English Language & Literature Teaching, *Vol. 30*, No. 4, Winter 2024
https://doi.org/10.35828/etak.2024.30.4.73

Enhancing Preservice Teachers' Practical Knowledge via Service-Learning: An Instructional Design

Soo Joung Choi
(Yonsei University)

Choi, Soo Joung. (2024). Enhancing preservice teachers' practical knowledge via service-learning: An instructional design. *English Language & Literature Teaching*, *30*(4), 73-89.

With the aim of enhancing teacher education (TE) curriculum of Korea by providing more practical experience for preservice teachers, this study presents an innovative instructional design that integrates service-learning into a TE content course in English language teaching (ELT). The proposed design incorporates service-learning in the ELT Methods course, designing the course to work in conjunction with a mandatory one-credit course, Educational Service Activity. Effecting curricular innovation via service-learning involves the interconnected stages of preparation, implementation, and assessment. In the preparation stage, the focus is on identifying the community partners who are open to a new approach and planning the course with clear goals and expectations. The requirements for the service-learning component and assessment methods are also established. During implementation, preservice teachers engage in lesson planning and enact teaching at the designated cooperating school while studying the course content in the university classroom. Guided reflection and feedback are fundamental to this stage. The course concludes with a demonstration and celebration of the participants' experiences. Evaluation of their learning is also conducted through a traditional assessment method combined with reflection. Providing institutional support and incentives to all parties and building reciprocal relationships are key to sustaining innovation.

[service-learning/instructional design/teacher education/preservice teachers/English language teaching]

I. INTRODUCTION

As Shulman (1987) has pointed out, one of the most fundamental goals of teacher

preparation in higher education institutions is to develop preservice teachers into professionals with the required knowledge and skills. This process entails various tasks, such as improving their understanding of the subject matter and curriculum design while acquainting themselves with effective pedagogical strategies and the larger sociocultural context within which teaching and learning occur. In addition, and more importantly, effective teacher preparation has to center on providing preservice teachers with practical experience accompanied by systematic guidance, so that they have an opportunity to think of theories within a concrete classroom context with students of diverse needs and interests. Practical experience is indeed one of the most significant elements of teacher preparation, given that it engages preservice teachers in the repetitive process of pedagogical reasoning and action as they strive to make subject matter accessible to students. This process of reconstructing the content to suit students' ability and prior knowledge and searching for the most appropriate instructional methods of teaching leads them to develop their pedagogical content knowledge (PCK), which is known to be intellectual property unique to teachers and one that distinguishes them from content specialists (Shulman, 1986).

Despite the criticality of practical experience in developing preservice teachers' knowledge base (Coffey, 2010; Golombek, 2009; Grossman, 2011; Zeichner, 2010, 2021), teacher preparation practice in Korea has long suffered from a paucity of clinical experience, with only one teaching practicum that lasts four weeks during the senior year throughout the teacher preparation program. With the perceived need to provide more systematic opportunities for preservice teachers to experience authentic teaching and learning contexts and develop their practical knowledge, this study presents a promising instructional design that incorporates service-learning in one of the core courses in ELT teacher preparation programs, while employing the mandatory one-credit course, Educational Service Activity.[1] In the following section, I provide an introduction to service-learning. I then provide the proposed instructional design, involving closely connected and interactive stages, that is, preparation, implementation, and assessment. The components and activities at each stage of curricular innovation with service-learning are provided in detail. The implications for the successful integration of service-learning into the core curriculum of teacher preparation in ELT follow.

II. BACKGROUND

Rooted in the tradition of American higher education's commitment to public service and

[1] The proposed instructional design is primarily intended for secondary teacher education (TE), but is also applicable to elementary TE.

community engagement, service-learning has gained prominence since the late 1980s and the early 1990s in the United States, with universities across the nation institutionalizing service-learning as a core curriculum. Interest in academia has grown rapidly with burgeoning studies that report positive outcomes of students' academic and social learning while engaged in service-learning. While many definitions (Kendall, 1990) exist, service-learning is best understood as a high-impact pedagogy that combines academic content, pertinent service activities, and structured reflection, which aims to bring positive academic, social, and civic outcomes among students. Reciprocal partnerships between universities and communities are also essential for successful service-learning implementation:

> Service-learning is a collaborative teaching and learning strategy designed to promote academic enhancement, personal growth, and civic engagement. Students render meaningful service in community settings that present them with experiences related to academic material. Through guided reflection, students—individually and in groups—examine their experiences critically and articulate specific learning outcomes, thus enhancing the quality of their learning and of their service. (Ash et al., 2005, p. 51)

While some scholars support the need for service-learning to be integrated into the curriculum to make the experience academically rigorous (Bringle & Hatcher, 1996), others take a more inclusive position of defining service-learning as both curricular and co-curricular activities, as long as service-learning activities are accompanied by an opportunity for reflection (Jacoby, 2015). In addition, service-learning is distinct from other types of community-based programs, such as volunteerism and field experiences, as it intends to benefit both parties—that is, the provider as well as the recipient of the service—and as it takes both service and learning equally significant for effective service-learning activities (Furco, 1996).

