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ABSTRACT

This thesis contributes to the field of Applied Linguistics by investigating the relationship between creativity, second language (L2) development, and the classroom curriculum in South Korea (Korea, hereafter). Despite curricular reforms since the 1990s calling for more communicative approaches to teaching English, and despite Korea’s present interest in developing more creative citizens, an emphasis on creative learning in the English as a Foreign Language (EFL) classroom has been difficult to implement in practice. There are numerous reasons for this, but adherence to traditional methods of teaching is perhaps one of the most significant; therefore, for creativity to become part of the EFL curriculum in Korea, it must first be considered valuable for the learning process.

Although a few studies have examined the correlation of these competencies by comparing assessments of creativity and language proficiency, this is the first longitudinal investigation of creativity in a classroom learning situation that uses an ethnographic, Case Study approach to explore creativity in a second language learning environment. The original analytical framework created for this study, derived at through the process of framework analysis, is an adaption of the Systems Model of Creativity proposed by Csikszentmihalyi (1999), which asserts that creativity depends not only on the person, but on environmental factors as well.

The main aim of this exploratory study was to examine these environmental factors by comparing two curricula, a more traditional textbook-driven (TB-driven) curriculum and a Project-based Learning (PBL) curriculum, to evaluate the role of the curricular approach in providing opportunities, or “affordances,” for creativity and emergent language use. The Findings report an in-depth, contextualized definition of creativity in the L2 classroom based on the empirical data and offers five specific characteristics that represent creativity as a learner/environmental trait. Findings also show important differences between the two groups in the teacher and learners interactions in the classroom and in their perspectives on creativity in language learning. Finally, the study demonstrates that the analytical model used in this study can be a useful research tool for further exploration of the topic and can act as a conceptual and practical guide to help teachers and students better activate their creative capacities in the EFL classroom.
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CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

“Creativity requires the courage to let go of certainties.”

—Eric Fromm

Today, creativity is a vital skill needed in nearly every profession and has become the distinguishing characteristic of our modern cosmopolitan ethos (Florida, 2014). Technology and innovation continue to change the world at a rapid pace, and being able to change with it has become integral to success (Robinson, 2011). It is therefore imperative that schools cultivate young people who are not only able to adapt to constant change but who are also prepared to be the dynamic force behind it. Many countries seem cognizant of this reality as creativity has become increasingly pervasive in educational policy around the world (O’Donnell & Micklethwaite, 1999); however, a genuine focus on creative development has not been easy to implement in classroom practice (K. H. Kim, 2011). In today’s reality of high-stakes testing, student and teacher accountability, and academic competition for university admission, creativity has become an auxiliary, if not incidental, part of education (Sternberg, 2010).

1.1 Background of Context: “Creative Korea?”

In Korea, where this study takes place, a tradition of “intense schooling” revolving around high-stakes testing often restricts time for creative endeavours (Siu, 2013, Woo, 2013). Under the new national slogan of “Creative Korea” (Kwon, 2016), a major provision of governmental policy is to develop young people’s creativity through education. This initiative would require some significant changes to the current educational system (Woo, 2013), perhaps the most important of which would be making classrooms more learner-centred. However, in terms of English language teaching in Korea, reforms since the 1990s that have heralded the implementation of a student-centred, communicative approach have been difficult to achieve because academic competition drives a private educational market that exploits the anxieties of parents (Choi, 2008). This, of course, directly affects the way teachers instruct their classes, compelling them to focus on the skills students need to perform well on high stakes tests (Shin, 2012; Whitehead, 2016). Until policymakers demonstrate a willingness to make fundamental changes, the focus will likely continue to be on preparing students for tests rather than developing thinking or communication skills (Moodie & Nam, 2016).
1.2 Purpose of the Study

Although teachers and policymakers have recognized the need to make education a more interactive and engaging endeavour (Anh, 2012), schools continue to find it challenging to effectively integrate creative thinking into actual classroom practice predominantly because testing outcomes have been prioritized over the learning process (Choi, 2008). For this reason, this study explores if and how creativity affects language learning, and the role of the curricular approach in creating the emergent classroom dynamic and in shaping the perspectives and attitudes of the classroom participants.

This study first seeks to define creativity in a language learning environment by proposing key characteristics of the learner and the learning environment that can help cultivate creativity in the classroom. Next, it seeks to understand the participants’ perspectives of creativity and how classroom interaction and activities impact their creativity and English language learning development. Finally, it explores how two different curricula, a Project-based Learning Curriculum and a more traditional Textbook-driven Curriculum, affect the learning environment and what role the curriculum plays in promoting creativity development and second language learning. To address these issues, the current study aims to answer three primary research questions.

1.3 Research Questions

The first question, explored in Chapter 4, aims to provide a foundational understanding of the concept of creativity in the language learning classroom by providing a definition of specific “creative characteristics”.

**Research Question 1**: When viewed through the *Modified Systems Model of Creativity for the L2 Classroom*, what are the essential characteristics that can define creativity in a language learning environment?

The second research question, addressed in Chapter 5, investigates the participants’ perspectives of creativity in a language learning environment and the role the curriculum plays in shaping their attitudes and perceptions.

**Research Question 2**: What are the participants’ perspectives and attitudes towards creativity in language learning and how does the curriculum influence these perspectives and attitudes?

The final research question, examined in Chapter 6, uses the longitudinal classroom data to evaluate creativity and language development over the course of the one year study.
**Research Question 3:** How do the characteristics of creativity manifest in the empirical data and how can they be analysed through the lens of the *Modified Systems Model of Creativity for the L2 Classroom* to explain the longitudinal development of creativity and L2 proficiency in six Case Studies?

**1.4 Research Approach and Rationale**

The few studies on the relationship between creativity and language learning have been quantitative, correlation studies that have administered assessments for each of these competencies and then compared results (Albert, 2006; Carroll, 1990; Ghonsooly & Showqi, 2012; Landry, 1973; Ottó, 1998). A few recent studies have begun to look at creativity through interaction and explored group and pair discussions in open-ended communicative activities (K. McDonough, Crawford, & Mackey, 2015; Tin, 2011). However, these studies examined interaction in a single speaking task and did not examine the effects of a curricular culture as it developed over time. Further, none of these studies have explored participants’ perspectives of creativity and language learning in the classroom, nor have they offered a contextualised definition of creativity based on empirical data, instead using only the scoring criteria of creativity assessments to represent it.

The current study was primarily concerned with participant’s perspectives, attitudes, actions, and interactions and investigates these elements through an in-depth, qualitative ethnographic approach. Hence, six Case Studies (three from each curriculum) were used to explore individual behaviours and perceptions. Further, recognising that creativity and language proficiency take time to develop, this longitudinal study was conducted over the course of one year.

**1.5 Structure of Thesis**

The thesis has seven chapters. It begins with the introduction, followed by the literature review, then continues with the methodology before moving to the three findings chapters, with each findings chapter independently committed to answering one of the research questions, and hence combining results and discussion to make the analysis more holistic and coherent. It then closes with the conclusion chapter.

**1.5.1 Literature Review (Chapter 2)**

The Literature Review first covers the major issues with English education in Korea that this study hoped to address. Next, it covers the studies conducted on the relationship between creativity and language
learning that are pertinent to this study. It then defines creativity using five characteristics which are both prevalent in the multi-disciplinary literature on creativity and salient in the empirical data collected in this research. The chapter then explains the existing theoretical frameworks relevant to this study before elucidating the novel analytical model created for this study and how it will be applied to the analysis of creative engagement through empirical data. The chapter concludes with a clarification (and word of caution) of how the two curricular approaches that are compared should be conceived within the theoretical framework employed in this study.

1.5.2 Methodology (Chapter 3)

This study used a longitudinal qualitative design that focused primarily on the selected Case studies. It is described as ethnography in the traditional anthropological tradition, in that it is an ‘interpretative-explanatory’ account of what transpired in the natural setting in which the researcher spent a significant amount of time (Fetterman, 2010; Watson-Gegeo, 1988). Further, it attempts to understand, interpret, and describe phenomena by honouring and prioritising the participants’ (emic) point of view, while being aware of one’s own perspectives (the researcher’s etic view), biases, and explanations (Eisenhart, 2001).

This study administered an assessment of creativity and a test of language proficiency at the beginning, middle, and end of the study to complement the qualitative analysis and to help construct learner profiles, but it is not considered a “mixed-method study” in the traditional sense. Indeed, the methodological and theoretical focus of this study was to employ a qualitative, descriptive approach to illuminate the empirical data and to prioritise the teacher and students’ voices. Multiple qualitative data collection methods were used, including field notes of classroom observations, video and audio recordings of all classes, participant interviews with the teacher and students, and an end-of-study Focus Group session. Also, as the empirical data was compiled through different learning methods and materials, the two curricular approaches are considered a form of data collection and thus the processes and theoretical underpinnings of the Textbook-driven Curriculum (TB-driven Curriculum) and the Project-based Learning Curriculum (PBL-Curriculum) used in this study are explained, with an example of both curricula (using data from this study) provided for clarification of how the classes were conducted and how the learning materials were used.

Framework Analysis (Gale, Heath, Cameron, Rashid, & Redwood, 2013; Srivastava & Thomson, 2009; Ward, Furber, Tierney, & Swallow, 2013) is used to evaluate the vast qualitative and multi-dimensional data collected during this study. Framework analysis is a qualitative method that can use an inductive
analysis that moves from open coding towards building a novel framework, or deductive analysis in which the researcher(s) utilize the existing literature on a topic, or, commonly, a mix of deductive and inductive strategies; (Dixon-Woods, 2011; Gale et al., 2013; Ritchie & Spencer, 1994; Srivastava & Thomson, 2009).

This study utilizes a mixed approach. It begins with using traits of creativity collected from the multidisciplinary research on the topic to ensure that the conceptualisation of creativity adopted in this study coheres with existing theories and perspectives, but also uses original codes when the traits from the literature did not encapsulate a particular behaviour. The codes are then categorized into major themes (M. Miles & Huberman, 1994; Saldaña, 2013) to define creativity (see Chapter 4). In defining and refining the analytical framework for this study, an existing model of creativity, the Systems Model of Creativity (Csikszentmihalyi, 2014d; Feldman, Csikszentmihalyi, & Gardner, 1994), represented the major components in this study (the teacher, students, and curricular approach) and embodied the classroom reality of interaction. However, it did account well for a critical element in the learning environment, the affordances, or opportunities, available for creative interaction and creative language use through/in the target language. Hence, the concept of affordances is added to the Systems Model. The inductive approach to the data analysis continues in exploring the Case Studies of the student-participants through ethnographic inquiry. With the characteristics of creativity delineated, the model revised, and the learners, teacher, and learning environment thoroughly articulated, the Modified Systems Model of Creativity in the L2 Classroom is then applied to the empirical data investigate differences in the two curricula.

1.5.3 Findings (Chapters 4-6)

Each Finding Chapters is dedicated to answering one of the research questions and hence include both results (interview data, classroom transcripts, and quantitative assessments) and analysis/discussion of the data.

Chapter 4 lays the groundwork for exploration of creativity in a language learning environment by using the Modified Systems Model of Creativity for the L2 Classroom (described in Chapter 2) to demonstrate, through the empirical data of classroom interaction, how the five characteristics of creativity are activated in the two curricula and to explain differences that emerged through the comparative analysis.

Chapter 5 examines teacher and learners’ perspective on the curriculum, creative engagement, their second language development and the interaction between these components. The main objective of this chapter is to understand how students perceive creativity, how they recognise and call attention to affordances for
creativity and language-use, and how they see the curriculum as affecting their creativity and second language development over the course of the year.

Chapter 6 then explores how students’ in both curricula activated (or failed to activate) the five key characteristics of creativity through classroom interaction by examining comparative segments (in terms of the number of times the class had met) from the beginning, middle, and end of the study. This analysis aims to demonstrate similarities and differences in how the curricula offered, and how the participants perceived, affordances for creativity and language-use. Further, it examines how this impacted their language learning experiences and how it may have influenced language learning outcomes.

1.5.4 Conclusion (Chapter 7)

Chapter 7 concludes the thesis. First, the main findings of the study are summarized and connected back to the previous research on creativity in language learning. The major contributions to the field of applied linguistics are highlighted, while the challenges and limitations of the study are acknowledged. Finally, the study’s implications and directions for future research are considered, and the impact in could have on second language education in Korea, and in the broader context, is envisaged.

1.6 Research Aims and Significance

This study first aims to explore how creativity can be defined in the language learning classroom by identifying learner characteristics that can engender creative behaviour and interaction. While there are many ways of conceptualising and describing creativity, this study focuses on establishing essential learner/environment characteristics that can be promoted in the L2 classroom so that a learning environment conducive to creativity can be better recognised and developed. Furthermore, by comparing a Textbook-driven curriculum and Project-based Learning curriculum, it aims to understand the role of the curriculum in providing opportunities for creative engagement and language-use. As Korea has traditionally used more teacher-centred, grammar-focused instruction in the teaching of English, how students responded to and engaged in the Textbook-driven curriculum compared to the researcher-designed Project-based Curriculum was of particular interest. By analysing individuals (Case Studies) from both curricula through this model, it aimed to better understand how the curriculum influences learner characteristics of creativity, and how these characteristics affected teacher and student perceptions of creativity and language-use affordances in the learning environment. Essentially, it endeavoured to better understand the relationship between learner characteristics of creativity, second language (L2) learning,
and the curriculum. If such a relationship can be reliably established, this may give impetus for relevant stakeholders to encourage and incorporate creativity into the EFL curriculum in Korea and elsewhere.
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

“Whatever creativity is, it is in part a solution to a problem.”

