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Understanding Korean Children’s L2 Dialogue Journals: Towards a Model of Creative Apprenticeship for Integrating Teaching and Learning

Kim Mi-Song

With the prevalence of globalisation, it is increasingly important for educators to develop effective methods of teaching second language (L2) learners. What does L2 learning within a “global” community mean to us? The world today is becoming more and more interconnected; no country any longer exists in isolation. Within this global perspective, beyond “learning L2”, “using L2” within a meaningful context is regarded as important in Korea. Furthermore, drawing on a constructivist perspective, researchers in L2 education have focussed on collaborative learning (Atkinson 2002; Donato 1994; Pavlenko & Lantolf 2000). Researchers and educators in English education in Korea (e.g. The Korea Association of Teachers of English) have also emphasised collaboration in the context of the L2 learning experience.

However, they have often disregarded L2 learners’ creative use of L2 and their teachers’ creativity as significant goals in L2 education. In addition, only a few studies have attempted to address the dialectical process of collaborative processes in L2 teaching and L2 learning. In this respect, this chapter provides new insights into L2 learning-and-teaching, with emphasis on the creativity of L2 learners and their teachers. This chapter is divided into four parts: 1) L2 teaching and teaching as creative collaboration; 2) dialogue journals as tools for integrating L2 teaching and learning; 3) Korean students’ conceptions about the characteristics of their best teachers, as recorded in their L2 dialogue journals; and 4) the theoretical framework of creative apprenticeship.

L2 Teaching and Learning as Creative Collaboration

English functions as an international language of communication and is
widely used in a number of settings by both native and non-native speakers of English. Korea recognised this in introducing English education into the third grade in 1997 (Ahn 2003). Although English is not officially declared L2 in Korea, it is often viewed as a Second Language (ESL), rather than a Foreign Language (EFL). The increasing influence of constructivist perspectives has brought about many educational reforms in ESL/EFL education in Korea. These reforms have been prompted by the fact that although students spend an enormous amount of time, money and energy on improving their English, only a few achieve a fluent command of the language. Thus, recently, educators have been putting more emphasis on the spoken language, rather than the written, and have gone beyond the previously routine teaching of writing solely through explicit grammar instruction.

However, because of the competitive entrance examination system, which uses mostly objective testing, the focus in Korea is still on teaching mechanical aspects of the English language, rather than using English in authentic communication. Also, second language acquisition (SLA) research has focussed primarily on specific cognitive skill-building, such as attention, memory and symbolic thinking, often disregarding the importance of the affective domain and meaning-making. In this respect, a Vygotskian perspective offers a powerful set of theoretical tools for supporting L2 learners' emotional and intellectual needs and for creating meaning-centered learning environments.

The Russian psychologist, Lev Vygotsky, emphasised the role of culture and language in human development in terms of the dynamic interdependence of social and individual processes (John-Steiner & Mahn 1996). According to the Vygotskian perspective, language acquisition – including SLA – occurs through social interaction, with language functioning as a psychological tool (Kozulin 1990) mediating the transformation of natural human impulses into higher mental functions. A language is not so much a finished product as a creative activity or ongoing process mediating the development of such complex forms of human psychological life as reading and writing.

Although Vygotsky’s view of cognition as emerging out of collaborative interaction has been recognised as especially beneficial for L2 learners, recent research on L2 literacy indicates that instruction features isolated separate activities, rather than an integration of these activities into ongoing joint interactions (Rogoff 1998). For instance, as a form of collaborative interaction between novices and experts, Vygotsky’s (1978)
notion of zone of proximal development (ZPD) and scaffolding (Wertsch 1985), represented as assistance in the ZPD, have been often employed to describe and explain the role of adults or more knowledgeable peers in guiding L2 students. However, most researchers have failed to point out that teachers benefit from interacting with learners, just as learners benefit from interacting with teachers (Kim 2004). SLA research tends to focus on what expert teachers do with novice students and to de-emphasise the role of the creativity of either L2 students or their teachers. As a consequence, there is little research on the ongoing, multidimensional, dialectical process of collaborative processes in L2 teaching and learning.

In this chapter, I pose questions about how L2 learners view what makes a teacher good, using an overarching focus on collaboration as an ongoing, multidimensional dialectical process.