The emphasis on the balance between service and learning is closely related to its theoretical foundation, Dewey's experiential learning (Deans, 1999; Giles & Eyler, 1994). Moving away from the traditional understanding of learning in which knowledge is passively acquired through memorization and rote learning, Dewey conceptualized learning as a dynamic process in which learners participate in the active construction and reconstruction of knowledge based on their concrete experience within immediate social contexts (Giles, 1991; Giles & Eyler, 1994). Experience, however, is not automatically transferred to learning, but has to be coordinated with careful and continuous reflection. Reflection, therefore, is the key to connecting learners' concrete experiences to learning, while allowing them to synthesize their observations with prior knowledge and develop new insights and understanding of the world (Eyler, 2001; Hatcher et al., 2004).

Building and sustaining a reciprocal relationship between the campus and the community

is another important component of meaningful service-learning. Service-learning, which is based on the principle of collaboration, often entails working for mutual benefits with shared goals and responsibilities to achieve collective goals (Jacoby, 2015). Therefore, the service-learning activity must be jointly developed based on a coordinated partnership with community partners actively engaged in its design and evaluation. Achieving robust collaborative relationships requires intentional efforts from both parties based on trust and respect.

Service-learning has resulted in significant benefits for students in several domains. Students involved in service-learning demonstrated improved academic performance and understanding (Astin & Sax, 1998; Celio et al., 2011; Jameson et al., 2013). Not only did they exhibit greater retention of course content but they were also better able to apply theoretical knowledge to real-world contexts (Novak et al., 2007; Strage, 2000; Warren, 2012). Students' critical thinking skills and problem-solving abilities also improved after their engagement in service-learning (Felten & Clayton, 2011; Sedlak et al., 2003). Service-learning cultivates a strong sense of civic responsibility among students and an understanding of their role in contributing to societal well-being (Battistoni, 2013; Celio et al., 2011; Gordon et al., 2022). Participation in service-learning assists students in building interpersonal skills and developing a broader understanding of societal issues and diversity (Conway et al., 2009; Herbert & Hauf, 2015). Students also reported that they gained increased self-efficacy and self-confidence and developed a better understanding of their values and interests (Celio et al., 2011; Conway et al., 2009).

With positive students' learning outcomes, scholars in the field of TE in Korea have begun to pay attention to service-learning as a viable pedagogy for better preparing preservice teachers since the past decade (S. J. Choi, 2023). Despite this gradual interest, the field of ELT teacher preparation has been quiet, with only three studies having been published, among which only one explored curricular-based implementation (S. Kim, 2012). Given this gap in the literature, this study aimed to present an instructional design that is theoretically driven and practically viable, drawing attention of scholars in ELT to the potential of service-learning in providing the much-needed practical experience and thereby working to enhance preservice teachers' practical knowledge and competence. Since the service activity in service-learning takes additional time and effort on the part of students in addition to listening to lectures and studying academic content in university classrooms, the proposed design was devised to operate with a one-credit course, Educational Service Activity, one of the core components of TE programs in Korea. This implementation will potentially be a practical way to make better use of the Educational Service Activity course, which has been reported as being managed rather haphazardly, depending on individual institutions (Chang, 2010).

III. INTEGRATING SERVICE-LEARNING INTO A TEACHER PREPARATION CONTENT COURSE: A THREE-STAGE FRAMEWORK

In bringing about curricular innovation incorporating service-learning, diverse implementation methods have been suggested that comprise different instructional stages—from a three-stage to a five-stage framework (Y.-H. Choi, 2021; Jin, 2018; Kaye, 2004). Despite these differences, they all build their framework around five elements essential to the successful curricular implementation of service-learning: preparation, service (action), reflection, assessment, and demonstration/celebration (Bringle & Hatcher, 1995; Fertman, 1994; Kaye, 2004). To present an instructional design of a teacher preparation course integrating service-learning, I offer a three-stage framework composed of preparation, implementation, and assessment. As reflection is an on-going activity that encompasses different stages of service-learning, I believe it makes more sense to present a three-stage framework, as the element of reflection is fundamental from implementation to assessment. To make the framework simple and realistic reflecting the context of Korean teacher preparation, demonstration/celebration was subsumed under assessment. Although the stages are presented independently, readers should bear in mind that they are closely interconnected.