—Brian Aldiss

The Literature Review begins by delineating the major challenges of implementing creativity-oriented teaching and learning in the Korean EFL context, and the recent initiatives that have aimed to address these issues. It then evaluates the existing literature on the relationship between creativity and language learning/proficiency and expounds upon their methodological and diagnostic limitations. Next, to define creativity, it discusses the five characteristics of creativity which are considered the most significant in the context of this study. Following the definition of these characteristics, the Systems Model of Creativity (Csikszentmihalyi, 1999), which forms the basis of this study’s conceptual framework, will be explained along with one recent modification to the model that is relevant to this study as it applies the model to the field of education (Csikszentmihalyi & Wolfe, 2014). Next, Gibson’s concept of affordances (2014), which is integrated into the modified model used in this study (described in Chapter 4), will be explained, particularly in reference to its application in language learning and creativity research. Based on these conceptual models and theories, the design of the analytical model used in this study is then explained, followed by how it is applied to data analysis. The chapter concludes with a consideration of how the two curricula used in this study should be understood within the proposed analytical model.

2.1 The Korean EFL Context

Despite ostensibly adopting a communicative syllabus in 1995 (Moodie & Nam, 2016; Nunan, 2003), the learning emphasis in the Korean EFL curriculum continues to be centred around memorizing grammatical forms and vocabulary items in preparation for multiple-choice tests (Jeon, 2009; Moodie & Nam, 2016). This process begins in the third grade of elementary school, when English becomes a compulsory subject, and continues throughout their academic career, culminating in the pivotal university entrance exam (S. Kim & Lee, 2010; J. K. Park, 2009; Shin, 2012; Whitehead, 2016).

In response to the emphasis placed on testing in the Korean education system, teachers spend much of their instructional time preparing students through drills, repetition, and didactic lessons (Anh, 2012; Choi, 2008; Jeon, 2009; Whitehead, 2016). Korea has stated a commitment to improve teachers’ pedagogical skills to cultivate more creative thinking and to use a more communicative approach in English education (Li, 1998; J. K. Park, 2009), yet, this has been slow to affect classroom practice. For now, the focus remains on preparing students for tests rather than developing thinking or communicative skills (T.-Y.
This intensive approach follows Korea’s long tradition of promoting academic excellence through competition, with English test scores being “of extreme importance” for future endeavours (Tudor, 2012, p. 106). Nevertheless, policymakers and other stakeholders continue to advocate the nation’s recent vision for language education with an emphasis on creative development.

2.2 “Creative Korea” as Impetus for Curricular Innovation and Change

The current Korean national curriculum includes “creative” in the definition of an educated person (Center, 2017; O’Donnell & Micklethwaite, 1999), and the ministry of education has firmly declared the need to infuse education at all levels with more creativity and critical thinking and to make English education more interactive and engaging (Center, 2017). Ministry of Education officials have recognized the need to focus less on rote-memorization and to encourage more active learning (Anh, 2012), and recent reforms have initiated changes that have given teachers more opportunities for creative activities in the classroom (K. E. R. Park, 2016).

The Free Semester Program initiated in 2015 allows Grade 7 students (first year of middle school) one semester in which there are no exams with the hopes that this will permit students to engage in activities that encourage creative problem solving and higher order thinking (R. Park, 2016). It will, of course, take time to determine if these objectives are being met or if they have any long-term residual effect on students’ learning. Thus far, however, these initiatives do not seem to be stemming the increased emphasis on English education and appear ineffective in promoting creative learning in the classroom (Moodie & Nam, 2016).

In her National Teacher’s day address on 15 May, 2016, then-President Park declared (as reported by K. E. R. Park, 2016),

“...Our country’s future depends on developing creative talents...Just as we caught up quickly with developed countries through education in the past, we now need to lead changes in this generation through the power of education.”

Shortly after her speech, a new national slogan, “Creative Korea,” was announced; it was chosen to affirm Korea’s commitment towards bolstering greater creativity in all economic and social sectors, including education (Kwon, 2016). Conversations regarding how the educational system might better foster the competencies needed for the future, such as creativity, cross-cultural understanding, and problem-solving, began several years ago but have yet to result in any substantial alterations in pedagogical practice. It has been argued that a major reason for this impasse is that the government has not allowed individual schools enough autonomy to create their own curricula (K. So & Kang, 2014). There is little question that significant change to the curriculum is a serious challenge in the Korean context. For these reasons, the
current study was conducted at a privately-owned language academy, rather than in the public-school system. While this held the advantage of allowing more freedom and flexibility in implementing the two curricula used in this study, it also created some unforeseen challenges, including difficulties with homework compliance, fluctuating levels of motivation in participation, sporadic attendance, attrition, and student accountability (the school owner granted limited permission to contact parents regarding their child’s productivity, attitude, and attendance). However, these issues are not seen as extraneous variables or methodological deficiencies, but rather as part of the complexity embedded in the circumstances. Moreover, many, if not most, of the existing studies on the topic are not without their own conceptual and methodological challenges. Consequently, one significant contribution that this study hopes to make is that, in contrast to previous studies, it attempts to address these challenges through “thick description” (Geertz, 2003) and in-depth ethnographic analysis. To lay the groundwork for the current study and to make clear the current gaps it hopes to fill, it is first necessary to expound upon the existing literature on the relationship between creativity and language proficiency/learning.

2.3 Studies on the Relationship between Creativity and Second Language Learning

At present, research on creativity and its relationship to second language learning is limited in both volume and scope (Albert, 2006). The few studies conducted on the relationship between these two attributes possess mixed conclusions (Kharkhurin, 2012), likely due to the variety of methodological approaches and measurement instruments used for evaluation and the differences in participant samples (age, learning context, language learning experience, etc.). Most studies are correlation studies that compare results on a creativity assessment to the results of language proficiency tests, providing little insight into what creativity entails in the L2 classroom, what role the curriculum and classroom materials play in promoting creative engagement, or how these capacities interact in the learning process. Moreover, the assessments of creativity and language proficiency are typically administered as one-off tests which do not show development of these characteristics over time. The few studies which have attempted to investigate variation in these competencies over an extended period do not use the same participants in a longitudinal design, but rather opt for different participant samples at different stages of a program. A final issue relevant to this study is that, as several researchers have pointed out, language proficiency tests, which are composed mostly of multiple-choice comprehension-type items, are not particularly compatible with most theories and conceptualisations of creativity. For clarity on these points, the existing studies have been divided into three subsections: 1) Foundational Studies on the topic; 2) Studies that use the Torrance Test of Creative Thinking (TTCT) (or a prototype); and 3) Studies that observe language-use in action.
2.3.1 Foundational Studies on the Relationship between Creativity and Second Language Learning/Proficiency

Carroll (1962, cited in Carroll 1990) was the first to empirically investigate the topic and did not find creativity to be a good indicator of language learning success. Indeed, in his later work Carroll references a study by Chastain (1975) that demonstrated a negative correlation between students’ level of French and German and their score on a creativity assessment. However, he offered the supposition that the language assessment was a simple discrete-point exam, and had the question types been more complex, the correlation may have been different.

Landry (1973), conversely, found that students who took a foreign language course for several years in elementary school scored higher on a creativity test than students from the same school who did not take foreign language courses. His study, which tested different populations in different grades and not the same students as they progressed, showed that the gap in creativity scores increased between the groups at later grades and postulated that a certain level of foreign language proficiency is required before it affects cognitive factors such as creativity. Although he did control for the socio-economic status of the students, there could have been a multitude of other extraneous variables (e.g., more exposure to different cultures, better involvement in classroom activities, and differences in learner characteristics) between those who took a foreign language course and those that did not that could affect creativity, and these learner variables are not accounted for in the study.

Cummins (1976), in an essentially theoretical review of the sparse literature on the topic, similarly claimed that there was evidence to suggest improved cognitive functioning, including greater creativity, for highly proficient bilinguals. This is based on the hypothesis that divergent thinking requires divergence from traditional ideas, an openness to new experiences, and cognitive skills that foreign language learning can provide. Cummins and his fellow researchers felt there was a gap in the literature concerning the contributions that learning a foreign language could make for improved cognitive functioning that had been overlooked, yet his petition for more research on the topic would not be significantly addressed for more than two decades.

2.3.2 Studies Employing the Torrance Test of Creative Thinking (TTCT)

The resurgence of interest in the relationship between creativity and language learning is in large part due to the growing interest in creativity in general that arose in the 1960s and 70s, and the development of psychometric assessments that claimed to provide a valid measure of the construct. With a new way to assess creativity, most studies employed a correlation design, meaning they compared the results of a
language proficiency test with a creativity test to evaluate the relationship between the two competencies. The test most often used to measure creativity (and the test used in this study) is the Torrance Test of Creative Thinking (TTCT) (E.P. Torrance, 1966). The TTCT measures one specific dimension of creativity referred to as divergent thinking (DT) (Kaufman, Plucker, & Baer, 2008). DT can be briefly described as producing multiple responses to open-ended questions and problems (Kaufman et al., 2008) and a willingness to explore many possible solutions through a deliberate process of idea generation (De Bono & Zimblist, 2010). While the TTCT scoring and test design will be described in greater detail in Chapter 3, basic information is necessary to preface this section, as each of the following studies used the TTCT (or a prototype) to measure participants’ creativity.

First, as mentioned, the TTCT is a divergent thinking test (Torrance, 1966); it measures one’s ability to think of many possible ideas or solutions to a single question or problem. People who can generate multiple possibilities are considered more creative (Sawyer, 2013). The TTCT that is used in this study is made and scored by an educational company called FPSP (http://www.fpsp.or.kr/). The test is written and scored in the Korean language and has three categories (conceived as three different creative thinking skills), which are:

1) **Fluency:** The total number of responses and ideas produced by the test-taker (K. Sawyer, 2013). For example, a student who provided 25 responses for a single prompt would score higher in this category than a student who produced only 15 responses. In this criterion, the “quality” or relevance is not assessed, only the number of responses (FPSP™ scoring guide book).

2) **Flexibility:** The number of different categories spanned in the responses (K. H. Kim, 2006). For example, if the prompt was “white,” responses could be categorized by paradigmatic association (“blue”), syntagmatic association (“cloud”), or collocations (“house”). It also relates to the ability to use different strategies to move from one idea to another in order to represent the “breadth of one’s thinking” (FPSP™ scoring guide book).

3) **Originality:** The number of rare and/or unusual responses to a specific prompt (K. Sawyer, 2013). This has to do with how uncommon responses are when compared to the existing corpus of previous test-takers in the same age category. For example, for a 12-year old test-taker, the response, “paper” to the prompt “white” would not score as high on originality as the response “grocery bags,” but it is possible that this is reversed with adult test-takers. Answers often include idiosyncratic responses, that is, the association to the prompt seems random because they are personal associations made by the respondent; these responses usually score high in originality.
It might be pointed out that most versions of the TTCT that are used in the United States and elsewhere include a fourth dimension termed, “Elaboration,” which essentially is the amount of detail given in an answer (K. Sawyer, 2013; E.P. Torrance, 1966); however, this criterion is not included in the Korean version of the test, so it will not be given further attention here. From a mean of the above three sub-scores, a cumulative (composite) final score, called simply “Creativity” on the report, is calculated and given as a percentile ranking (compared to other test takers of the same age and grade in Korea). With this groundwork laid, the following studies on the relationship between creativity and language learning which use the TTCT (or a prototype) are summarised to demonstrate their limitations in regards to understanding what creativity is in classroom interaction, and its shortcomings in explaining how second language learning develops over time.

Ottó (1998), investigating EFL learners in Hungary who were using a communicative language learning approach, found a significant positive correlation between students’ final English course grades and their scores on items taken from a prototype of the TTCT. As the course used a communicative language teaching methodology, his rather curious deduction was that students who were less creative were disadvantaged and hence language courses should “employ a variety of tasks that differ in the level of creativity required” (Ottó, 1998, p. 772). In other words, rather than seeing creativity as something that could be fostered to enhance second language development, he saw it as a fixed individual difference and believed that course curricula should consider ways to accommodate the creative deficiencies of some students to grade more equitably.

Albert and Kormos (2004) found a moderate correlation between participants’ TTCT scores and their output in a narrative task. This is considered a correlation study because their treatment of the interaction data was to quantify the amount of talk of the participants (and the amount of different “dimensions” of talk), not to evaluate the interaction itself. The data included two narrative tasks completed by participants in pairs, requiring them to create a short story based on a picture they were given by the researchers. They found that the strongest relationships between the TTCT and performance on the narrative task were between the fluency dimension of creativity and quantity of talk (as one might expect), and between originality and the number of narrative clauses used in their stories. However, they found a negative correlation between originality and quantity of talk—in other words, the more participants spoke, the more they tended to repeat the same linguistic items and syntactical structures. They concluded that differences in task performance could be accounted for by variation in the participants’ particular strengths on the various dimensions of creativity, although the relationships were fairly weak.
In a strictly correlational study, Albert (2006) explored the relationship between creativity and language learning by using both a language aptitude test and two tests to measure English language proficiency. To test creativity, the researcher used a standardized creativity test designed for Hungarian adults, which incorporated elements of the TTCT with another type of creative capacity called convergent thinking (CT), which can be defined as problem solving through synthesizing different ideas into one optimal answer or solution (K. Sawyer, 2012). The author found that language aptitude correlated negatively with creativity. Similar to Carroll’s early deduction about the question types on language proficiency tests and the nature of creativity, he explains that the reason for this might be that coding and memorizing of the phonetic material on the language aptitude design does not cohere with the types of skills assessed on the creativity test. Results from the creativity scores and either test of language proficiency showed no statistically significant correlation between these capacities.

In a similar correlational design, Kasaeian and Kasaeian (2010) administered a standardised English proficiency test and a locally-derived prototype of the TTCT to the participants. Like Albert’s (2006) study, it did not find a statistically significant correlation between students’ scores on either of the language proficiency tests and the TTCT. Their suggested implications to these findings were, contrary to Ottó (1998), that students who score low on a creativity assessment (hence, those who are not creative) should not be affected in learning a foreign language, again seeing creativity as an individual and static ability.