**Dialogue Journals as Tools Integrating L2 Teaching with Learning**

Recent L2 research treats literacy as a process of constructing meaning, rather than as a decoding or encoding of the linguistic aspects of written texts (Day & Bamford 1998), and criticises traditional methods of literacy instruction based on a single, universal timetable and cross-cultural universals (John-Steiner & Mahn 1996). Until the 1970s, reading and writing were regarded as separate linguistic processes. By the 1980s, researchers began to shift their interest towards the relationship between reading and writing as cognitive and social processes (Goodman 1986; Goodman, Flurkey & Xu 2003). Throughout the 1990s, research maintained its focus on reading and writing as interdependent activities through such approaches as whole language and the process-oriented approach. L2 literacy activities can also be viewed as constructing meaning and having the potential to open up new ways of viewing the world (Freire 1970). L2 literacy is neither a solitary cognitive task occurring inside the head of the L2 learner, nor a fixed sequence of observable behaviours. Rather, L2 literacy activities are dynamic and multidimensional collaborative processes in which L2 learners and their teacher co-construct knowledge within a community of learners. In this respect, Mahn’s (John-Steiner & Mahn 1996) application of dialogue journals is a useful L2 literacy activity for exploring the dynamic interdependence of student-teacher L2 interaction. Vygotsky (1978, pp.117-118) wrote:
Teaching should be organized in such a way that reading and writing are necessary for something...that writing should be meaningful...that writing be taught naturally...and that the natural methods of teaching reading and writing involve appropriate operations on the child’s environment.

Therefore, in the classes studied in this chapter, interdisciplinary, literature-based thematic units (Richard-Amato 2003) were implemented along with dialogue journals. The term “dialogue journal” was coined in 1979 by educational psychologist Jana Staton and sixth-grade teacher Leslee Reed to describe Reed’s use of individualised interactive writing with L1 and L2 English speakers in California (Peyton & Staton 1993). According to Peyton (1993), dialogue journals mediate non-threatening contexts of communication in which L1 and L2 learners can engage in collaborative reading and writing in authentic and purposeful ways, and provide a natural and comfortable bridge to other genres of writing.

By considering these dialogue journals as tools in an L2 literacy activity, this chapter investigates how Korean children viewed their best teachers. In addition to dialogue journals, the data comprises interviews and field notes taken during observation.

The Context
This chapter focusses on L2 students registered at a Korean School in Montreal, Canada. In Montreal, there are two official languages – French and English – but immigrants must register their children in French-language schools. Korean parents and Canadian parents who have adopted Korean children often send their children to ‘Korean School’ on Saturdays to be taught Korean and English. There is no Korean School in Montreal for students who expect to return to Korea, so in this study the term ‘Korean School’ is used to refer to ‘Korean Saturday School’ or ‘Korean Heritage School’. The study in this chapter took place in such a school, in which students were learning Korean and English in addition to their formal educational experience at their French-language school in the Québec public school system.

The participants in this chapter were four L2 Korean students attending the same class. This classroom was selected because the teacher, who had been teaching for 2 years at a Korean School, was interested in using dialogue journals in her class. Born in Korea, she moved to Canada
because of her husband’s job and became a Canadian citizen. Her L1 is Korean, with English as L2 and French as L3. The students, 10 years old at the time of the study, were bilingual or trilingual children from Korean, English and/or French backgrounds. Although all were ethnic Koreans, it is hard to define which language was the first language (L1), second language (L2) or third language (L3) because students had widely differing backgrounds, such as place of birth and language(s) of education.

Ju-Na was born in the United States and has spent her childhood there. From 5 years of age, she has studied at a French private school in Montreal; her L1 is Korean (her family language) and L2 and L3 are English and French, although which is which is not clear. Tae-Ho was born in Korea, and moved to Montreal one month before the time of the study, his father having accepted a post as a visiting university professor. Tae-Ho has been studying at an English private school in Montreal. His L1 is clearly Korean, with English and French as L2 or L3 – again, it is difficult to determine which is which. Su-Seok was born in Canada and has been exposed to English education in an English day care and French elementary school. Su-Seok’s L1 is Korean, with English as L2 and French as L3. Although Young-Joon was born in Korea, he has only attended French public schools. Young-Joon’s L1 is French, his father being a francophone Canadian; his L2 is English and Korean his L3.

