125-149.

Lee, I. (2000). Writing teacher education and teacher learning: Testimonies of four EFL teachers. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *19*, 143-157.

Lee, I. (2013a). Becoming a writing teacher: Using "identity" as an analytic lens to understand EFL writing teachers' development. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 22*, 330-345.

Lee, I. (2013b). Second language writing: Perspectives of a teacher educator-researcher. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 22*, 435-437.

Matsuda, P. K., Saenkhun, T., & Accardi, S. (2013). Writing teachers' perceptions of the presence and needs of second language writers: An institutional case study. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 22*, 68-86.

Ministry of Education. (2011). *Parental guide of policy: National English Ability Test guide.* Retrieved January 10, 2014, from the World Wide Web: http://www.mest.go.kr/web/279/ko/board/view.do?bbsId=45&boardSeq=24284.

Park, H., & Jang, S. Y. (2014). A comprehensive review of English writing studies in *English Language & Literature Teaching* over the past 20 years. *English Language & Literature Teaching, 20*(1), 403-426.

Park, M., & Shim, J. (2014). An investigation into pre-service and in-service teachers' judgment of English writing performance. *Modern English Education, 15*(2), 71-90.

Reid, J. M. (2001). Writing. In R. Carter., & D. Nunan (Eds.). *The Cambridge guide to teaching English to speakers of other languages* (pp. 23-33). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Shim, E. (2009). An investigation of secondary English teachers' perception of writing instruction. *Modern English Education, 10* (1), 114-130.

Shim, E. (2010). Research trends in writing teacher education. *Modern English Education, 11*(1), 36-50.

Weigle, S. C. (2007). Teaching writing teachers about assessment. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 16*(3), 194-209.

Yoon, S. (2014). An analytical review of teacher-relate articles in *English Language & Literature Teaching*. *English Language & Literature Teaching,* 20(1), 449-473.

Examples in: English
Applicable Languages: English
Applicable levels: Secondary & Tertiary

Eun-Ju Kim
Department of English
Hanyang Women's University,
200 Salgoji-gil, Seongdong-gu,
Seoul, 133-817
Tel: 02-2290-2298
Fax: 02-2290-2299
E-mail: exk188@hywoman.ac.kr

Received in January 15th, 2015
Reviewed in February 26th, 2015
Revised version received in March 5th, 2015