In contrast to the studies above, research conducted by Ghonsooly and Showqi (2012) showed a significant difference on divergent thinking tasks in favour of advanced proficiency English learners compared to beginners. However, the tests were administered only once and, like other correlational studies, there was no attempt to observe the relationship over the course of time or to evaluate any specific factors that could have influenced either language proficiency or creativity. Again, the low proficiency learners and advanced proficiency learners were not the same individuals (scores were not taken over the course of time and linguistic development but with different populations). The authors contend that studying English in a classroom context can benefit creativity, but do not specify the type of classroom context(s) that might be favourable for developing it.

These methodological drawbacks and varied conclusions were instrumental in motivating the qualitative approach taken in the current study. Unlike the studies that suggest implications for tailoring language proficiency tests for differences in students’ level of creativity (Kasaeian & Kasaeian, 2010; Ottó, 1998), this study queries how nurturing and developing creativity in a classroom setting can affect the language learning process. The current study is perhaps most concerned with the element alluded to by Ghonsooly and Showqi (2012), which is how the classroom environment influences creativity in the language learning
context. Two recent studies begin to address the issue of evaluating creativity in a communicative learning situation and thus are particularly germane to the current study.

2.3.3 Studies on Creative Language-Use in Action

The following two studies look at the student interaction in pair/group tasks in situ and give attention to the type of tasks being employed and student engagement in the task. Tin’s (2011) study evaluated how task constraints influenced students’ language production. K. McDonough et al. (2015) investigated the type of language produced through communicative tasks to evaluate how specific forms of interaction relate to creativity in language learning activities and posited that learner traits may play a role in student performance in communicative tasks and that these traits may influence creative language use.

Tin (2011) used English learners’ written and spoken performance in two pair-work writing tasks (acrostic poems and a writing task using similes) to explore the effects of task constraints on learners’ creative language in a writing exercise with high constraints (acrostic poem) to one with relatively fewer constraints (a simile task). In brief, findings revealed that acrostic poems, with their higher formal constraints, resulted in more novel language use as the constraints acted as a “transmission bottleneck,” requiring them to combine familiar phrases and utterances with unfamiliar constructions, and in the process developing new compositional strategies and syntactical structures to deal with these constraints (Tin, 2011, p. 231). In contrast, the less formally constrained simile task resulted in the use of more familiar language and forms rather than exploratory language-use.

A study conducted by K. McDonough et al. (2015) compared students’ scores on the TTCT to their performance in a group speaking task to explore task effect on language use, which they analyzed through a corpus-based approach. The participants were administered the TTCT before engaging in a small-group speaking task. A corpus was compiled from the group discussions, which was used to compare students’ group discussions in the speaking task to their scores on the TTCT. Rather than merely quantifying the amount of verbal production, the researchers identified the most common lexico-grammatical features used in the task (those used at least once by every group) and divided them into six categories of linguistic forms. They did not find a statistically significant correlation between creativity scores on the TTCT and the linguistic forms except for in two categories, questioning (sentences beginning with question words) and coordination (clauses or sentences using and). This suggests that questioning group members in speaking tasks and the use of more complex syntactic structures relate to the “creativity index” (composite score) on the TTCT. The implication they propose is that individual learner factors (e.g. students more inclined to ask questions and those who give more detailed responses) may interact with the type of task
being conducted to influence students’ language use during engagement, which would account for variation amongst L2 speakers.

2.3.4 What’s Missing?

The most significant limitations of the correlation studies is the use of one-off tests as a data collection method to measure creativity and L2 proficiency and the use of different populations rather than exploring how these capacities are mutually affected over time through the analysis of longitudinal data with the same research participants. Further, beyond basic demographic data of participants and a vague explanation of the context, most studies include little to no analysis of the language learning environment, nor do they give adequate attention to the learning trajectory of students in either language proficiency or creativity. What is required is a deeper exploration of how creative engagement affects the language learning process; this necessitates a careful look at what is going on in the classroom. Naturally, a mere statistical correlation does not substantiate a causal relationship nor can potential reasons for one be satisfactorily proffered from quantitative data alone. Most of the aforementioned studies do not sufficiently attend to a range of learner variables and contextual factors, with the most consequential omission being a consideration of what teachers and learners are actually doing in the language classroom.

This is addressed in the “language use in action” studies that attend more to the learning context and emphasize the type of tasks being completed by the participants. Still, these studies would have benefitted from the researcher’s extended involvement in the research context to elaborate on variations between individual learners and their performance in various task types, on various occasions with different partners, and to give greater attention to the fluctuating circumstances of individual participants (e.g. motivation in specific tasks, performance during various periods, interest in different topics and activities). Beyond a greater consideration of situational, environmental, and contextual factors, what is needed is a detailed explanation of how learners develop over time.

Another important drawback in the existing studies, resulting from the lack of a qualitative description, is that there is essentially no attention given to the role the curriculum and materials play in promoting or inhibiting creative thinking and engagement in the L2 classroom. The studies conducted by Tin (2011) and K. McDonough et al. (2015) begin to reconcile the importance of interaction amongst learners, the types of activities being employed in the classroom, and the communicative strategies used when engaged in creative, collaborative exercises, but more concern needs to be given to change over an extended period of time and creativity and language development in situ as well as to the interactional dynamic between learners and the learning environment. To elucidate the importance of creativity in L2 learning, it is
imperative to expound upon its various dimensions and to contextualize it in a language learning environment (Maybin & Swann, 2007).

But perhaps the most critical shortcoming in the literature is a clear explanation of how creativity is specifically defined beyond the measurements of creativity or outcomes of single communicative and/or writing tasks. This oversight relates directly to the earlier addressed challenges of implementing creativity in the Korean education system: beyond the pressures of intense schooling, academic competition, and the myriad of other curricular and pedagogical challenges of integrating creativity into the language classroom in Korea, there is also the very real issue of its definitional ambiguity (Sternberg & Lubart, 1996; Weisberg, 2006). Simply put, creativity is not an easy concept to define, and harder still to capture in action. This study aims to provide a comprehensive, qualitative description of interaction in order to offer a clear definition of creativity in the L2 learning context. This should help students and teachers better understand and activate it in the L2 classroom.

The above studies used either the results of a language proficiency test or categorised and counted specific linguistic forms to demonstrate language proficiency. However, as this study uses a longitudinal, qualitative approach, it was necessary to conceptualise and define creativity in a manner that could be demonstrated and validated through the empirical evidence of classroom interaction. Furthermore, if the goal is to help teachers and students actuate creativity in the classroom, it is essential to define creativity in a way that can help teachers recognise, nurture, and stimulate it in the learners and through the learning environment. As this study focuses not only on creativity, but on how creativity interacts with and affects L2 learning in a classroom setting, how language learning will be defined must first be resolved.

2.4 Defining Second Language Acquisition and Learning in the Classroom Context

The field of study that investigates the phenomenon of learning a language beyond one’s native language, Second Language Acquisition (SLA), is concerned with the process of change over time in the L2 knowledge and use of learners, as well as the factors that bring about change (Ellis & Barkhuizen, 2005). To explain this change, this study adopts a sociocultural theory of cognitive development which posits that learning is the result of social interaction and sees speaking and thinking as closely related (Lightbown & Spada, 2006). Vygotsky (1978, p. 85) offers the term “zone of proximal development” to explain “the difference between the child’s development level as determined by independent problem solving under adult guidance or in collaboration with more capable peers.” The current study evaluates second language
learning in a classroom context and aims to show how learners improve their knowledge and skill with the L2 through interaction and ongoing feedback.

Learning implies both knowledge gained through immersion in the target language environment and through explicit instruction; this distinction is often categorized as ‘acquisition’ and ‘learning,’ respectively. According to Ellis (2015b, p. 7) “Acquisition refers to the incidental process where learners ‘pick up’ a language without making any conscious effort to master it; whereas learning involves intentional effort to study and learn a language.” Both are happening in the L2 classroom; students acquire new knowledge through exposure to and use of the L2 and also study the language directly through teachers, peers, and the classroom materials. This study is concerned with students’ English learning in the classroom as it relates to creativity and the curriculum and hence provides numerous samples of learner language to demonstrate their developing use of English over the course of the study (Research Question #3). Language Proficiency and Creativity assessments, administered at the beginning, middle, and end of the study, are used to provide a measurement of language development. However, it might be pointed out that these tests, even given the courtesy of longitudinal investigation, measure English competency at the time the test was taken, while not necessarily focusing on the view of “learning” taken in this study, which adopts the sociocultural epistemological view of continuous development in cooperation with others. The focus of the study is on the “thick description” of classroom interaction and the students’ process of developing, in cooperation with others, both their English ability and their creativity. Thus, I now turn to how creativity will be defined in this study.

2.5 Defining Creativity in the Language Learning Context

Before elaborating on the specific elements of creativity that will be the foci of this research, it is first helpful to briefly address important divisions in the term. Beghetto and Kaufman (2007) make a distinction in the classifications of creativity: Big-C creativity is categorized as transformational creative genius (such as the works of famous artists); “little-c creativity” refers to the everyday creativity that everyone possesses; and “mini-c creativity”, is defined as the “experiential” and “transformative process” of creativity which everyone can experience. Multiple studies have shown that “little-c” and “mini-c” creativity can be taught through training and the proper learning environment (Beghetto & Kaufman, 2007; Lindström, 2006; Peachey & Maley, 2015; Sternberg, 2003b, 2015; Thompson, 2003). This requires teachers to encourage specific characteristics of thinking, acting, and feeling that build pathways to creative output. Again, this study focuses on “mini-c” creativity — how participants’ creativity changes over time and how this process is based on their learning experiences. This classification conveniently
narrow the scope, so that attention can now be turned to defining creativity in a language learning environment.

Numerous creative traits have been offered in the extensive literature on the topic. The data procedure and analysis in this study began with transcribing interviews with students and teachers, refamiliarizing myself with the data by examining my field notes and re-watching videos of the classes, and then composing a comprehensive (though, by no means exhaustive) list of creative personality traits found within the literature (see Table 2.5) (Gale et al., 2013). Some of the codes below were not found in the existing literature, but rather were my own interpretations of certain behaviours and were added during the initial coding; these are marked with an asterisk (*) symbol.

The primary goal was to identify the learner characteristics of creativity, but a supplementary intention was to propose traits to assist teachers in consciously developing students’ creativity; hence, the first step in narrowing down the criteria was to eliminate the traits which would be considered negative because while unfavourable traits are often part of the composition of creative individuals (K. Sawyer, 2012), teachers are understandably unlikely to encourage disruptive attributes. These included: bores easily, controlling, cynical, occasionally withdrawn, temperamental, and uncooperative. “Uncooperative” was later reintegrated into the category of “Collaboration” as it became clear that a level of disruption could facilitate more divergent thinking.

The next step in reducing the categories was to eliminate traits that are relatively difficult to observe or fully recognise and/or analyse through classroom observation or interview. These included: emotionally sensitive, generally intelligent, idealistic, introverted, and sense of wonder. In other words, without further psychological inquiry of their personality and/or more extensive knowledge of their interactions and behaviours in other contexts, these particular traits would be difficult to assess on a surface level.