**Methodology**

The four L2 students kept dialogue journals, describing and expressing their classroom experiences and outside life based on thematic units (e.g. Family, Seasons, Transportation, Oceans) during class time. Dialogue journals were thus used as written conversations, through which the L2 students and their teacher communicated weekly from February to April during the 2004-05 school year. While participating in the unit Valentine’s Day, the L2 students enthusiastically engaged in the task of describing their best teachers to their peers and teacher, using dialogue journals they entitled “My Good Teacher”. The excerpts that appear in this chapter were selected from these dialogue journal entries.

Preliminary interviews with students and their teacher indicated that the students did not like receiving an adult’s unsolicited written response in their dialogue journals, because they had a lot of difficulty in writing and reading. Ju-Na said, “I hate it [receiving teacher’s written response in her dialogue journal]. It’s so boring”. In the case of students’
soliciting feedback, the teacher wrote her thoughts and feelings in her students’ dialogue journals. Further, the teacher allowed students to draw pictures to represent activities and experiences in class with their best teacher, using either English or French, depending on their level of comfort with either language, to express their thoughts and feelings.

Although the journals were originally conceived as a form of written communication between teacher and student (Peyton & Staton 1993), in this case it was found that the majority of students did not welcome written feedback from teachers. Thus, instead of actually responding to students’ drawings and writings, the teacher used these student inputs primarily as mediational tools in order to construct genuine dialogic context and intersubjectivity, as referred to by Wertsch (1985a). For example, although the teacher selected the theme of ‘oceans’ and introduced the Korean book entitled “요술부채” (The Magic Fan in English), subsequent learning activities drew on the students’ dialogue journals; thus, utilising the students’ own work, the teacher assisted them to reflect on their experiences and knowledge and participate in other activities such as creating seafood recipes, counting money to sell and buy seafood, and discussing why the sea is salty.

When the dialogue journals of each student were collected, I analysed them using open coding, which Strauss and Corbin (1998, p.101) defined as the analytic process through which concepts are identified and their properties and dimensions discovered in data. Because there are drawbacks – ambiguity in particular – in using open coding to analyse students’ L2 dialogue journal entries, drawings and interviews with the students were used to triangulate the data. While the four students were drawing and writing in their dialogue journals, I observed their work and attitudes towards their teacher and peers, recording their interactions with a digital camera. After the students had finished their journal entries, they were interviewed individually about their dialogue journal entries and drawings. During these interviews, I had each student explain both their journal and drawing in order to discover the themes that emerged from the data and reconstruct this understanding into a holistic description (Runge 1997) and explanation (Merriam 1988). This was followed by an interview with the teacher about the students’ home life.

Coding of the dialogue journals thus proceeded in two steps. In the first step, dialogue journal statements were examined to determine the specific teacher characteristic the student had described. In this analysis,
each of the student's journal entries was examined in terms of the traits that the student ascribed to the described teacher. By using the students' 

Table 3.1: The Coding of Students' Dialogue Journals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Student</th>
<th>Dialogue Journal Entry</th>
<th>Coding</th>
<th>Theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ju-Na</td>
<td>One of my best teacher was my gym teacher. Her name is Rita and she's very nice with everybody. She taught me how to juggle, ride a unicycle, balance on a ball and everything else. I was one of her favorite student because I was good in sports. She would always encourage me for everything. She also made funny jokes and make nick names to her best students. She helped me develop my talent in sports and to be more confident in my actions and myself. She would give me private skiing and help me in sports.</td>
<td>1. Caring</td>
<td>1. Affective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Knowledge-able</td>
<td>2. Cognitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Encouraging</td>
<td>3. Affective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Having a good sense of humour</td>
<td>4. Affective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. Helpful &amp; Understanding</td>
<td>5. Social</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tae-Ho</td>
<td>Lorn in the middle of drawing on the board during recess which is at 11:00. He is so patient and flexible.</td>
<td>7. Patient &amp; Flexible</td>
<td>7. Social</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Su-Seok</td>
<td>I like him because he gives no punishments. He don't get mad at oders. He always has a giant smile as you can see on his Face. He is a pro in geography and in history. And his name is Mr. Solomon.</td>
<td>8. Helpful &amp; Understanding</td>
<td>8. Social</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young-Joon</td>
<td>Because she [she] is funny! Well she took the time to see my difficulties and made me work on them without pushing me so far that I hate school.</td>
<td>11. Having a good sense of humour</td>
<td>11. Affective</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
own experiences and understandings of what makes a teacher good, this analysis sought to understand the teaching/learning interaction from the students’ point of view. After all the journal statements had been coded, the codes were standardised so that nearly identical or very similar descriptions were assigned to the same label. For example, descriptions such as ‘gives no punishments. He don’t get mad at oders [others]’ from Su-Seok and ‘took the time to see my difficulties’ from Young-Joon were both recoded as ‘helpful and understanding’.