Preparation is the most critical stage in enabling the successful integration of service-learning into academic TE courses. It involves an array of activities that include identifying a community need and working with a community partner on the logistics of service-learning while establishing a course goal/objective that ties the learning outcome of course content with that of service experience, specifying the components of service-learning activities, and developing a plan for assessing preservice teachers' learning. Institutional support for the faculty available on campus, such as course development stipends and grants for hiring teaching assistants, should also be identified. Implementation is "the direct result of preparation" (Kaye, 2004, p. 10). Based on a thoroughly prepared plan, preservice teachers begin their services while studying academic content. This is where the established goals and objectives of a service-learning TE course are expected to be realized, resulting in learning and growth among preservice teachers in the academic, social and personal areas. For meaningful learning to occur, the connection between course content and service-learning must be intentionally promoted through regular, structured reflection.

The third stage involves the evaluation of preservice teachers' learning and the course. Diverse methods of evaluation, both summative and formative, are employed to assess students' learning in curricular-based service-learning, such as small-group discussions, class presentations, and analysis of reflections, in addition to exams and research papers (Bringle & Hatcher, 1996; Cooks & Scharrer, 2006; Strage, 2000). The most widely utilized

form of assessing academic and civic learning is to analyze reflective journals. The evaluation of course objectives and outcomes is often conducted using questionnaire surveys and Likert scales (Bringle et al., 2016; Rubin, 2001). The faculty can ask for participation from community partners to provide feedback on students' reliability and performance in the community while evaluating the outcomes of students and the course. This strengthens the cooperative and reciprocal relationships between universities and communities. Course evaluation brings about a more productive implementation of service-learning TE courses for future semesters. Demonstration/celebration allows preservice teachers to validate and publicly share their experiences and learning with peers and community partners. This can be conducted in the form of an individual/group presentation or poster session. Faculty members can also participate in campus-wide workshops to share their successes and challenges and publish their experiences (Kaye, 2004).

In the following section, I provide a detailed description of one potential way to integrate service-learning into a TE curriculum for preservice English teachers, reflecting on the current literature on service-learning while contextualizing the design to fit the Korean setting of teacher preparation.

1. Preparation

As the proposed design integrates service-learning into the ELT Methods course, together with the Educational Service Activity course, the priority of faculty in the preparation stage is to locate potential cooperating schools that are willing to try out service-learning. In identifying service sites, faculty should contact schools located relatively close to the university so that carrying out the service for preservice teachers is more practical and viable. Once cooperating schools are identified, the faculty need to begin communicating with a designated cooperating teacher in participating schools while introducing the nature of service-learning and discussing the details of the semester-long implementation. Having a clear understanding of the roles and responsibilities of both faculty and community partners is critical for successful service-learning, reaching an agreement on what is feasible and what is not, and what will be conducive for the learning of both preservice teachers and secondary students.

The faculty must also devise a concrete and detailed course plan in the form of a syllabus. The course description should specify that it is a three-credit TE content course incorporating service-learning and that preservice teachers taking the course need to register for an additional one-credit course—that is, Educational Service Activity. Course goals and objectives for both content and service-learning must be clearly stated, while the syllabus should include a definition and rationale of service-learning, linking the service-learning experience to course content. In other words, it must be explicitly stated in the syllabus that

preservice teachers are expected to master academic content and demonstrate their ability to apply it to actual educational contexts in the community while engaging in service-learning.

The components of service-learning and the requirements for each activity are also important information that must be detailed. The required service hours, types of service-learning, service partners (and locations), and the manner in which service activities will be conducted are information that preservice teachers who plan to take the course must be well aware of before registering for the course (Berle, 2006). For this particular service-learning TE course, preservice teachers must complete a 30-hour service throughout the semester, given that the course is run with the one-credit Educational Service Activity course. Preservice teachers in this course also engage in both indirect and direct service, such as analyzing textbooks, devising lesson plans, and teaching at the service site. The service activity in the proposed TE course is designed to be conducted in a group format, which requires certain attitudes and skills from all participants to make their learning more productive (Johnson & Johnson, 1999). The collaborative format in which service-learning will be carried out must be provided in the syllabus so that preservice teachers who are ready and willing to work with others can register for the course. The manner in which reflection is conducted should also be provided—whether it will be in the form of a typical weekly reflective journal or a combination of written and oral reflections and whether it will require both individual and group reflections. The importance of reflection as both a critical component of service-learning and as an assessment tool cannot be overemphasized.