After two rounds of coding, the third step was to eliminate traits that were not salient in my field notes or interview transcripts; these are traits which appeared fewer than four times in the coded data set. These included, aesthetically-inclined, charismatic, fluent, and independent. The reason these codes were not prevalent was because they were more difficult to see in terms of communicative production and difficult to precisely define, particularly “charismatic” and “independent.”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trait</th>
<th>Source(s)</th>
<th>Trait</th>
<th>Source(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ability to synthesize information</td>
<td>(Root-Bernstein &amp; Root-Bernstein, 2013)</td>
<td>Idealistic</td>
<td>(Barron &amp; Harrington, 1981)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-Authoritarian</td>
<td>(Wallace, 1986)</td>
<td>Non-conformist</td>
<td>(Chamorro-Premuzic, 2015; Puccio &amp; Grivas, 2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asks questions</td>
<td>(Walsh, 2011)</td>
<td>Occasionally withdrawn</td>
<td>(Mark A Runco &amp; Pritzker, 1999)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assertive</td>
<td>(Harrington, 1975)</td>
<td>Open to new ideas/experience</td>
<td>(Digman, 1990; Montgomery, Bull, &amp; Baloco, 1993)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomous</td>
<td>(Barron &amp; Harrington, 1981)</td>
<td>Original thinker</td>
<td>(Amabile, 1996; Ellis, 2015a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bores easily</td>
<td>(Chamorro-Premuzic, 2015)</td>
<td>Passionate</td>
<td>(Ghiselin, 2005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candid</td>
<td>(Thompson, 2013)</td>
<td>Polymath (wide interests)</td>
<td>(Barron &amp; Harrington, 1981)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controlling*</td>
<td>(Ollerhead &amp; Burns, 2016)</td>
<td>Rebellious</td>
<td>(Harrington, 1975)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenges Rules</td>
<td></td>
<td>Resilient</td>
<td>(Ollerhead &amp; Burns, 2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convergent thinker</td>
<td>(Johnson, 2011)</td>
<td>Seeks out new experiences</td>
<td>(Goldberg, 1993)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical (of themselves and others)</td>
<td>(Montgomery et al., 1993)</td>
<td>Sense of inspiration</td>
<td>(Sternberg &amp; Lubart, 1999)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynical</td>
<td>(Harrington, 1975)</td>
<td>Steadiness</td>
<td>(Maley, 2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divergent Thinker</td>
<td>(Beghetto &amp; Kaufman, 2007)</td>
<td>Temperamental*</td>
<td>(Puccio &amp; Grivas, 2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathetic</td>
<td>(Root-Bernstein &amp; Root-Bernstein, 2013)</td>
<td>Unconventional</td>
<td>(Harrington, 1975)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressive</td>
<td>(Renzulli &amp; Hartman, 1971)</td>
<td>Unpredictable</td>
<td>(Maley, 2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluent (a large number of ideas)</td>
<td>(E. Paul Torrance, 1993)</td>
<td>Unique viewpoints*</td>
<td>(Kharkhurin, 2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexible Thinker</td>
<td>(Kharkhurin, 2012; Spiro &amp; Jehng, 1990)</td>
<td>Versatile thinker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generally intelligent</td>
<td>(Beghetto &amp; Kaufman, 2007)</td>
<td>Wants the facts</td>
<td>(Bronson &amp; Merryman, 2010; Götz, 1981; M. A. Runco, 2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highly observant</td>
<td>(Perkins, 2009)</td>
<td>Willing to take on different roles in group work*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Finally, I clustered the remaining traits into five larger categories which I believe encompassed one bigger idea (Gale et al., 2013; Saldaña, 2013). It should be mentioned again, that this list does not intend to be
exhaustive and certainly other attributes could be argued as essential for creativity and for language learning. The primary reason for generating five specific traits was to provide an intensive and directed focus that can help teachers and students invoke creative potential in the classroom. These five characteristics are: 1) Originality and Appropriateness; 2) Process-(but not step-by-step)-Oriented; 3) Openness to Experience; 4) Meaningful Work; and 5) Collaboration. The characteristics that compose the larger categories are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Originality &amp; Appropriateness</th>
<th>Process (but not step-by-step)-Oriented</th>
<th>Openness to Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Ability to synthesize information</td>
<td>• Energetic</td>
<td>• Adaptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Abstract Thinker</td>
<td>• Non-conformist</td>
<td>• Asks Questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Anti-Authoritarian</td>
<td>• Passionate</td>
<td>• Challenges Rules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Convergent Thinker</td>
<td>• Resilient</td>
<td>• Curious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Divergent Thinker</td>
<td>• Steadiness</td>
<td>• Highly observant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Flexible Thinker</td>
<td>• Tolerant of ambiguity</td>
<td>• Open to new ideas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Imaginative</td>
<td>• Unpredictable</td>
<td>• Rebellious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Versatile Thinker</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Risk-Taker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Original Thinker</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Seeks out new experiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Unconventional</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Unique viewpoints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Wants the Facts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meaningful Work</th>
<th>Collaborative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Assertive</td>
<td>• Candid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Autonomous</td>
<td>• Convergent Thinker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Energetic</td>
<td>• Critical (of self and others)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Expressive</td>
<td>• Empathetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Passionate</td>
<td>• Non-conformist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Polymathic</td>
<td>• Uncooperative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Seeks out inspiration</td>
<td>• Willing to take on different roles in group work</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An important feature of the final category characteristics is that they are mutually dependent on the learner and the learning environment. Regardless of how creative a learner is, if the classroom activities and climate do not permit opportunities to make use of these characteristics, the learner will have difficulties exhibiting them. Reciprocally, when opportunities do exist for creative engagement through the classroom activities, the learner must have the capacity, willingness, and fortitude to activate creativity in the moment (Glăveanu, 2012; Robinson & Aronica, 2015).
2.5.1 Originality and Appropriateness

The most commonly mentioned characteristics of creativity in the literature are originality (at least original to the creator) and appropriateness, which essentially means working within a set of conventions and established guidelines that befit a particular use, task, or project (Amabile, 1996; Beghetto & Kaufman, 2007; Kharkhurin, 2012; Robinson, 2011; Robinson & Aronica, 2015). Originality and appropriateness will be considered as one characteristic as they are inextricably bound in creative production, particularly in a classroom environment where the creative undertaking is assigned by the teacher and students are required to complete certain learning provisions as part of the learning activity.

Therefore, the basic conditions must be met to ensure they learn the unit goals, yet students are asked to produce something ‘original.’ Originality in this study essentially means that students are using new language to convey their ideas and experiences, stretching beyond familiar vocabulary and grammatical structures and instead discovering new phrases and word combinations to express themselves (Tin, 2011). Likewise, it means that through the language tasks in the Textbook-driven curriculum, or the projects in the PBL curriculum, they are attempting to generate something different, novel, and unexpected.

To this point, M. A. Runco (2010, p. 237) stresses that originality and creativity are not the same thing and places emphasis on the ‘appropriateness’ dimension of calling something creative:

Creativity certainly requires originality, but it requires something else as well — a kind of effectiveness or fit [...] Originality is then, necessary but not sufficient for creativity. You might say that creative things are not maximally original but are optimally original instead.

As a final note, the originality-appropriateness duality attempts to account for both divergent and convergent thinking. Divergent thinking and convergent thinking are both essential when considering students’ creativity as they engage in language use tasks because they must both come with their own original ideas, but also integrate what they learn from the teacher and from other students into the various activities and projects.

2.5.2 Process-(but not Step-by-Step)-Oriented.

Most experts agree that creativity is a process (Ghiselin, 1985; Robinson, 2011; K. Sawyer, 2013). In his manual for the TTCT Figural test, E.P. Torrance (1966, pp. 663-664) defined creativity as

... the process of becoming sensitive to problems, deficiencies, gaps in knowledge, missing elements, disharmonies, and so on; identifying the difficulty; searching for solutions, making guesses, or formulating hypotheses about deficiencies; testing and retesting these hypotheses and possibly modifying and retesting them; and finally communicating the results.
Creative works and innovative breakthroughs are almost always the result of a long process of trial and error involving many iterations and modifications (K. Sawyer, 2013). Various models for the creative process exist; however, students and the teacher should bear in mind that the creative process is spontaneous, unpredictable, iterative, and nonlinear, rarely proceeding in any deliberate or orderly sequence (Ghiselin, 1985). Essentially, creativity is a process of development that manifests through constant and committed engagement with the problem, and, while it is not easy to articulate, to share, to understand, or to empathise with (Edwards, 2010), most experts concur that “it can be taught” (Beghetto & Kaufman, 2007; Kaufman et al., 2008; Rhodes, 1961, p. 308; Robinson, 2011; Robinson & Aronica, 2015).

What is important to consider is how ‘creators,’ through one process or another, apply their imagination to the medium they are working with and how the context within which they are working affects their creative engagement. In his seminal article, Götz (1981, p. 299) asserts simply, “Creativity, then, is a process of making,” and that, “It rests on the facts of experience and logic.” The creative process typically begins with some vague hunch and a yearning to resolve a problem that fuels excitement throughout the journey (Ghiselin, 2005). K. Sawyer (2013, p. 88) insists that, “Creativity takes place over time, and most of the creativity occurs while doing the work.” The enthusiasm to take creative strides forward despite ambiguity has much to do with a person’s openness to experiment and explore (Elisondo et al., 2013) — the same might be said of language learning.

2.5.3 Openness to Experience

Students need opportunities to become immersed in learning, to articulate what they have been taught and what they think, and to open their minds to the mystery and infinite possibilities that make learning engaging, satisfying, and challenging. Bronson and Merryman (2010) point out that fact-finding and research are essential to the creative process; creativity does not infer freedom from facts, so the idea that formal learning must come at the expense of creativity, or vice versa, is simply a false trade-off (Lubart & Sternberg, 1995). But it is important that learners go beyond basic facts in their quest for understanding topics more deeply. Walsh (2011, p. 12) emphasizes that “. . . genuine, more open-ended questions promote discussion and debate, engage learners, and produce longer, more complex responses,” resulting in a more “conversational type of interaction.” But the challenge is how to help both teachers and students ask “better” questions.
The questions asked by teachers are too often display questions (the answer is already known), close-ended (yes, no, or short answer questions), multiple choice (usually on written exams), or questions regarding direction and clarification; unsurprisingly, these are the questions that students tend to generate themselves —questions that are in pursuit of one correct answer. To continue to develop and innovate, what humans need is a reason to search for new answers, new questions, and new meaning (Tin, 2013). Students must learn to initiate questions that open the door to wonder and creativity, to ask “more beautiful questions,” as journalist Warren Berger (2014) calls them. Following Berger, this study considers questions that are open-ended (i.e. how, why, what kind?), process-oriented (i.e. what should we do next?), probing (i.e. why did you do it that way?), divergent (i.e. what is another way we can do it?), higher-order (i.e. what is the most important part of this activity?), challenging (i.e. why do you think that way?), and affective (questions about attitudes, values, and feelings) as ones that will be considered within the creative spectrum.

Beyond asking better questions, students should possess a willingness to try new things and take part in new experiences. In psychometric studies, the trait of ‘openness to experience’ is often based on self-report questionnaires that aim to measure an individual’s inclination to seek new experiences and engage in personal reflection (Goldberg et al., 2006). This characteristic has been linked to adeptness on divergent thinking tasks in creativity research (McCrae, 1987). In the current study, openness to experience is understood as a willingness to shares one’s ideas in classroom activities and to gather the opinions and insights of others. Encouraging students to share their opinions and thoughts is fundamental to bolstering creativity in the classroom (K. Sawyer, 2007), perhaps even more so in the language classroom where language is both the medium and goal of the learning enterprise. Learning comes with taking the key points of a lesson and from these points discovering and creating new, personal meaning —students should learn to recognize, appreciate, and explore the infinite possibilities available, particularly those that stimulate genuine interest.

2.5.4 Meaningful Work

A crucial impetus of the creative process is becoming absorbed in something that is personally meaningful, challenging, and rewarding (Amabile, 2001; Csikszentmihalyi, 1997). Sternberg (2003a, p. 7) believes, “Creativity is as much a decision about and attitude toward life as it is mere ability.” He points to the fact that in childhood we do not play for acclaim nor obsess over being critiqued, but societal pressures suppress our creative potential and herd us towards conformity. Teachers must strive to embolden students
to enact their creative capacities and to have the confidence to take risks and to stand behind their ideas (M. A. Runco, 2010). As Amabile and Kramer (2011, p. 4) wrote, “Of all the things that can boost emotions, motivation, and perceptions . . ., the single most important is making progress in meaningful work.” Meaningful Work (MW) is a developing area of study in the field of psychology that can be summarised through three essential elements: 1) it is a subjective experience that entails personal significance; 2) it is best expressed through self-directed action, or what might, in applied linguistics vernacular, be called agency; and 3) in addition to self-directed, it is also “other-directed,” or action taken not only for the individual, but as something that will positively contribute to a group, community, or broader society (Rosso, Dekas, & Wrzesniewski, 2010). The construct has not yet been notably adopted in applied linguistic research, but might be conceptualized as agentive action on work that holds personal interest and meaning, and, especially in communicative-oriented environments, will serve the group effort and be recognized as valuable by others. Essentially, it provides the learner with opportunities to infuse their own knowledge, personalities, passions, and identities rather than simply doing work for work's sake.

Yet, many activities which students are asked to in the English classroom may not be seen by learners as embodying the elements of ‘meaningfulness’ as described above. Carter (2007, p. 604) believes that many communicative and task-based exercises in second language teaching are “utilitarian” and “transactional,” using formulaic language to instruct learners on how to accomplish routine functions (e.g. ordering food at a restaurant). While this may be useful, many learners quickly move on to more personal motivations for expressing themselves in the target language and being able to do so depends, to a large extent, on the methodologies employed in the learning course. Students need learning experiences which provide a clear sense that their efforts of going above and beyond what is required will be recognized and, in some way, rewarded, both through an internal feeling of achievement and an external sense of appreciation by others (Gladwell, 2008). In his bestselling book *Outliers*, Malcolm Gladwell (2008) defines the three dimensions of meaningful work as 1) autonomous (not necessarily meaning independent, but rather self-governing and empowering); 2) complex (the work must be challenging); and, as mentioned above, 3) rewarding (hard work is recognized). In his description of personal attributes of creativity that are important to the bilingual educational process, Starko (2013, p. 56) rightly argues that, “Individuals are more likely to be motivated by ideas and activities they find interesting or those they have chosen to pursue.” In this study, students are aware that creativity is valued in the learning environment, but to what end they seek out new experiences to enhance their learning depends on how personally meaningful they perceive it to be.
2.5.5 Collaboration

Thompson (2013, p. 1) asserts, “Creative collaboration is the ability of teams and their leaders to organize, motivate, and combine talent to generate new and useful ideas.” Effective collaboration involves sharing, debating, negotiating, and fusing individual contributions (Rojas-Drummond, Albarrán, & Littleton, 2008; K. Sawyer, 2007). K. Sawyer (2007, p. 7) contends, “When we collaborate, creativity unfolds across people; the sparks fly faster, and the whole is greater than the sum of its parts.” Robinson (2011) makes the distinction between cooperation and collaboration, with the former inferring only that there is a synchronized effort amongst different people and the latter asserting a shared, concerted, and interactive process in which the nature of the interaction directly affects the outcome. This study considers collaborative engagement to be instances in which students are sharing ideas, debating elements of the project or activity, and working together as a team to complete the work. This interaction boosts creative productivity amongst all group members, stimulates the elaboration of ideas through dialogue, and increases through multiple encounters with the same group members (R. K. Sawyer & DeZutter, 2009).