The second step was to triangulate this coding by interviewing each student and asking them to expand upon and explain their journal entry and drawing. After verifying the coding using interviews and drawings, the data were assigned code labels that described the students’ statements about the characteristics of their best teachers at a higher level of abstraction, as shown in Table 3.1. For instance, in order to clarify his dialogue journal, ‘He is a pro in geography and in history’, I asked Su-Seok to describe his drawing and writing in his L1 (Korean) and determined that due to his teacher’s expertise in geography and history, he became interested in those subjects and achieved good results at school. Therefore, the quoted dialogue journal entry was assigned the open code ‘knowledgeable’.

Once all statements had been assigned codes and these codes verified in the interviews, each code was examined to identify which aspect or theme relating to the teacher that code referred to. Thus, as can be seen in Table 1, rather than focussing only on cognitive aspects, three key themes pertaining to cognitive, social and affective perspectives on best teachers by the L2 learners emerged from the data.

Discussion
As can be seen in the above analysis, these Korean children clearly conceptualised the learning situation as a social one. Traditional pedagogical or cognitive views of teaching and learning cannot account for the multidimensional aspects of these data; before we can determine what these results tell us about L2 teaching and learning, we must examine how the teaching/learning situation is conceptualised.

New perspectives on the nature of knowledge, thinking and learning, such as situated knowledge and situated learning (Brown, Collins & Duguid 1989; Rogoff 1990; Lave & Wenger 1991), and other contemporary pedagogical approaches, such as problem-based learning, inquiry-
based learning, project-based learning and collaborative learning, emphasise the active role of learners in constructing knowledge by interacting with their environments (which include their teachers). Furthermore, based on traditional conceptions of apprenticeship, Collins, Brown and Newman (1989) proposed an alternative model of instructional design, “cognitive apprenticeship” (CA), within the framework of the formal schooling. A main goal is to make the processes of thinking visible to both learners and their teacher using authentic contexts (Collins, Brown & Holum 1991).

However, these situated learning perspectives do not imply that teachers develop and change their teaching through interacting with their students; instead, they focus on the products of individual learner’s cognition. Furthermore, the dyadic master/apprentice relationship of cognitive apprenticeship fails to take into account the heterogeneity of cultures. My main critique is that it cannot incorporate a notion of a shared joint activity in which there is no fixed problem, goal, single solution or predetermined expertise.

Cognitive apprenticeship was reconceptualised upon recent developments in Activity Theory (Engeström 1987) following a Vygotskian perspective. However, the models based on Activity Theory still do not provide a satisfactory account of the dialectical relationships within a community of learners. I therefore propose an alternative conceptual framework of creative apprenticeship to understand the Korean children’s L2 dialogue journals. The proposed alternative provides useful ways to integrate L2 teaching with learning characterised by key aspects of a Vygotskian perspective: creative collaboration with psychological tools; integration of affect and thought; and wholeness.

**Creative Collaboration with Psychological Tools**

Vygotsky suggests in his well-known “genetic law of development” (Valsiner 1987, p.67) that lifelong processes of development are dependent on the mediation processes of social interaction, including adult guidance or collaboration with more capable peers. Following this Vygotskian perspective, some researchers (Gallimore & Tharp 1990; Cole & Engeström 1993; Rogoff 1998) have focussed on cultural-historical processes within collaboratively shared activities in terms of dynamic interactions among teachers, students, researchers and reformers beyond the dyadic or the small group level. They argue that learning becomes a
reciprocal or shared experience for the students and their teacher in that they create their own meaning and knowledge.