The assessment methods and criteria must be specified in concrete terms. The service-learning TE course must evaluate students' learning in terms of their knowledge growth, not only from lectures, readings and discussions in the classroom but also from their experience in the community. In addition, preservice teachers must be assessed for their competence in applying theoretical and academic knowledge to practice by designing lessons and teaching. Reflection is the key to relating preservice teachers' academic learning to service in the real world, and is one of the core components of assessment.

2. Implementation

It is important to begin the course by providing preservice teachers with an orientation toward the course in general and service-learning in particular. While the written syllabus is available on-line for interested preservice teachers to preview, going over the important features of the course and clarifying understanding in class will benefit both the faculty and preservice teachers. Class time also must be devoted to introducing service-learning as a philosophy and pedagogy, acquainting preservice teachers not only with the theoretical underpinnings of service-learning but also with exemplary practices and benefits, which will help them enact service-learning with greater motivation and vision. During the orientation

session—typically the first week of the semester—preservice teachers are asked to form a group that they will work with during the course of the semester for their service-learning, and to decide their service site based on the list of cooperating schools that the faculty has prepared.

As the course progresses, preservice teachers will focus on studying the principles and practices of diverse teaching methods in ELT. The topic of ELT materials development is also part of the course curriculum, as preservice teachers need to analyze textbooks used in secondary schools and modify them when necessary (See Table 1 for a sample weekly schedule for a course integrating service-learning for preservice English teachers). Throughout the semester, preservice teachers familiarize themselves with different methodological designs existing in the field of ELT while discussing their feasibility in the Korean context, as well as devising ways to adapt the methods to better accommodate the needs and interests of Korean students.

TABLE 1
Sample Weekly Schedule of the ELT Methods Course Integrating Service-Learning

Week	Course content	Service-learning
1	• Orientation to the course and service-learning • Introduction to service-learning as a philosophy and pedagogy	• Form a group for your service-learning activity for the semester • Decide on the cooperating school your group will work with • Prepare for a needs analysis with your group members
2	• Historical overview of approaches and methods in ELT • ELT methods (Grammar Translation Method) • Sample lesson plan analysis	• The cooperating school visit: Fine-tune the service activity with the cooperating teacher • Conduct the needs analysis
3	• ELT materials analysis and design • ELT methods (Audiolingual Method) • Introduction to lesson planning	• Analyze the textbook used in the cooperating school • Weekly reflective journal
4	• ELT methods (Communicative Language Teaching) • Sample lesson plan analysis	• Prepare a lesson plan for teaching • Design teaching materials • Weekly reflective journal
5	• ELT methods (Learning Strategy Training, Cooperative Learning, and Multiple Intelligences)	• Work on your group's lesson plan & materials adaptation and/or design • Weekly reflective journal
6	• ELT methods (Content-Based Instruction)	• Work on your group's lesson plan & materials adaptation and/or design • Weekly reflective journal
7	• ELT methods (Participatory Approach)	• Work on your group's lesson plan & materials adaptation and/or design • Weekly reflective journal

8	• Midterm exam	
9	• Conference with the teacher educator[2]	• Revise your group's lesson plan and teaching materials based on the teacher educator's feedback • Weekly reflective journal
10	• Class presentation (for peer feedback on each group's lesson plan and teaching materials)	• Revise your group's lesson plan and teaching materials based on the feedback from your classmates • Get ready for your direct service starting the following week • Weekly reflective journal
11	• In-class weekly group reflection • ELT methods (Task-Based Language Teaching)	• Teach at the cooperating school • Weekly reflective journal
12	• In-class weekly group reflection • ELT methods (Task-Based Language Teaching)	• Teach at the cooperating school • Weekly reflective journal
13	• In-class weekly group reflection • ELT methods (Technology in ELT)	• Teach at the cooperating school • Weekly reflective journal
14	• In-class weekly group reflection • ELT methods (Technology in ELT)	• Teach at the cooperating school • Weekly reflective journal
15	• Final presentation (Demonstration/Celebration)	• Invite your cooperating teacher to your presentation
16	• Final paper due	