Research has found that group creativity can be encouraged by being open to each other’s ideas, generating new constructive challenges, having shared goals, focusing strongly on the work itself and simply responding positively to creativity in the process of learning (Kurtzberg & Amabile, 2001). Robinson and Aronica (2015) contend that empowering young people to work with their peers can improve students’ self-esteem, activate curiosity, foster greater empathy and compassion, encourage students to work together to meet goals and share problems, and to support one another by drawing on each other’s strengths. Through collaboration, young people develop the capacity to understand and appreciate each other’s characteristics and ideas, become better prepared to make their own contributions by building on the energy of their peers, and learn to consolidate their experiences and knowledge towards a cooperative goal (Guyotte, Sochacka, Costantino, Kellam, & Walther, 2015); in this way collaborative creativity is the exploration of novel learning experiences through the process of a shared creative commitment (R. K. Sawyer & DeZutter, 2009; Thompson, 2013). In an educational setting, this allows students (and the teacher) to weigh multiple perspectives on an issue, debate areas of contention, and learn to understand both the nature of the challenge and how a collaborative effort might be realized throughout the process (Guyotte et al., 2015).

These five characteristics provide the foundation for understanding creative engagement in this study, and the analysis of classroom interaction aims to exemplify the way in which these characteristics were enacted and how they affected students’ language learning. Understanding characteristics of the creative person is important because innovative ideas begin in the minds of individuals and, as the current study aims to
demonstrate, recognizing, nurturing, and empowering certain traits can help students develop their creative capacities; however, in social settings such as the classroom, the individual is only part of the equation; the environment plays an important role in how creativity is perceived and valued (Feldman et al., 1994).

2.6 A Systems Model of Creativity: Csikszentmihalyi (1999)

The Systems Model of Creativity (Csikszentmihalyi, 1999, 2014c, 2014d), proposes that, in the words of its author, Mihaly Csikszentmihalyi (2014c, p. 536):

...an idea or product cannot be called creative until or unless it is seen as such by society ...In other words, it is the attribution of creativity by relevant segments of society that determines whether a new idea or product is creative.

This is to say that, in social realities, whether an idea, product, or project is deemed creative or not is ultimately judged by others. According to the Systems Model (Csikszentmihalyi, 1999) (Figure 2.6), there are three elements dynamically interdependent in a social perspective of creativity, the “Person,” “Field” and “Domain.”

2.6.1 Person

A creative Person (“Person” is capitalised here and throughout when used as a proper noun relating to the criterion terminology proposed by Csikszentmihalyi’s model, as are “Domain” and “Field”) is composed of one’s biological characteristics, demographic background, personal life experiences, and the interests and emotions that lead to engagement in one area of expertise, activity, or intellectual enterprise and not others. It is these qualities and characteristics that make one a unique individual (Csikszentmihalyi, 2014a). The “creative person” tends to have a number of cognitive, affective, and social traits that contribute to and enable
the creative process (Feldman et al., 1994).

Nonetheless, as the Systems Model emphasizes, creativity does not exist merely in a person’s mind, but must be exercised and expressed within a social sphere, and further, to enter and permeate the culture, the person must have access to the Domain and convince the Field to value their work as creative (Csikszentmihalyi, 2014a; Feldman et al., 1994; Weisberg, 2006). In the classroom context, the students represent the “Person” dimension of the model, but exist in a reciprocal relationship with the Field and the Domain.

2.6.2 Domain

The Domain is the cultural or symbolic aspect of the creative environment; it comprises the symbolic codes, knowledge, techniques, rules, and conventions within a discipline (Csikszentmihalyi, 2014a; K. Sawyer, 2012). The domain functions to preserve the desirable features and conditions of a discipline or area of expertise (as selected by the Field), and to “transmit them to a new generation of people in a form that will be easy to learn” (Feldman et al., 1994, p. 153). To enact change, individuals must become immersed in the Domain so they may recognize what is new and then justify the innovation and convince others that the change is beneficial and/or necessary (Csikszentmihalyi, 1999).

In the context of this study, the Domain is considered the artefacts and conventions of the language classroom. This consists of the curriculum and classroom materials, including the syllabus, lesson plans, textbooks, and all other activities, exercises, and classroom practices, as well as the constraints embedded in the materials (e.g. the unit’s grammatical focus), the school and class rules (e.g. speak only English), classroom conventions (e.g. students should have a notebook and pencil), and elements that manifest cultural and social knowledge and uniformity (e.g. students should sit and face the teacher). In the current study, the Domain is best represented by the curriculum (Project-based Learning and Textbook-driven; Chapter 3) and the materials that facilitate and emanate from these curricular approaches.

2.6.3 Field

The Field are those privileged to make judgements about creativity and play the essential role of either preserving the Domain or allowing for innovation, perhaps even transformation, in a given discipline. They serve to either legitimize or deny “creative” status to works submitted to the Domain (K. Sawyer, 2012). Essentially, in the word popularized by Stein (1963), they are the gatekeepers. They are bestowed the authority to determine what is given status and priority and what is accepted as creative and disseminated (Csikszentmihalyi, 1999, 2014b). Hence, they have the power to structure the Domain (Feldman et al., 1994).
In language education, the Field may include policymakers and other stakeholders, materials and assessment writers, school administrative officials, parents, and the teacher. In the classroom context of this study, the teacher is considered the Field. The teacher’s role in deciding if and how students actuate their creative potential in the classroom cannot be understated; in applying the model to the educational context, Csikszentmihalyi and Wolfe (2014, p. 180) assert:

> It is important that the teacher enjoy students’ explorations beyond the boundaries of textbooks and lesson plans, instead of feeling threatened by them. Teachers, who allow deviation from the curriculum, who encourage students to ask questions, to explore alternative paths to solve problems, are more likely to see novelty produced by their students.

Persons, Domain, and the Field interact to account for creative production within a social context: There must be creative people that generate new and useful ideas; the individual must have tacit understanding of an existing body of knowledge and symbol system in which a particular discipline or activity is embodied; there will likely be a gatekeeper (or a collective of gatekeepers) with the influence and power to preserve the domain or to accommodate new ideas.

### 2.7 Variation on the Systems Model of Creativity: Applications to Education

The Systems Model of Creativity has been used to investigate creative behaviour in a range of academic and professional fields, and through this wide application has been modified into numerous manifestations. Although no versions of the model have been applied to the second language classroom, an adapted model proposed by Csikszentmihalyi and Wolfe (2014) applies the original framework to the field of education. It replaces ‘Person’ with ‘Student’, ‘Domain’ with ‘Materials’ (the curriculum, textbook, rules, conventions, and activities of the classroom), and ‘Field’ with ‘Teacher’ (the one that evaluates what is and is not accepted and propagated as creative in the Domain).

Csikszentmihalyi and Wolfe (2014) argue that the curriculum and pedagogical methods can stimulate genuine interest and exploration; however, in many educational situations, students’ interests are too often disregarded. Yet, students
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who actively engage and are motivated by creative and intellectual endeavours will find opportunities to actuate their ideas. Students that have creative personality traits, “often come in conflict with teachers who consider it their responsibility to enforce conformity and discipline” (ibid, p. 175). Clearly, creative expression in the classroom depends a great deal on the teacher because their attitudes towards creative behaviour crucially impact students’ perception of learning, as well as the dynamics of interaction and the classroom climate. However, it cannot be ignored that teachers work within a particular domain; a system which possesses a set of rules and conventions, an existing body of knowledge and expectations, and teaching methods and rules that are predetermined, often with little input from the teacher, by those who make decisions about school curriculum and policy.

As suggested by the model (Figure 2.7), there is a constant flow between the work students produce (“Variations in Old Knowledge”), how a teacher evaluates this work in accordance with the standards and rules (“Selection of New Variation”), and the materials and curriculum followed by the teacher and students (“Transmission of Old Knowledge”). While the last, “Transmission of Old Knowledge,” is primarily what informs the content of lessons and steers pedagogical decisions in today’s standardised and intense educational demands, students who are motivated and inclined to enact their creativity and explore new language use to express their thoughts and ideas can and will do so within the opportunities afforded by the learning environment.

2.8 Gibson’s Concept of Affordances

The perceptual psychologist James J. Gibson (1979) proposed the theory of affordances which he defined as the perceived opportunities for action that an organism is given by the environment. Affordances are the possibilities that an object or environment offers (or does not offer) for action. Greeno (1994, p. 338) elaborates further:

An affordance relates attributes of something in the environment to an interactive activity by an agent who has some ability, and an ability relates attributes of an agent to an interactive activity with something in the environment that has some affordance. The relativity of affordances and abilities is fundamental. Neither an affordance nor an ability is specifiable in the absence of specifying the other. It does not go far enough to say that an ability depends on the context of environmental characteristics, or that an affordance depends on the context of an agent's characteristics. The concepts are co-defining, and neither of them is coherent absent the other.

In applying the concept to learning and linguistic communication, Segalowitz (2001) claims that affordances are important for learning because an organism can only seize opportunities for action by perceiving the affordances that are available. Thus, for Gibson (1977) the essential question was how do organisms prepare for and attune to the environmental affordances as to be ready to perceive and act upon them.
2.8.1 Affordances in the Research of Second Language Learning

In the L2 classroom context, recognizing opportunities to use language provided within the environment depends on the perpetual interaction between the Person (how does each individual student understand, recognize, and interpret opportunities for action based on their idiosyncratic characteristics?), the Domain (what are students supposed to learn and do in the lesson?), and the Field (how does the teacher react to students’ interpretation of the environmental affordances and subsequent actions?).

The theory of affordances in the language learning environment is important because only by attending to affordances can students adapt their language resources to take advantage of available learning opportunities (Larsen-Freeman & Cameron, 2008a). Teachers create opportunities for learning and students interpret and attend to the myriad of affordances embedded in the activity according to their own conception; a teacher may highlight and direct students’ attention in the activity, but the active learner will ultimately exploit the opportunities they deem most important and/or interesting (Csikszentmihalyi & Wolfe, 2014), assuming, of course, that they have the ability to make use of the available opportunities and understand their effective ability to create them (Gee, 2014; R. H. Jones & Richards, 2015). Affordances in the language learning classroom can be seen as the interrelationship between the learning context and circumstances and the learner (Larsen-Freeman & Cameron, 2008a). They are the opportunities that learning activities offer the learner, but more than that, *affordances* denote how the learners (and the teacher) perceive and engage with the opportunities available.

2.8.2 Affordances in the Research of Creativity

Glăveanu (2012, p. 196) contends that the concepts of affordances and creativity overlap in “The process of perceiving, exploiting, and generating novel affordances during socially and materially situated activities.” Gibson’s theory essentially suggests that perception cannot be conceptualised as ‘static’ qualities of the environment, but should rather be seen as dynamic and interactive affordances which a person chooses to attend to or overlook. In this way, the theory employs a sociocultural perspective by seeing affordances as the dynamic relationship between creators and the social world – a reality with infinite potential constructed by the participants, rather than predetermined. It is this idea of potentiality in the environment that also forms the link between affordances and creativity. As Heft (2003, pp. 175-176) wrote, “new entities with novel affordances are introduced into the culture, new affordances of familiar objects are realized, familiar affordances are sustained over time through continued use, and affordances fade from the scene through disuse.” In other words, novelty enters the system created by both the agents of change and an environment that endorses change; elements of the Domain that are perceived as useful and important remain, while some elements eventually disappear. Echoing the assertions embodied in
Csikszentmihalyi’s Systems Model of Creativity, Glăveanu (2012, p. 192) maintains that psychologists have focused too much attention on the mental aspect of the individual and ignored a “fundamental reality: that people necessarily live in a material world.”

To understand why some opportunities in the environment are capitalized upon and why some go unrealized, constrained, or rejected in a given sociocultural context (Domain), Glăveanu (2012, p. 196) proposes a sociocultural model of affordances: “unperceived affordances” are those that, for whatever reason, go unrecognized, but do not breach any cultural norm; “Uninvented affordances” refer to the potential for the combination or transformation of (existing) possibilities that have not yet been exploited, activated, or fully brought into being; “Unexploited affordances” represent what a person would do and could do, but do not for ‘cultural reasons’ (perhaps for contextual or situational reasons would be more appropriate in the context of the current study). Thus, instead of taking advantage of the affordances, the person does either what they would normally do or what they feel is expected of them by others.

The concept of affordances is integral to the current study for three primary reasons. First, students must learn to recognize and exploit affordances in the learning environment, as well as forge their own, in order to use English and enact their creative capacities. Secondly, the theory of affordances is premised on a sociocultural perspective as it asserts a dynamic relationship between individuals and the environment in which learning is co-constructed through purposeful communication. Finally, how a student (Person) perceives and responds to the curriculum (Domain) and the teacher (Field), and the learning environment that emerges from the interaction between these components, crucially affects how students engage and interact in the classroom. Thus, creativity in the language learning process is investigated by integrating the Systems Model of Creativity and the concept of affordances to construct the novel analytical model used in this study. As data analysis in this study began through the process of inductive reasoning through extensive coding of the qualitative data sources to first uncover the characteristics of creativity in the language learning classroom, before proceeding to an explanation of the modified model (and how the data will be analysed through it), the model’s progressive development during the study will first be discussed.

2.9 The Evolution and Implementation of the Modified Systems Model of Creativity for the L2 Classroom

A major interest of this study is to investigate the ways in which the curriculum affects learner creativity and how creative engagement can benefit L2 development. This necessitates a holistic perspective because the continually changing context is at the root of understanding the multi-dimensional, deeply intertwined,
dynamic interaction that affects and creates the synergy between the students, the classroom environment, and the learning culture (Burns & Knox, 2011; Larsen-Freeman & Cameron, 2008a; Seedhouse, 2015).

J. Gibson (1979) defined “affordances” as what the environment had to offer and its relationship to an individual’s ability to recognize and take advantage of it. He also believed that humans hold the capacity to affect and alter their environment to create affordances. In essence, the theory of affordances posits that humans perpetually interact with the environment and can alter it, provided they perceive and act upon the opportunities available to them (van Lier, 2000). Greeno (1994, p. 338) adds the term “ability” to this concept, believing, “one also needs a term that refers to whatever it is about the agent that contributes to the kind of interaction that occurs,” asserting that affordances and abilities are “inherently relational” and “co-defining” — affordances are what the environment offers for actors to act upon with their abilities, while abilities are what actors possess to act upon what is available to them in the environment.