Cole and Engeström (1993, pp.22-23) also view reading as a socially organised activity rather than a solitary activity, with individual mental psychological processes occurring inside the head of the learner. However, my critique of their approach relies on Wells’ (2000) notions of a shared joint activity and John-Steiner’s (2000) study of creative collaboration. Wells (2000) stresses the mutually constitutive relationships between individuals and society, in which participants with relatively little experience can learn with and from each other, as well as from those with greater experience (pp.56-58). Thus, there is no fixed problem, goal, single solution or predetermined expertise. John-Steiner (2000) emphasises that creativity develops from the reciprocal relationship between learners and teachers, rather than arising spontaneously from one individual. Cole and Engeström’s program, therefore, fails to recognise an emergent property of “moment-by-moment interactions between actors, and between actors and the environments of their action” (Suchman 1987, p.179).

For instance, they describe the role of the teacher as the bearer of the cultural past, the bearer of authority concerning the correct interpretation of the text, and the organiser of the teaching/learning process. In addition, by implementing deliberate instruction according to a set of preformulated objectives, they assume that the expected future state of mature reading must somehow be already present at the beginning of instruction in the form of constraints that enable the development of the to-be-acquired system of mediation (p.23). They ignore broad social relations, institutions and conditions in order to investigate how these factors affect motivational and cognitive aspects to enhance reading (Ratner 1997, p.212). In this sense, they ignore the heterogeneity of culture as well as the active role of reader’s agency, which has been objectified in social activities and concepts.

Like Canadians, Korean people celebrate Valentine’s Day on the fourteenth of February; in particular, Koreans celebrate romantic love (for instance, on that day, girls give chocolate to their boyfriends). In addition to Valentine’s Day, in Korea there is another special ‘romantic’ day, “White Day”, on March 14. On that day, boys give candies to their girlfriends. However, in Canada, Valentine’s Day is a time to celebrate all love such as family love between parents and children, love between friends, and love between students and teachers. In order to express respect and love to teachers in Korea, there is “Teacher’s Day” on the
fifteenth of May. Therefore, with formalised cultural expressions of these types common to both Korea and Canada (even if encompassed by a single special day in Canada, and assigned different days in Korea), using the theme of ‘Valentine’s Day’, the L2 Korean students and their teacher could share and negotiate their different experiences and knowledge.

Within this context of cultural activity, the teacher, responding to the emergent students’ interests, selected the theme of Valentine’s Day for class focus. The L2 Korean students and their teacher were encouraged to work on topics that they found personally relevant and challenging, and in so doing went beyond knowledge transmission from teacher to student typical in teachers’ responses to assigned writing. For instance, students improvised their own topics in journal entries such as “My Good Teacher”, posed their own goals and problems, and created their own solutions in dealing with the latter.

Furthermore, student-chosen writing topics in the L2 students’ dialogue journals worked as a “mediational tool” through which the teacher and the researcher became active participants in order to explore how to integrate L2 teaching with L2 learning. For instance, the L2 students’ dialogue journals led the teacher and researcher to reflect on their shared experience and knowledge in the process of seeking to understand the students’ perspectives on the characteristics of their best teachers. As the result of the activity of composing, the students’ dialogue journals became a “tool” to mediate both communication and the thinking in the further processes of knowledge construction and dissemination (Wells 1996). Through this process of using dialogue journals as psychological tools (Kozulin 1998; Vygotsky 1962/1986), a creative apprenticeship has been established through the creative collaboration of L2 students, teacher and researcher, as they pursued their joint activities.

Because the teaching and learning process is examined from the L2 students’ point of view, as expressed in their dialogue journals, the role of the teacher has not been explicitly described. Nonetheless, Vygotsky’s (1978) notion of zone of proximal development suggests that through using available cultural artifacts (e.g. literature-based thematic units, dialogue journals), the teacher should be involved in the active co-construction of knowledge in collaboration with students. While observing and facilitating her students’ development, the teacher was also actively interacting and negotiating with her students. Thus, like her students, the teacher
could internalise and appropriate specific teaching experiences with specific students, thereby creating knowledge. This implies a dialectical and asymmetrical process of teaching and learning in the classroom.