At the same time, preservice teachers begin their service activity. They visit the service site and fine-tune their upcoming service activity with the cooperating teacher while conducting a needs analysis for both the cooperating teacher and secondary students. Once they ascertain what they have to prepare for their service, they begin their indirect service-learning—analyzing the textbook used in the cooperating school and developing a lesson plan as well as teaching/learning materials. The indirect service-learning phase is intentionally designed to be process-oriented, in which preservice teachers work on several drafts of their lesson plan by making the first draft by themselves, revising it based on feedback from the teacher educator through a group conference, and finalizing it based on peer feedback given through the whole-class group presentation in the class.

Two critical elements that must be integrated into the implementation stage of service-learning are 1) linking service-learning and course content, and 2) providing feedback and support (Ash & Clayton, 2004; Bringle & Hatcher, 1995; Hatcher & Bringle, 1997; Jacoby, 2015). By designing the preservice teachers' experiences in the university classroom to be process-oriented, the proposed service-learning TE course assists preservice teachers in

[2] In this paper, I use the two terms, faculty and teacher educator(s), interchangeably.

receiving expert feedback from the teacher educator, which assists them in engaging in a continuous cycle of thinking about their lesson plan based on the theories learned in the classroom. Sharing their lesson plan with peers is also conducive to their learning as they come to see multiple ways of applying theories of ELT into actual classroom settings, while having an opportunity to provide and receive constructive feedback and support from one another.

Direct service-learning—teaching at the service site—begins once preservice teachers finalize their lesson plan and complete their midterm exam. In line with the typical practice of Education Service Activity, the proposed framework requires each group of preservice teachers to spend two hours at the cooperating school for each weekly visit. The framework also suggests that the group should comprise four preservice teachers. In this way, each preservice teacher, still learning to teach and presumably without much teaching experience, will not be overburdened with teaching, as the assigned teaching session per week for an individual preservice teacher does not exceed 20-25 minutes. The group format will further prove to be conducive to preservice teachers as they observe their peers' teaching while providing feedback to one another on the way the collaboratively built lesson plan is realized in an actual classroom.

During the direct service-learning period, the university class is spent on preservice teachers having a collective in-class reflection session while sharing their successes and failures, providing feedback to one another, and exchanging ideas while connecting their service-learning to the course content (Hatcher & Bringle, 1997; Hatcher et al., 2004). Preservice teachers will also review theories on ELT methods and materials design while revising their lesson plans based on their experience at the service site with the help of a teacher educator and peers. Throughout the service-learning implementation phase, preservice teachers log their experiences and learning in the form of a weekly reflective journal, contemplating their service-learning activities in light of the academic content. For preservice teachers' reflections to be conducive to learning, feedback from teacher educators must be provided. The reflective journal also helps teacher educators monitor preservice teachers' performance and reliability, while preservice teachers can use it to share their issues and challenges at the service site. The teacher educator can also arrange class observations at the service site at least once for each group to show support and encouragement, preferably in collaboration with the cooperating teacher. This observation will also allow the teacher educator to see what the preservice teachers' experiences are like, transferring the written lesson plan into an actual classroom full of students with real needs. As the semester ends and preservice teachers complete service-learning, an opportunity for them to share their work publicly in a presentation format is arranged. Community partners, interested students and campus faculty can join the demonstration/celebration session.

3. Assessment

As in any content course in teacher preparation, faculty should evaluate preservice teachers in the service-learning TE course based on their overall performance and learning, not just exclusively on their service. As previously mentioned, evaluation in a curricular-based service-learning course can take various forms, from exclusively employing traditional methods such as exams and papers, to utilizing different arrangements of reflection activities such as reflective journals, directed writing, structured class discussions, and class presentations, or using a combination of both (Bringle & Hatcher, 1996; Hatcher & Bringle, 1997). For the proposed TE course, the assessment component will include a midterm exam, a final draft of the lesson plan with teaching materials, weekly reflective journals, a final presentation, and a final paper.