Csikszentmihalyi’s Systems Model of Creativity also assumes that a person has the capacity to do or make something, but how it is received depends on the environment, the attitudes and receptiveness of the current social milieu and those that shape it; reciprocally, the environment holds opportunities, without which advancement and innovation would not be possible, and it is dependent on the actors and their abilities to be perceptive and receptive to opportunities in the environment. In short, the concept of affordances within a sociocultural framework emphasises that the dynamic components within an environment affect and are affected by participants, how participants interact and learn, and how changes to either or both environment and learner emerges from these interactions (Holland, Gong, Minett, Ke, & Wang, 2005).

In analysing the data from the initial stages, it was clear the Systems Model of Creativity represented well the sociocultural epistemological view of language learning assumed in this study and the different
dimensions of the model embodied the reality of how creativity was enacted, defined, and evaluated in the L2 classroom. However, as I proceeded through the data coding, I came to believe that while the model accounted for the social and cultural nature of judgements about creativity in the classroom, and some of the more tangible demonstrations of creative engagement (e.g. writing assignments and group discussions), the process and the conditions that facilitated creativity, the experiential and substantive circumstances, were difficult to infer at best and completely absent at worst.

This is because while the Systems Model of Creativity (Csikszentmihalyi, 1999, 2014a) proposes that the success of creative transformation depends to a large extent on how open a society is to novelty, the production of creativity is implicit in Csikszentmihalyi’s model. That is, the model assumes that artists and innovators are generating creative works as part of their occupation and/or personal passion, and then submitting them to the field for appraisal. However, for most middle-school students, English language learning rarely holds such responsibility or intense interest, and it would be difficult to posit that students “naturally” seek out opportunities to be creative or produce new language in class out of a profound personal commitment to the “Domain of English.” In addition, in some learning environments, such as courses that are predominantly taught through lecture, few opportunities may exist for students to influence the current Domain (curriculum and materials). Therefore, The Systems Model of Creativity framework, when applied to the L2 learning environment, is missing an essential element —opportunities, or affordances, for students to be creative and use the target language must be built into the classroom dynamic. With this in mind, I propose a Modified Systems Model of Creativity for the L2 Classroom which argues that language use affordances geared towards creativity are requisite to stimulate creativity in the language learning classroom context (Figure 2.9).

The modified model further proposes that there is a reciprocal relationship between the classroom participants (teachers and students) and the learning environment. Rephrasing Gibson, van Lier (2000, p. 252) affirms, “an affordance is a particular property of the environment that is relevant – for good or for ill – to an active perceiving organism in that environment.” In the case of this study, the property of interest is the students’ use of English, therefore, the modified model contends that there is a reciprocal relationship between the opportunities for L2 use and how students engage and build off those opportunities; when purposeful linguistic interaction is rich, creativity will thrive. The model also asserts that there is a cyclical relationship between the curriculum and the affordances for L2 in the classroom. Regardless of the curricular approach, the accommodation of language-use affordances should be immediately considered and built into the classroom activities and interaction with opportunities for creativity in mind.
Moving to the relationship between the Field and the Domain and the Person and the Domain, the modified model posits that if the curriculum and materials dictate what teachers and students do in a unidirectional fashion (i.e., if teachers and/or students are governed strictly by the course materials), creativity is likely to be inhibited; instead both students and teachers should contribute to and be actively involved in dynamically constructing the curricular approach and materials used in the classroom so that they may promote and enrich creative thinking. There should be a constructive, symbiotic relationship between what the curriculum and materials offer and what the teacher and students do (the affordances created) to supplement, enhance, and mould the materials to make them conducive to a creative climate.

The curriculum and materials act as the Domain (the symbol system and existing body of knowledge transmitted to students), and to show their creative capacities, students must seek to transform this knowledge into something new and meaningful. This can only be achieved if there are affordances to explore the boundaries of possibility and if the teacher is receptive and encouraging of such interaction. Again, teachers (Field) play a pivotal role as “gatekeepers” of what is considered acceptable and valued in the classroom so they must be constantly aware of how creativity is or is not being accounted for through the materials (Domain) if they wish to cultivate it in their students.

To investigate creative behaviour through this framework, I explain students’ interaction with the Domain and Field and its relationship to their creative output and creative language use through the ethnographic analysis of empirical data. The study aims to explain how participants (students and the Teacher) reference, understand, create, and enact creative behaviour and creative language use by responding to and stimulating affordances through their interaction with the classroom environment. Through the lens of the modified model, this study aims to define the five essential characteristics of learner creativity in the L2 classroom and how development and utilization of these characteristics contribute to creative behaviour. Further, it explores how the participants perceive and respond to the curriculum and the ways in which their beliefs influence classroom interaction. Finally, the experience and development (or lack thereof) of the six Cases are examined through the modified model to understand how individual, contextual, and situational factors influence how the Cases exploit language-use and creative affordances.

2.10 The Characteristics of Creativity and the Importance of Language-Use Affordances

Before covering the data collection instruments and the data analysis procedures, it should first be established with some emphasis that it is not inherently the curriculum that is responsible for language learning or for nurturing the characteristics of creativity. Rather, it is the nature of the communicative
activities, the learning materials and processes, the classroom environment, the relationship between students and the teacher, and the students’ perceptions and actions (or inactions) that determine the ways in which students interact and use language. In other words, it is the language-use affordances, how the language learning environment structures opportunities for learning for the actively participating learner that enables their access and potentiality for communicative and creative engagement in the classroom. No curricular approach by itself will automatically activate creativity in language learning, nor does any approach inherently preclude it —what is important is that students are granted opportunities to use their creative capacities and for creativity to be a valued dimension of the learning experience. If one learning goal is to help students develop their creativity through the classroom activities, then clear opportunities must be given for them to do so and they must also understand their role in taking advantage of these opportunities.

Having laid this foundation, the next chapter establishes the methodological framework for the current study, including the contextual elements, the data collection methods and modes of analysis (including the two curricula) and introduces the ethical considerations in the subsequent Findings chapters.
CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY

“Creativity involves breaking out of established patterns in order to look at things in a different way.”
—Edward de Bono

This chapter begins with an explanation of the research design and explains the context of the study and the research participants. It then presents the qualitative data collection methods, including an explication and example of the two curricula, before discussing the instruments used for qualitative analysis of classroom interaction—Ethnography and Case Study. This is followed by details of the quantitative data collection, which included assessments of creativity and language proficiency, the Torrance Test of Creative Thinking™ (TTCT) and the Darakwon™ TOEFL Jr Practice Test, respectively. As mentioned, this study does not use a correlation design to analyze the relationship between creativity and language learning, so how the assessment data will be integrated into the qualitative analyses to develop learner profiles will be clarified. The chapter concludes with the ethical considerations of the study.

3.1 Research Design

The focus of this study is on the intensive observation of participants in order to demonstrate the characteristics of creativity and how they influence L2 development over the course of one year. The students were divided into two groups; each group undertook a different curriculum for the whole year (i.e. students were assigned to one group/curriculum and did not change group/curriculum during the study). Students’ interaction and development is detailed through rich ethnographic analysis and description that aims to bring their social, cultural and learning practices to life. In addition, the inclusion of quantitative measurements provides a deeper and more complex view producing what Richardson and St Pierre (2008) refer to as ‘crystallisation.’ Including both qualitative and quantitative data is often termed a ‘mixed-method design,’ where the quantitative data is used to validate the qualitative analysis (Mertens, 2014); however, here it is used more to open fruitful lines of inquiry in the process of qualitative exploration (Sandelowski, 2003). Instead of thinking of mixing methods as improving validity, it can be said to grant different lenses through which to view variability amongst learners (Mertens, 2014). Indeed, a crucial rationale for the purpose and design of this study is that extracting numerical scores on creativity and language learning is of little value without contextualizing student performance on such tests with an appreciation of each individual’s characteristics and a clear description of their experiences and interactions in the classroom.
This study is longitudinal, with the same participants being taught and assessed over the course of one year. To be clear, the data in this study was not collected with different populations in a cross-sectional design, as are many of the studies on the relationship between second language learning and creativity (Albert, 2006; Albert & Kormos, 2004; Kasaeian & Kasaeian, 2010; Landry, 1973; Ottó, 1998), but rather involved intense observation over the course of one year with the same participants being continuously analyzed for variability and fluctuations throughout the data collection period. The study is quasi-experimental in design with one group adhering to the Teacher’s guide for the textbook, World English 1 published by Heinle Cengage Learning™ in cooperation with National Geographic™ (Milner, 2010), and the other group studying the same textbook, but through a Project-based Learning curriculum, termed The 10Cs of Project-based TESOL Curriculum, which I designed specifically for this study.

The study employed a Framework Analysis methodology, in which the data was “sifted, charted, and sorted in accordance with key issues and themes,” primarily creativity, L2 development, and the effects of the curricular approach, to generate and test a new theoretical model (Srivastava & Thomson, 2009, p. 75). Beginning with a general inductive approach, the interviews with participants were transcribed, as were sections of video, to locate and develop patterns from the data (Bernard, 2011). An inductive approach does not require that existing theories are ignored nor prevent the researcher from using existing theories in the formulation of research questions or exploration of the data, hence the data was examined and coded using characteristics of creativity proposed in the vast, multi-disciplinary research on creativity. The codes were then condensed into categories that conveyed the key themes of the data assessment, which became the five characteristics of creativity (as detailed in Section 2.5) (Gale et al., 2013; Thomas, 2006). Next, I sought to construct an analytical framework to demonstrate the effects of these characteristics and evaluate their application and prevalence in the two curricular. This was achieved through a Case Study analysis of the participants’ (the students’ and teacher’s) views on creativity and their experiences, attitudes, perspectives, and challenges in the classroom. After careful analysis of the data and review of the existing literature, it was determined that the findings of this study—essentially, that there was a crucial interplay between how creativity was encouraged, how the learning materials were used, and how the personalities of individuals affected their interactions—corresponded well with Csikszentmihalyi and Wolfe’s (2014) conceptualisation of a Systems Model of Creativity in the classroom. However, in the early stages of applying the model it was clear that the essential element of affordances was needed and hence the model was augmented to create The Modified Systems Model of Creativity for the L2 Classroom. Figure 3.1 below summarizes the data analysis process:
The Modified Systems Model of Creativity for the L2 Classroom was used to investigate the dynamic and complex mosaic of contextual and situation factors and to interpret how learners interacted with the environment to exploit and create opportunities for creative behavior and language use. Data collection methods included field notes of classroom observations (Emerson, Fretz, & Shaw, 2011); participant interviews (Fetterman, 2010; Walsh, 2011; Watson-Gegeo, 1988); audio and video recordings of student interaction (Hemming, 2008), one Focus Group session with each group at the end of the study (Dörnyei, 2007), and the two curricula. The qualitative analysis aims to provide a ‘thick description’ (Geertz, 2003) of actual classroom interaction and explain the relationships between creativity, English language learning, and the classroom curriculum. The quantitative data collection intends to provide another lens for investigation of the qualitative data and includes two assessments; the Torrance Test of Creative Thinking™ (TTCT) to evaluate creativity, and the Darakwon™ TOEFL Jr Practice Test to assess English language proficiency.

3.2 Research Context

This study took place at a private English language school in Korea. Private language schools in Korea are for-profit businesses that offer specialized, intensive tutoring. The private language school industry is ubiquitous throughout the nation and highly competitive and thus “results” are imperative for the success...
of the school. Generally, results are measured by improvement on school English tests and scores on the university entrance exam (J. K. Park, 2009).

Many academies include classes taught by both Korean teachers and native-speakers of English. This course, however, was taught by a native-speaking English teacher only, and her classes (both her classes in her regular teaching context at this school and her classes taught for this study) were oriented towards communicative practice. This study was conducted at a franchise school of a long-established, well-known educational company found throughout South Korea. The corporate office provides all learning materials including the curriculum, lesson plans, textbooks, audio-visual aids, and assessments. As previously mentioned, this study did not use the materials produced by the school, but rather a different textbook that was chosen by the researcher in cooperation with the school administrator.

The school is located in the small city of Andong, North Gyeongbuk Province, in the eastern part of the country (Figure 3.2).

![Figure 3.2: Location of Andong, in North Gyeongsang Province, Korea (Worldatlas.com)](image)

It is a city of approximately 170,000 residents, spread out over nearly 1,600 km², with much of it being agricultural land ("The National Statistical Office of the Republic of Korea," 2015). It is not considered a major educational hub in the way that major cities in Korea are often regarded. Compared to some of the more heavily populated metropolitan areas in Korea where schooling is typically competitive, most residents of Andong have a more relaxed attitude toward education.
The school is owned and operated by a Korean citizen who possesses a bachelor’s degree in English Literature and a TESOL graduate certificate, and who expressed a keen interest in more student-centred, communicative approaches to English education. He was genuinely supportive of this research undertaking; nonetheless, as an owner of a school where gaining new clientele is often related to the exam scores of current students — and of a franchise school where much of the curriculum was pre-set — the school’s existing curriculum did not allow much time for conversation or creative enrichment. Project-based Learning was certainly a unique proposition for the administrator, teacher, and students, so several meetings were conducted with the administrator and teacher before the commencement of the study to discuss the curriculum, research design, and research objectives. The administrator and teacher were assured that the teacher would receive a period of formal training before the course began.

3.3 Research Participants

All students in the study were Korean nationals and grew up in the city of Andong. The American teacher was also a three-year resident of the city and had never resided in another city in Korea. I, the researcher, am also an American citizen and had lived in a larger city in the same region of Korea for nine years prior to the study, but was new to the city of Andong when the study commenced. Prior to the start of the study, all participants were informed of the aims and processes of the research through Participant Information Sheets, and all agreed, by signature, to the terms of taking part in the study as outlined in the Consent Forms. The students and teacher participated in the research (Appendices A1~A2, respectively), while the administrator (Appendix A3) was not directly involved in the research, although he did conduct the Focus Group session at the end. As the students were minors, the parents were also required to read and sign a consent form (Appendix A4) in order for their child to take part in the study.