In that sense, Sawyer (2004, p.13) characterised teaching as “improvisational performance” and “a creative art”, with an emphasis on the collaborative and emergent nature of effective classroom practice:

Effective classroom discussion is improvisational, because the flow of the class is unpredictable and emerges from the actions of all participants, both teachers and students.

While Piaget proposed a conceptual dichotomy between the creative activities of individuals on the one hand, and social processes on the other, Vygotsky argued that creativity is mediated and regulated by the socio-cultural practices of communities (John-Steiner & Moran 2003). In light of this argument, Sawyer focusses on classroom interactions as dialectical collaboration in which teachers empower their students, who, in turn, empower their teachers, while carrying out open-ended, ongoing complex tasks.

John-Steiner and Moran (2003, p.72) also observe how creative thought and collaboration develop within sociohistorical contexts:

Creativity transforms both the creator, through the personal experience of the process, and others, through the impact of new knowledge and innovative artifacts disseminated through culture.

According to John-Steiner (2000), the idea of creative collaboration, by focussing attention on all collaborators, can account for teachers’ transformations through social participation and thereby foster the creativity of teachers as learners.

Integration of Affect and Thought
According to Rogoff (1998, p.716), positive student-student interdependence and inherent interest help participants recognise, elaborate on, justify and resolve conflict and contradiction. This is an important way in which lower levels of cognition are transformed into higher-levels of cognitive reasoning strategies and meta-cognitive processes. Based on Vygotsky’s perspective on dialectical relationships between thought, affect, language and consciousness, Mahn & John-Steiner (2002) suggest
the importance of affective factors in lifelong learning and creativity. Most participants in this study also stressed affective qualities of teachers such as “caring, having a good sense of humour” and “encouraging”.

Until now, the ability to act rationally, to control oneself, and to adopt an objective point of view in order to gain understanding in new situations have often been cited as the defining qualities of such higher-order psychological activities as problem solving and reflection. Mainstream cognitive theorists (e.g. Atkinson & Shiffrin 1968; Newell & Simon 1972; Sternberg 1979) sought to account for meta-cognition by constructing models of the cognitive control processes that differentiate the actual strategic functioning in problem solving for active monitoring and regulation of cognitive processes. Influenced by the work of Piaget describing the emergence of age-related changes in strategic problem-solving processes, Flavell (1976, p.232) characterised meta-cognition as referring to “the active monitoring and consequent regulation and orchestration of these processes in relation to the cognitive objects or data on which they bear”. Schoenfeld (1985) also viewed meta-cognition as managing or coaching a person’s learning by guiding information processing and monitoring the effectiveness of strategies applied to particular learning tasks. Thus, meta-cognitive processes represent an “executive control” system and are central to planning, problem solving, evaluation and many aspects of language use.

According to Piaget, each person owns and is responsible for the development of structures for achieving knowledge and understanding (John-Steiner 2000). In this sense, the relationship between the learner’s “self-control” or “self-determination” (Iyengar & Lepper 1999) or “self-regulation” and their positive achievement in educational contexts has been substantially concerned with the study of intrinsic motivation, where learners are viewed as actors seeking to exercise and validate a sense of conscious control and rationality over their external environments. The effective teacher is regarded as supporting intentional, thoughtful, problem-driven and student-centered activity. In this sense, cognitive approaches often regard thought as separated from emotion without any awareness of the importance of the motivating sphere of consciousness.

Preliminary interviews with the teacher and field notes in this study indicated intimate relationships between the teacher, her L2 students and their parents. The teacher expressed how much the students meant to her, and the teaching process was made more meaningful as a result. Further-
more, there was an improved relationship between the teacher and the researcher such that the fear of being observed was displaced by trust.

By emphasising this reciprocal emotional support offered by partners in collaboration, Mahn & John-Steiner (2002) introduced Vygotsky’s concept of perezhivanie in descriptions of the ways in which collaborating participants perceive, experience, appropriate, represent and process the emotional aspects of social interaction. Creative apprenticeship supports the integration of emotional and intellectual experience beyond fostering the cognitive development of L2 learners.