For the effective use of reflection as a method of evaluation, scholars suggest that reflection must be structured; in other words, the questions in reflections need to be carefully designed to be aligned with the desired learning outcomes or course objectives (Ash & Clayton, 2004; Ash et al., 2005; Hatcher et al., 2004). For this, rubrics have been suggested in evaluating students' cognitive process while reflecting or in assessing the extent to which reflections link service to course content (Ash et al., 2005; Bringle & Hatcher, 1996). Sample reflection questions suggested by Ash and Clayton (2004) that tie service experience to the course content include the following:

> 1. "Identify and describe course concepts in the context of your service-learning related activities.
> 2. Apply course concepts in the context of these activities.
> 3. Analyze course concepts in light of what you have experienced in these activities.
> 4. Synthesize and evaluate course concepts in light of what you have experienced in your service-learning related activities." (p. 153)

It is also emphasized that not only must the expectations and requirements for reflection activities be provided in detail, but the clearly defined criteria of evaluation should be presented (Hatcher & Bringle, 1997).

IV. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

With the aim of strengthening the current TE curriculum in Korea and providing the much-needed opportunity for preservice teachers to develop their practical knowledge during teacher preparation years, this paper presents a potentially promising instructional design

that integrates service-learning into a TE content course in the field of ELT. The service-learning pedagogy in the proposed instructional design is devised to be incorporated in the ELT Methods course while tapping into the one-credit course, Educational Service Activity. Curriculum innovation via service-learning involves several interconnected and interacting stages, including preparation, implementation, and assessment. As the most important stage, preparation entails identifying the community partner (i.e., the cooperating school) who is open to this new way of carrying out the Educational Service Activity course and coming to an agreement with the way service-learning is enacted at the service site. With concrete course goals and objectives, the faculty should plan the semester by laying out a weekly class schedule and the assessment methods with course content and service components in mind.

Implementation involves preservice English teachers undertaking both indirect and direct service-learning. While listening to a lecture and studying the principles and practices of teaching methods in ELT at the university, they work on creating a lesson plan and teaching/learning materials while going through multiple feedback cycles and engaging in teaching at the service site. Throughout the implementation stage, preservice teachers' reflection, both in written and oral forms, conducted in an individual and a collaborative format, is the most critical element in their successful service-learning experience. Reflection is the key that links preservice teachers' service experience to course content, and should be accompanied by regular feedback from the teacher educator. The service-learning course ends by celebrating all participants for their learning and experiences through public demonstration in the form of a presentation. For assessing preservice teachers' learning, the proposed framework incorporates a combination of the traditional method and reflection.

Successful curricular-based service-learning requires considerable time and energy for faculty to plan, guide students through the implementation stage, and evaluate their learning and performance. Therefore, the prime concern in advancing curricular innovation utilizing service-learning is providing institutional support for faculty. Faculty workshops, mentoring programs, and instructional resources such as sample syllabi and an instructional prototype will be effective in encouraging faculty to consider participation in curricular changes with service-learning. Incentives such as course development grants and grants for teaching assistants will be more practical in assisting faculty in launching and operating their service-learning courses. In higher education institutions where service-learning has been institutionalized campus-wide, the faculty support described above is readily available. In institutions in which service-learning has not yet been implemented, interested individual faculty can still locate mini-grants at the college level or campus-wide that are designed to provide support for those willing to take advantage of innovative instructional pedagogy. Students taking a service-learning course can also benefit from financial and logistical assistance in areas such as transportation and preparation of educational materials. Where funds are available, financial incentives for cooperating teachers will work as a motivating

factor for continuing positive relationships and prolonging participation in the future.

Where consensus is achieved at the department level, offering a service-learning TE course for two consecutive semesters, thereby making service-learning a sustained experience, will be conducive for preservice teachers' academic and civic learning as well as their personal growth. Engaging in service activities while studying course content for an extended period will enable preservice teachers to not only improve their practical knowledge and competence but also become more involved in community issues while searching for ways to solve societal problems as active citizens. For such implementation to take place, efforts to build and strengthen reciprocal relationships with community partners must be an ongoing process at both the individual faculty and the institutional level.

Since its emergence in the 1970s in U.S. academia, service-learning has been widely implemented in higher education institutions around the world, with proliferating empirical studies reporting positive learning outcomes for students and the community. While the first publication on service-learning appeared in Korea in the late 1990s (S.-Y. Kim, 1997), it was only recently that a substantial body of research was conducted, reporting a diverse range of student learning and outcomes (S. J. Choi, 2023). Given the reality of Korean TE practice with limited opportunities for preservice teachers to develop their practical competence during their teacher preparation years, service-learning will be an effective alternative that allows preservice teachers to learn from their hands-on experience of preparing for and teaching a class, while reflecting upon their experience. Considering the lack of research on service-learning in the field of ELT teacher preparation in Korea, more qualitative and quantitative studies are needed, highlighting the ways in which it contributes to assisting preservice teachers in becoming competent teachers of English who are capable of constructing their own knowledge while working in the field through reflection. As service-learning by nature requires preservice teachers to engage in a continuous cycle of reflection while applying theoretical knowledge to practice with the needs of the community in mind, service-learning will strengthen the current practice of teacher preparation in Korea.