3.3.1 Students

The participants were all middle school-aged (13-15 years-old) EFL students at a high-beginner to intermediate level of English proficiency. Students were recruited by mass distributing advertisement flyers (Appendix B) around the city of Andong. With permission from the respective authorities, I placed flyers at various public locations including department stores and banks, and in other high-traffic pedestrian areas around the city. Several students who were attending the private academy where this study took place also elected to take part.
In total, 24 students applied to be in the study and 18 were selected based on the pre-test score of the language proficiency assessments. The preliminary selection criterion was based on a “baseline score” of high-beginner (40) on the Darakwon™ practice test; if students scored below this baseline score, they were not selected to take part in the study. The creativity scores were not taken into consideration in the selection process due to the low number of suitable applicants, but most scores on the TTCT were at approximately the same level, which was slightly below the age-referenced mean for Korean test-takers (although there were a few outliers at the high and low end of the scale). Students’ starting point on either assessment was not of particular importance since the study focused on development at the individual level (Case Study). The English proficiency score “cut-off” was essentially to ensure that participants had a basic knowledge of the concepts in the textbook and that they could participate to some degree in classroom activities, particularly in communicative-oriented tasks. All names are pseudonyms and, as there was only one teacher instructing both classes, she is referred to simply as Teacher or ‘T’ in the transcript data (as “Teacher” is used as a proper noun in lieu of her name, it is capitalised in all instances where it refers directly to the instructor in this study). While an equal number of male and female students were desired for each group, there were significantly more female applicants (see Table 3.3.1A).

Although female participants outnumbered males by nearly 3 to 1, this was not a major concern as gender was not a variable under investigation; however, other factors made ‘matched pairs’ difficult to achieve. The study selected students who were at a similar level of language proficiency (although there was admittedly a large range), who had studied English for approximately the same amount of time (5~8 years), and who had not lived abroad for more than three months in total during their life. However, more in-depth demographic data, such as students’ socio-economic status and parents’ occupation and level of education (and level of English proficiency) could not be accounted for in the selection process. Despite this being mentioned in Chapter 2 as a shortcoming in previous studies, and is an acknowledged drawback in this study, the school administrator understandably would not permit me to ask the young participants or their parents about their socioeconomic background, nor would the administrator provide any such information on their behalf. Nonetheless, as much data as possible regarding their previous learning experiences was collected, particularly in terms of their English education.
Table 3.3.1A: Research Participants’ by Gender, Age, & Grade

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Female Name</th>
<th>Age/School Year</th>
<th>Male Name</th>
<th>Age/School Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>14 / 7</td>
<td>Kevin</td>
<td>14 / 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie</td>
<td>14 / 7</td>
<td>Matt</td>
<td>14 / 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ailee</td>
<td>14 / 7</td>
<td>Danny</td>
<td>13 / 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diana</td>
<td>14 / 7</td>
<td>Kellan</td>
<td>13 / 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lily</td>
<td>14 / 7</td>
<td>Max</td>
<td>13 / 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle</td>
<td>14 / 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amber</td>
<td>13 / 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann</td>
<td>13 / 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashley</td>
<td>13 / 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emma</td>
<td>13 / 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holly</td>
<td>13 / 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stella</td>
<td>13 / 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor</td>
<td>13 / 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.3.1B shows the division of students into either the Textbook-Group (TB-Group) or Project-based Learning Group (PBL-Group). The students selected as Case Studies are denoted by the obelisk symbol (†).

Table 3.3.1B: Curricular Approach Assignment for Research Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Textbook-driven Group</th>
<th>Project-based Learning Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Age/School Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lily†</td>
<td>14 / 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle</td>
<td>14 / 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emma</td>
<td>14 / 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danny</td>
<td>13 / 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kellan†</td>
<td>13 / 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max</td>
<td>13 / 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holly</td>
<td>13 / 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann†</td>
<td>13 / 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stella</td>
<td>13 / 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.3.2 Teacher

One teacher taught both classes throughout the one-year course to eliminate the possibility of teacher-bias (i.e. different learner effects attributed to differences between teachers). The ways in which the Teacher perceived differences in learner characteristics, behaviours, and interaction due to the differences in the curriculum, was also of interest to the researcher. The teacher, hereafter referred to simply as the Teacher (again, with a capital letter to signal that it is being used as a proper noun in place of her name, and abbreviated to ‘T’ in the transcript data), is a female American expatriate who had lived in Korea for three years when the study began. She was an employee at the institution where the study was conducted and was recommended by the school’s owner. She was 28 years old and had two years of teaching experience in Korea at the commencement of the study, with all of her experience served at the academy where the study took place. She had also recently received a certificate in TESOL for a course completed online over a three-month period. Before this study, she stated that she had only used the academy’s required course books in her classroom teaching, but occasionally supplemented them with materials or games she designed, which were usually based on the coursebooks’ lessons, but with a more communicative intent.

The Teacher was given six hours of formal training on how to implement and carry out the two curricula, as well as a detailed overview of the textbook used in this study. This training period included going over each step of The 10Cs of Project-based TESOL Curriculum, with a detailed rationale and explanation of each of the elements, and a description of what students might be doing during each element. In addition, the researcher supplied the teacher with several books on student-centred teaching approaches, Project-based Learning, and creativity to aid her development and to use as reference material.

The Teacher was informed during her training period that both the textbook chosen for this course and Project-based learning were intended to encourage students to communicate in class and that only English was to be used in the classroom. To avoid the potential for curricular ‘cross-contamination,’ she was asked not to use project work in the Textbook-driven curriculum beyond the directions of the textbook’s teacher’s guide (although supplemental materials, short tasks, and games were permissible) and to limit the use of the textbook in the Project-based curriculum to introducing the material, some basic practice exercises, and a few pages for homework.

3.3.3 Researcher

Prior to this study, I had lived in the region where this study took place (North Gyeongsan Province), for nine years, but had only recently moved to the city of Andong. Although, as mentioned, the educational culture was more relaxed than in the major urban centre where I had previously resided, the general
cultural attributes of the Korean students in this study were similar to other cities, so there was a great deal of familiarity with the educational, social, and cultural circumstances.

Prior to the commencement of the study, I had never met the teacher, administrator, or any of the students, so a period of acclimation was required. In ethnographic studies, the relationship the researcher has with participants depends to a large degree on how the researcher identifies their role and status within the group (LeCompte and Goetz, 1982). From the beginning, all participants were made aware that this was a research study and that my primary objective was to “observe.” They were informed that I would not teach any of the classes, nor engage in many of the usual administrative roles (holding students accountable for homework or attendance, administering rewards/disciplinary measures, or contacting parents); however, I did take responsibility for scheduling the classes and in helping to decide on appropriate materials.

3.4 Qualitative Data Collection Methods

Six instruments were used for qualitative (ethnographic) data collection. These are: 1) researcher field notes (Walsh, 2011; Watson-Gegeo, 1988; Wolfinger, 2002); 2) participant interviews (Fetterman, 2010); 3) video recordings (Jordan & Henderson, 1995); 4) audio recordings (and subsequent transcriptions) (Walsh, 2011); 5) one Focus Group session conducted at the conclusion of the study (Dörnyei, 2007); and 6) the two curricula, which are also considered a method of data collection as a primary objective of this study was to evaluate differences in creativity and language learning between curricular approaches.

3.4.1 Field Notes

The main purpose of ethnographic research is to produce a “thick description” of the target culture and setting (Geertz, 2003), and this entails a precise narrative of interaction, behaviours, and attitudes (Dörnyei, 2007). ‘Field notes’ is a generic term in ethnographic research that refers to annotating what is noticed in the environment where the research is taking place, and there are several styles, depending on the aims of the study (Emerson et al., 2011). This study opted for a Comprehensive Note-taking strategy that was guided by an initial list of questions drafted at the onset of the study (see Appendix C), a method recommended by Lofland and Lofland (2005). Wolfinger (2002) describe “Comprehensive Note-Taking” as attempting to record as much and as many different features about the observation as possible. Following Palmer (2010), field notes were supplemented with key words as they were recorded to help identify different themes as they emerged and were (usually) rewritten in detail shortly after the observation period (see Appendix D for example); primarily, the key words related to the creative
characteristics I felt the students’ behaviour and interaction reflected at that moment. The field notes were later re-organized into sub-categories (predominantly related to the five characteristics used in the definition of creativity in this study) to make analysis more orderly and strategic (Fetterman, 2010; Wolfinger, 2002).

3.4.2 Participant Interviews

Interviews are perhaps the most important tool in the ethnographer’s data gathering repertoire; they allow the researcher to better contextualize what they see, hear, and experience by eliciting the perspectives, interpretations and cultural connotations of the participants (Fetterman, 2010). Ethnographic research commonly begins with structured and/or semi-structured interviews (see Appendices E and F for sample interview questions with the students and Teacher, respectively). Semi-structured interviews were used at the beginning of the study to obtain a wider scope of compelling phenomena, which helped the researcher formulate a focus to address more specific elements of interest as the research proceeded (ibid, 2010).

Beyond the early stages of the study, informal interviews were primarily used as they helped to develop rapport with the young students and novice teacher and proved to be more conversational, organic, and informative. Nonetheless, interview questions were prepared ahead of time and incorporated as naturally as possible into the interview if they were considered crucial to better understand recent events, ongoing phenomena, or a particular individual’s perspective. Many of the “crucial” questions addressed in the interviews focused directly on the aims of this study, including how students perceived the curriculum and its effect on their learning, how well they understood the aims of the curriculum, how they conceived their creative development through the curriculum, and how the type of interaction in the classroom affected their learning. Other questions were specific to what the researcher observed in regard to a particular students’ actions, attitude, and behaviour.

3.4.2.1 Interviews with Students

It should first be noted that all interviews with students were conducted in English. It is acknowledged that this limited the students’ ability to fully articulate their thoughts and perceptions. In the early stages of the study, all students were interviewed at least once; however, as the study progressed, six students, three from each group, were selected as representative Cases and interviewed a total of four times each at different stages of the research (Kellan and Jane were interviewed only three times due to availability issues) (Appendix G1). The selection process for these Cases was based on five main factors: (1) consideration of matched-pairs (matched by pre-test scores on the Darakwon™ TOEFL Jr. Practice test)
from the two curricula; (2) regular attendance; (3) satisfactory homework compliance; (4) participation in classroom activities; and (5) comprehensibility and ‘openness’ in interviews. Interviews helped to better capture students’ perspectives and experiences, complemented what was observed in classroom interaction, and provided an additional means of crystalizing qualitative data. However, some students struggled with articulating their thoughts in English, sometimes having to use their electronic dictionaries to find the appropriate word(s), and occasionally having difficulty understanding the researcher’s questions; for this reason, interviews with students were kept relatively short, typically around 10 to 15 minutes. Some examples of interview questions include:

- Do you like the class so far?
- Do you think this way of learning is helping you?
- How do you think this textbook/project will help you with your English?
- Do you like listening to the teacher or working in groups with your classmates? Why?
- Today you did X activity, could you explain a little about what you were doing during that activity, what you learned from it, and whether or not you liked it?

3.4.2.2 Interviews with the Teacher

Over the course of the study, nine formal interviews were conducted with the Teacher (see Appendix G2 for dates and duration). These interviews spanned a range of topics, but aimed to focus on the teacher’s attitude towards the curricula, her perception of students’ attitudes towards the curricula, the students’ classroom behaviour, their understanding of the curriculum and textbook materials, and her opinions regarding their language and creative development. While the Teacher is not the primary focus of analysis in this research, information elicited through these interviews provides an important means of crystallisation when viewed alongside students’ perceptions and behaviour (Richardson & St Pierre, 2008). Moreover, what she did and did not do and how she interacted with students had important consequences on what transpired in the classroom. After our final interview, she opined that she could articulate her final thoughts better in writing, so I suggested she compose a “reflective essay” to gather her thoughts, to which she agreed. As it is essentially an extension of the final interview, it is included here.

3.4.3 Video Recordings

All classes were video-recorded by the researcher over the course of the year, equalling 54.5 hours and 50 hours of classroom instruction time for the Textbook-based curriculum and the PBL curriculum, respectively. Video recordings allowed the researcher to “stop time,” and observe behaviours, verbal and non-verbal, that may have gone otherwise unnoticed (Fetterman, 2010). Video is an indispensable tool for ethnographic research because it allows the researcher to watch the same moments of time repeatedly and
discover new layers of meaning each time (*ibid*, 2010). In this study, video was used to record and extract moments when the various characteristics of creativity occurred, allowing for the better recognition, evaluation, and notation of specific elements and conditions that led to creative engagement, behaviour, and dialogue. Video recordings allowed for a comparative analysis of group interaction, and were useful for the continuous monitoring of individual students’ attitudes and behaviours throughout the course of the study.

3.4.4 Audio Recordings and Transcription

Digital audio recorders were used in addition to the camcorder. Digital audio recorders are smaller, arguably less “intrusive” than video, allowing several to be positioned around the classroom at the same time. They allowed the researcher to pick up long quotations made by participants and to concentrate on the classroom interaction and interviews, rather than attempting to notate everything (*Fetterman*, 2010). Twelve classes, two classes each taken from the beginning, middle, and end of each curriculum (i.e. six from each curriculum) were transcribed using both video and audio recordings to achieve the most complete and accurate account of reality (*Walsh*, 2011). The selected classroom samples (specified and detailed in Chapter 7) are based on two primary factors:

1) The number of times that class had met up to that point. The textbook-driven curriculum proceeded faster through the textbook than the PBL group, and in the sixth month of the research the PBL-Group began to jump around the textbook in order to combine units. Therefore, students in the two curricula are not always performing the same textbook unit on the same dates. Because the major consideration for analysis is progressive development over the one-year timeframe, time in the curriculum is the reference point for comparison and not the textbook unit.