**Wholeness**

Collaborative researchers within a Western perspective often characterise mutual engagement as involving symmetrical exchanges (Rogoff 1998, p.723). Thus, through shared endeavour and mutual engagement, rather than as teachers-as-authority figures, the role of teachers-as-equal-partners is critical to the collaborative process with learners. Piaget (1970) also seems to have identified the importance of social interaction as symmetrical through equilibration. According to Piaget, teachers need to carefully structure children’s experiences in order to foster optimal cognitive development through the inevitable stages, and to assist them by providing positive influence and social support.

A Vygotskian approach, rather than dividing teachers-as-authority figures from learners-as-equal-partners in a dualistic perspective, views the relationship between teachers and learners as mediated by a dialectical process of social interaction. Asymmetrical relationships are not frozen and they can and do evolve over time to become more symmetrical (Gallimore et al. 1992). Following Vygotsky, Ratner (1997) proposed an asymmetrical dialectic in which the subordinate partner could be active and influential in affecting the dominant partner. Similarly, Gaskins (1999) introduced an Eastern perspective into the analysis of motivation. In “Adding Legs to a Snake”, he likened the concept of a distinct and autonomous self as undermining contentment (e.g. intrinsic motivation) to adding legs to a snake.

In order to make sense of the kinds of social interactions that these Korean students and teachers engage in, it may be useful to understand a little about how Koreans view these social interactions. In general, Asian cultures, including Korean, emphasise collectivism, as opposed to the individualism emphasised in the West. For instance, in Korea, allegiance to each other is very important; the needs of the group take priority over
the needs of the individual. The importance of a group ethos is further reinforced by Confucian teachings, which are primarily concerned with family relationships. That is, individuals do not exist independently, but rather as part of an extended family and collective network. With this orientation, it is difficult to define one’s identity without reference to the collective identity to which one belongs.

The L2 Korean students’ dialogue journals featured mostly positive statements, no doubt in service of the topic “My Good Teacher”. However, students’ perspectives also included negative descriptors such as “punishment” and “mad” from Su-Seok’s journal and “pushing” from Young-Joon’s. Furthermore, the relationships between the L2 Korean students and their teacher seemed to depart from the typical teacher-student relationship in Korea, a prominent aspect of which is emotional attachment to the teacher. For instance, in the following excerpt, Ju-Na used the pronoun “she” in order to refer to her teacher, and there was no use of “we” or “our” — a result, perhaps, of the influence of Western cultural and social contexts in the USA and Canada.

One of my best teacher[s] was my gym teacher. Her name is Rita and she’s very nice with everybody. She taught me how to juggle, ride a unicycle, balance on a ball and everything else. I was one of her favorite student[s] because I was good in sports. She would always encourage me for everything. She also made funny jokes and make [gave] nick names to her best students.

In Korean culture, the concept of jeong is defined as a special interpersonal bond of trust and intimacy. Developed mutually between people or among communities, jeong brings about special feelings of relationship such as togetherness, sharing and bonding (Kim 2005). Jeong refers to the enduring, close connections of people belonging to a group and fosters emotional attachment to the “we” rather than the “I” (Kim, Deci & Zuckerman 2002). In this sense, “we” does not presuppose the coexistence of “I” and “you” as independent individualised units, as in the West. In Korean culture, human relations do not involve the exchange of relationships between “I” and “you” as individual units; rather, “I” and “you” form a unified single unit in terms of non-dual consciousness. Through the interview, Ju-Na also referred to the sense of emotional support that comes from such relations: “I cannot express
myself well toward my French school teachers, but it is easier to communicate with Korean teachers”.