REFERENCES

Ash, S. L., & Clayton, P. H. (2004). The articulated learning: An approach to guided reflection and assessment. *Innovative Higher Education*, *29*(2), 137-154. https://doi.org/10.1023/B:IHIE.0000048795.84634.4a

Ash, S. L., Clayton, P. H., & Atkinson, M. P. (2005). Integrating reflection and assessment to capture and improve student learning. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, *12*, 49-60.

Astin, A. W., & Sax, L. J. (1998). How undergraduates are affected by service participation. *Journal of College Student Development*, *39*(3), 251-263.

Battistoni, R. M. (2013). Civic learning through service learning: Conceptual frameworks and research. In P. H. Clayton, R. G. Bringle, & J. A. Hatcher (Eds.), *Research on service learning: Conceptual frameworks and assessment* (Vol. 2A, pp. 111-132). Routledge.

Berle, D. (2006). Incremental integration: A successful service-learning strategy. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, *18*(1), 43-48.

Bringle, R. G., & Hatcher, J. A. (1995). A service-learning curriculum for faculty. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, *2*, 112-122.

Bringle, R. G., & Hatcher, J. A. (1996). Implementing service learning in higher education. *The Journal of Higher Education*, *67*(2), 221-239. https://doi.org/10.1080/00221546.1996.11780257

Bringle, R. G., Ruiz, A.I., Brown, M. A., & Reeb, R. N. (2016). Enhancing the psychology curriculum through service learning. *Psychology Learning & Teaching*, *15*(3), 294-309. https://doi.org/10.1177/1475725716659966

Celio, C. I., Durlak, J., & Dymnicki, A. (2011). A meta-analysis of the impact of service-learning on students. *Journal of Experiential Education*, *34*(2), 164-181. https://doi.org/10.1177/105382591103400205

Chang, K.-W. (2010). The study on change of 'Educational Service' course through service-learning. *The Journal of Korean Teacher Education*, *27*(3), 373-393.

Choi, S. J. (2023). A review of research on service-learning in teacher education in Korea. *Secondary English Education*, *16*(4), 23-50. https://doi.org/10.20487/kasee.16.4.202311.23

Choi, Y.-H. (2021). A study on the instructional design and effect integrating writing education and community service activities. *The Journal of the Korea Contents Association*, *21*(7), 500-509. https://doi.org/10.5392/JKCA.2021.21.07.500

Coffey, H. (2010). "They taught me": The benefits of early community-based field experiences in teacher education. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *26*, 335-342. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2009.09.014

Conway, J. M., Amel, E. L., & Gerwien, D. P. (2009). Teaching and learning in the social context: A meta-analysis of service learning's effects on academic, personal, social, and citizenship outcomes. *Teaching of Psychology*, *36*, 233-245. https://doi.org/10.1080/00986280903172969

Cooks, L., & Scharrer, E. (2006). Assessing learning in community service learning: A social approach. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 13*(1), 44-55.

Deans, T. (1999). Service-learning in two keys: Paulo Freire's critical pedagogy in relation to John Dewey's pragmatism. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, *6*, 15-29.

Eyler, J. (2001). Creating your reflection map. *New Directions for Higher Education*, *114*, 35-43.

Felten, P., & Clayton, P. H. (2011). Service-learning. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, *128*, 75-84. https://doi.org/10.1002/tl.470

Fertman, C. I. (1994). *Service learning for all students*. Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation.

Furco, A. (1996). Service-learning: A balanced approach to experiential education. In B. Taylor & Corporation for National Service (Eds.), *Expanding boundaries: Service and learning* (pp. 2-6). Corporation for National Service.

Giles, D. E. Jr. (1991). Dewey's theory of experience: Implications for service-learning. *Journal of Cooperative Education*, *27*(2), 87-90.

Giles, D. E. Jr., & Eyler, J. (1994). The theoretical roots of service-learning in John Dewey: Toward a theory of service-learning. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, *1*(1), 77-85.

Golombek, P. (2009). Personal practical knowledge in L2 teacher education. In J. C. Richards & A. Burns (Eds.), *Cambridge guide to second language teacher education* (pp. 155-162). Cambridge University Press.

Gordon, C. S., Pink, M. A., Rosing, H., & Mizzi, S. (2022). A systematic meta-analysis and meta-synthesis of the impact of service-learning programs on university students' empathy. *Educational Research Review*, *37*, 100490. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2022.100490

Grossman, P. (2011). A framework for teaching practice: A brief history of an idea. *Teachers College Record*, *113*(12), 2836-2843. https://doi.org/10.1177/016146811111301205

Hatcher, J. A., & Bringle, R. G. (1997). Reflection: Bridging the gap between service and learning. *College Teaching*, *45*(4), 153-158. https://doi.org/10.1080/87567559709596221

Hatcher, J. A., Bringle, R. G., & Muthiah, R. (2004). Designing effective reflection: What matters to service-learning? *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, *11*(1), 38-46.

Herbert, A., & Hauf, P. (2015). Student learning through service learning: Effects on academic development, civic responsibility, interpersonal skills and practical skills. *Active Learning in Higher Education*, *16*(1), 37-49. https://doi.org/10.1177/1469787415573357

Jacoby, B. (2015). *Service-learning essentials: Questions, answers, and lessons learned*. Jossey-Bass.

Jameson, J. K., Clayton, P. H., & Ash, S. L. (2013). Conceptualizing, assessing, and investigating academic learning in service learning. In P. H. Clayton, R. G. Bringle, & J. A. Hatcher (Eds.), *Research on service learning: Conceptual frameworks and assessment* (Vol. 2A, pp. 85-110). Routledge.

Jin, S.-H. (2018). A case study on the effect of service learning education program integrating engineering design and community service activities. *Journal of Engineering Education Research*, *21*(4), 35-45.

Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. T. (1999). Making cooperative learning work. *Theory into Practice*, *38*(2), 67-73. https://doi.org/10.1080/00405849909543834

Kaye, C. B. (2004). *The complete guide to service learning: Proven, practical ways to engage students in civic responsibility, academic curriculum, & social action*. Free Spirit Publishing Inc.

Kendall, J. C. (1990). Combining service and learning: An introduction. In J. C. Kendall & Associates (Eds.), *Combining service and learning: A resource book for community and public service* (Vol. 1, pp. 1-33). National Society for Internships and Experiential Education.

Kim, S. (2012). Christianity-based service-learning programs in English courses. *Christian Education and Information Technology*, *33*, 205-234.

Kim, S.-Y. (1997). A study of the concepts and principles of service-learning. *Ewha Journal of Social Sciences*, *1*, 41-61.

Novak, J. M., Markey, V., & Allen, M. (2007). Evaluating cognitive outcomes of service learning in higher education: A meta-analysis. *Communication Research Reports*, *24*(2), 149-157. https://doi.org/10.1080/08824090701304881

Rubin, M. S. (2001). A smart start to service-learning. *New Directions for Higher Education*, *114*, 15-26.

Sedlak, C. A., Doheny, M. O., Panthofer, N., & Anaya, E. (2003). Critical thinking in students' service-learning experiences. *College Teaching*, *51*(3), 99-104. https://doi.org/10.1080/87567550309596420

Shulman, L. S. (1986). Those who understand: Knowledge growth in teaching. *Educational Researcher*, *15*(2), 4-14.

Shulman, L. S. (1987). Knowledge and teaching: Foundations of the new reform. *Harvard Education Review*, *57*, 1-22. https://doi.org/10.17763/haer.57.1.j463w79r56455411

Strage, A. A. (2000). Service-learning: Enhancing student learning outcomes in a college-level lecture course. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, *7*, 5-13.

Warren, J. L. (2012). Does service-learning increase student learning?: A meta-analysis. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, *18*(2), 56-61.

Zeichner, K. (2010). Rethinking the connections between campus courses and field experiences in college and university-based teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *89*(11), 89-99. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487109347671

Zeichner, K. (2021). Critical unresolved and understudied issues in clinical teacher education. *Peabody Journal of Education*, *96*(1), 1-7. https://doi.org/10.1080/0161956X.2020.1864241

Examples in: English
Applicable Languages: English
Applicable Levels: Tertiary

Soo Joung Choi (professor)
Dept. of English Language & Literature
College of Humanities & Social Sciences Convergence
Yonsei University
264931 Yonseidae-gil, Wonju, Gangwon-do, Korea
Email: soochoi1@yonsei.ac.kr

Received: September 27, 2024
Reviewed: December 9, 2024
Revised version received: December 23, 2024