Eastern cultures focus on the weakening of one’s concept of self in favour of wholeness in a community-inclusive sense, in contrast to Western culture’s emphasis on self-control and self-regulation in terms of greater personal competence and autonomy mainly through cognitive aspects. In this sense, Gaskins (1999) preferred an interfusion view of the self to that of an interdependent view, because an independent self is still involved with personal opinions, needs and desires. Influenced by Zen Buddhism, Gaskins pointed out that in the interfusion view of the self, one is socialised to subordinate personal opinions, needs and desires to the needs of the whole, or the group. Buddhism teaches that there is no distinction between self and others in terms of interfusion, and that this unity results in compassion and selflessness, rather than “self-determination” supported by current self-oriented motivation theories in which self and others are related but distinct and other is regarded as secondary. Hwang (2004, p.274) also characterised compassion in terms of Korean Seon (Zen) Master Daehang Sunim’s view:

[Compassion is a practice in which one can break one’s fixed or one-sided view, and work to broaden one’s mind and cultivate inner strength towards loving and kind relations with all beings. If we are able to see all beings as ourselves, eventually there will be no need for compassion itself.

Thus, Gaskins (1999, p.211) suggested that the modelling of compassion and respect for all aspects of the universe, humility, patience, and appreciation for and full attention to one’s current circumstances are important features of a Zen Buddhist approach to education.

Based on a Vygotskian perspective, Mahn & John-Steiner’s (2002) view of the complementarities in collaborative activities also suggests an important sense in which a weakening of the self could lead to an affective and cognitive mutual openness to foster creative collaboration. In terms of cultivating the compassionate mind, Hwang (2004) also addressed an important role of wisdom beyond the emotional level of understanding the self and others in order to be aware of and understand the self and others, and furthermore to create true caring and loving relationships.
Furthermore, Buddhism suggests that we are dynamic and ever-changing configurations of potentiality. Unlike a conceptualisation that focusses on static states of being, Zen Buddhism’s concern with the principles of change and emptiness can help L2 learners deal with fundamental restlessness, anxiety or discontent due to integration with the learning situation involving the use of L2. Thus, like Vygotsky’s dialectical perspective, Buddhism’s non-dualistic view of the self and others in terms of wholeness helps L2 learners to resolve conflicts and discrepancies and to achieve peace when confronting difficult tasks, because they perceive that everything is empty and impermanent.

Therefore, if we miss this dialectical aspect between the individual and the social world – one of the most significant characteristics common to both Vygotskian perspectives and Korean culture – the multi-dimensional and dynamic process of creative collaboration in L2 teaching and learning might be misinterpreted as a unidirectional movement from the social plane to the individual one. In this sense, with its emphasis on wholeness (in contrast to current Cognitive Apprenticeship), Creative Apprenticeship focusses on an open-ended, dynamic, asymmetrical teaching and learning process in which all learners – including teachers – share, collaborate on, negotiate, co-construct and co-create knowledge, rather than limiting our understanding of learning to only the individual learner’s moving towards autonomy and independence.

Conclusion
In comparison to cognitive views of teaching and learning, the Korean children’s conceptions about the characteristics of their best teachers in their L2 dialogue journals tell us that affective aspects play an important role in both teaching and learning. Drawing upon a Vygotskian perspective and John-Steiner’s notion of creative collaboration, this chapter thus suggests a substantial role for creative teaching, and leads to a model of creative apprenticeship represented by the following characteristics: a) creative collaboration using psychological tools; b) the integration of affect and thought; and c) wholeness.

Unlike static individualistic approaches in which teaching and learning are conceived as distinct processes, creative apprenticeship addresses an ongoing, multidimensional, dialectical process of L2 teaching-learning. In comparison with other research in which L2 dialogue journals are implemented as written responses for the trans-
mission of information, in a creative apprenticeship, the teacher needs to adapt her/his thoughts and behaviour, so that the L2 students’ dialogue journals can work as psychological tools for the transformation and creation of knowledge. In that sense, this chapter focusses on L2 learning and teaching as a joint meaning-making activity mediated by L2, in which students and their teacher co-construct cognitive, social and affective experiences within a community of learners.

Furthermore, in order to understand the Korean students’ affective aspects, this chapter describes Korean Buddhism’s non-dualistic view of the self and others (e.g. compassion) as representing an asymmetrical dialectic. One of the implications of this view will be the integration of Vygotskian theories and Korean culture in order to address L2 Korean learners’ needs and motivation in terms of the affective process in cross-cultural teaching situations. This fosters the development of competent, creative, caring, loving and lovable people (Noddings 1992), rather than simply focussing on intellectual and academic achievement.
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