2) Beyond the classes that are transcribed and described in detail, all other videos were analysed and relevant details were transcribed. Those details frequently were representative of specific points made by the researcher or were examples of reoccurring or salient features of the two curricula (regardless of which class session they occurred in.) This allowed a more careful analysis of classroom dialogue and behaviour (*J. McDonough & McDonough*, 2014).
3.4.5 Student Focus Group Session at Conclusion of the Study

At the conclusion of the study, one 30-minute focus group session (Dörnyei, 2007) was held with each group (see questions in Appendix H). The focus group, which was video and audio recorded, was conducted in Korean by the school administrator. The focus group was held so that students could more easily articulate their final thoughts about the curriculum in their native language and to create an environment where students could share their ideas and insights in an open discussion about the course (although all participants were aware that it was being recorded). The video recording was later transcribed and translated by the researcher, with the help of the administrator.

3.4.6 The Two Curricular Approaches

The same textbook, World English 1™ by Heinle Cengage Publishers (Milner, 2010), is used in both curricula, and both groups were expected to learn the same language goals and thematic concepts as set out in the “Unit Goals” (Milner, 2010, pp. iv-v) (Appendix I). The central difference is the “vehicle” of learning. The “Textbook-driven” Group (TB-Group) used the textbook itself as the main learning resource, students learned primarily through the visual aids, readings, activities, and exercises in the textbook (X. Cheng, 2011). It is important to be clear that “textbook-driven curriculum” does not intend to imply that the book automatically steers pedagogical procedures in a fixed, unbendable course; it would be outrageous to portray teachers as being a mere accessory to the textbook’s plan. Competent teachers may deviate from the book as they make moment-to-moment instructional modifications based on the difficulties encountered during a lesson, the needs of the students, institutional priorities, and an array of other factors. In this study, the teacher was not confined to the textbook in the Textbook-driven curriculum and was permitted to use games and her own activities, but was asked to follow the teacher’s guidebook, as prepared by Heinle Publishers, fairly closely when developing her lesson plans.

The Project-based Learning Group (PBL-Group) learned essentially the same content, but the learning aims from the textbook units were integrated into the projects. Because the driving force in PBL is the students’ project rather than the textbook exercises and activities, it has been referred to as “student-driven” (Bell, 2010, p. 39). PBL has been advocated as means for open-ended, student-directed learning that can promote creativity, collaboration, and innovative thinking in the classroom (Bender, 2012). In contrast, the Textbook-driven curriculum is intended to resemble the more traditional learning paradigm in the Korean EFL classroom in which the class is predominantly teacher-led, and the main learning resource is the course textbook (Moodie & Nam, 2016; Whitehead, 2016). As the primary interest in this study is the role the curriculum plays in encouraging and cultivating creativity in the language learning classroom,
these two approaches were selected because they are at opposing ends of the student-centred/teacher-centred continuum. While there are varied and numerous approaches along this spectrum that could have been selected, PBL was chosen as the student-centred approach because it has been advocated as an efficacious educational innovation for fostering creativity (www.bie.org) and because of my own experience using this approach in the EFL classroom. The TB-driven curriculum was chosen because it is analogous to the students’ past learning experiences (as students and teacher affirm throughout the study) and is also akin to my past experiences teaching more traditional EFL approaches in Korea. However, to be clear, this study does not theorize the type of curriculum as a deterministic independent variable to advocate one curriculum over the other, but uses the quasi-experimental design to shed light on important similarities and differences in regard to creativity and L2 development.

3.5 The Two Curricula: Textbook-driven Curriculum and Project-based Learning Curriculum

Before delineating and exemplifying each curriculum, it is necessary to provide some basic information regarding their similarities and differences in total number of classes, total hours, units completed, and number of class periods to complete a unit on average (see Table 3.5).

Table 3.5: Comparison of Time and Units Completed between the Curricula

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Textbook-Driven Curriculum</th>
<th>Project-based Learning Curriculum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Duration/Lesson</td>
<td>90 min (5-min break)</td>
<td>90 min (5-min break)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Classes</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classes Per Week</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Hours</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Classes to Complete A Unit/Project (Average)</td>
<td>5 (7.5 hours)</td>
<td>7 (10.5 hours)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total # of Units Completed</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Units Completed</td>
<td>1–11</td>
<td>1, 2, 3+6, 7, 9+10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Each class met once per week for 90-minutes per class (note: after week 7, class duration was changed from 2 hours to 90 minutes for both groups per the request of the students and administrator). The two groups shared the same holidays and break periods; however, by the end of the study the TB-Group had met three more times (4.5 hours) in total than the PBL-Group due to unexpected class cancellations in the PBL-Group.

On average, it took the TB-Group approximately five class periods to complete a unit, which amounts to 7.5 hours of class time. In comparison, the PBL-Group took on average seven class periods to complete a unit, equalling 10.5 hours per unit. By the end of the study, the TB-Group completed nearly 11 units, going through the textbook in orderly fashion (Unit 1, Unit 2, and so on.) while the PBL-Group finished only 7 units, skipping some and combining others into one project. In the PBL Curriculum, most of the in-class steps required 1-2 classes to complete, although some steps took longer in different projects. Both classes began in the second week of November 2014 and ended in the second week of December 2015.

3.5.1 Textbook-Driven Curriculum

There are many components to the learning materials of a language learning course, but textbooks are often considered a basic and necessary element and, as Sheldon (1987) puts it, “represent for both students and teachers the visible heart of any ELT programme” (p. 237). In many cases, textbooks also determine to a great extent the language input and practice that occurs in the classroom as they are used as the basis for the content, structure, and syllabus of a course (X. Cheng, 2011). Some years ago, Ornstein (1994, p. 70) asserted that, “Textbooks have come to drive the curriculum, and one might wonder why so little attention is given to the position of the textbook in the process of curriculum making.” More consideration has since been given to materials development in language teaching and learning and how they influence curricular and pedagogical decisions (Swaffner & Arens, 2005; Tomlinson, 2001a, 2001b), yet there is such a vast diversity in the ways that teachers perceive and use textbooks that attempting to explicitly define a ‘textbook-driven curriculum’ would be difficult. Therefore, this section aims to explicate only how “textbook-driven” will be defined in this study. However, it might be helpful to begin with defining a “textbook” as it relates to the language learning classroom. Sheldon (1987, p. 1) explains

…a 'textbook' may be loosely defined as a published book, most often produced for commercial gain, whose explicit aim is to assist foreign learners of English in improving their linguistic knowledge and/or communicative ability. Within this definition are a variety of diverse examples, ranging from books aimed at general English contexts, to those centring upon any one of a number of specialist applications […] Most evince an eclectic pedagogical stance, fusing grammatical, situational, topic and functional components in various ways.
This definition covers the essential components of the aims advocated by World English 1™, particularly in that it seems to embody a diverse approach to instruction, incorporating several grammatical and lexical exercises, along with various gap-fill activities, a range of response-type questions to listening passages, and sections in the middle and end of each unit dedicated to communicative practice, both in the form of prepared dialogues and more open-ended discussion activities.

World English 1™ makes use of various linguistic and thematic elements and activities in its design and explains how to engage various skills through the “Teacher’s Edition” guidebook (essentially a user’s manual) and a “Lesson Planner” which is available online. Thus, “textbook-driven” in this study means that the book is used as the primary tool for improving students’ knowledge and understanding of the content (Sheldon, 1987). As previously mentioned, the Teacher followed the publisher’s guidebook for the most part, but, taking into consideration Orstein’s (1994) caveat not to adhere so strictly to the textbook as to become “hypnotized” by it, did at times incorporate other instructional aids and activities.

3.5.1.1 Theoretical Underpinnings & Design of the Textbook-driven Curriculum

Heinle, the publisher of World English 1™, advertises the book as being “four-skills general English” and uses a “practical, competency-based syllabus” (Milner, 2010, p. back cover). In discussing the early models of adult ESL education for immigrants to the United States, Auerbach (1986) argued that there is no single paradigm which can define, or be defined as, ‘competency-based education.’ It is proposed as a method that connects language to its social context, thus taking a “functional and interactional perspective on the nature of language” (Richards & Rodgers, 2014, p. 143). In a competency-based curriculum the materials are said to provide examples of texts and tasks so that learners can relate the acquired knowledge of the language across different contexts and situations; thus the primary aim of the materials is to improve a variety of competencies through these tasks (Richards & Rodgers, 2014).

It has long been debated whether a textbook is the best learning tool to allow for a “demonstrated mastery” of using English for everyday functional purposes (Kohonen, Jaatinen, Kaikkonen, & Lehtovaara, 2014; Thornbury, 2013; Wilhelm, 1999). Nonetheless, it is difficult to dispute that textbooks provide certain advantages for teaching and learning. For example, textbooks can help give learners something concrete with which to measure their progress and provide something they can take home for further study (Parrish, 2004). For the teacher, they can be a convenient means of preparing and presenting new material and provide a way to ensure cohesion, continuation, progress, and organization as students proceed through a series of language features (Tomlinson, 2001b).
Despite these advantages, textbooks have been criticized for having inherent limitations, questionable theoretical propositions, and concerns about their practical efficacy for language development. The main charges are that they are reductionist in nature, dictate uniformity in approach and lesson objectives, lack authentic language and real-world language practice, and inhibit teachers’ sense of empowerment and initiative (Chou, 2010; Hutchinson & Torres, 1994). Chou (2010) also points out that the over-reliance on the ‘question and answer’ format can make the activities repetitive, tedious, and boring after a few lessons, and the similarity with the many other textbooks they have used in the past may also adversely impact their motivation. As approaches to foreign/second language teaching have changed significantly over the years, textbooks have also adapted to new theories, modes, and mediums of learning, yet scholarly perceptions of textbooks and how to use them in the classroom remains a hotly debated topic. However, whether an advocate or opponent, it is overly simplistic to attribute the success or failure of a given course directly to a textbook alone because there is, in fact, a great deal of teaching skill required to effectively employ a well-constructed textbook (X. Cheng, 2011). For the most part, the textbook used in this study contains a variety of activities and skills, creates communicative opportunities, appropriately scaffolds language points, and grants enough material and practice to help students achieve the unit goals. To demonstrate these features, the following section provides an example of a unit from the textbook used in this study, Heinle Cengage World English 1™.

3.5.1.2 Example of a Textbook-driven Lesson

The sample activities and tasks that follow are all taken from Unit 7 (pp. 74~85) of the textbook. First, the main objective here is not to critically analyse the textbook or the activities, but simply to provide a clear example of the way the units are organized and structured, the types of activities and exercises that are included in the units, the instructional tips provided by the pedagogical resources produced by the publisher, and the way that students and the teacher in this study typically proceeded through the lesson.

The unit begins with pages that possess the unit title of “Communication”, two discussion questions that ask students to analyse the pictures on page 74, and, near the bottom of the page, the unit goals (Figure 3.5.1.2A). The first page of unit activities, page 76 (Figure 3.5.1.2B), begins with identifying key vocabulary items for the unit and instructs the learner to use the word box to write the correct lexical item under the appropriate picture. The next exercise on the page, labelled ‘B’, asks students to complete a grid about whether the items above are Expensive/Inexpensive and Fast/Slow. Presumably, this is to introduce the adjective and to see if students are familiar with how the pictured objects are used. The final activity on the page is meant for grammar instruction in which the teacher is instructed to cover the concept of verbs
that use both direct and indirect objects. Using the newly acquired vocabulary from the pictures, students should say the sentences aloud.

1. Look at the pictures. What do they have in common?

2. What other ways do people communicate?

UNIT GOALS

- Talk about personal communication
- Give and write down contact details
- Describe characteristics and qualities
- Compare different types of communication

Figure 3.5.1.2A: Heinle Cengage World English 1™, Unit 7 (p. 74)
A GOAL 1 TALK ABOUT PERSONAL COMMUNICATION

Vocabulary

A. Label the pictures. Use the words in the box.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>fax</th>
<th>BlackBerry® newspaper ad</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>email</td>
<td>text message</td>
<td>phone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV</td>
<td>letter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. 2 3 4

B. Write the words in exercise A in the correct column.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inexpensive</th>
<th>Expensive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>fast</td>
<td>phone call</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>slow</td>
<td>letter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Grammar: Verbs with direct and indirect objects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Subject) + verb</th>
<th>Indirect object</th>
<th>Direct object</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I sent</td>
<td>Mike</td>
<td>an email.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My parents bought</td>
<td>me</td>
<td>a BlackBerry®.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I wrote</td>
<td>Helen</td>
<td>a text message.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>me</td>
<td>his number, please.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Find</td>
<td>him</td>
<td>the diagram.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I faxed</td>
<td>me</td>
<td>a call.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

76 Communication
On page 77 (Figure 3.5.1.2C), the unit moves immediately into another grammar practice in which students learn the present and past tense of five verbs with irregular past tense construction. Directly below is Activity A, which requires students to unscramble the words to form a grammatically correct sentence. Activity B directs students to read and understand a specific situation and to use the present tense of the verb form (from above) to compose a request. The vocabulary from page 76 and the verbs from page 77 are used in a conversation dialogue which students listen to, then practice with a partner using the transcript (Activity B), but are instructed to change the underlined words (intending for them to use other communication-device vocabulary from page 76). For the final activity, students are prompted to write a list of all the forms of communication that they use personally and then to compare this with a partner’s list.
Irregular past tense

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Past</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>buy</td>
<td>bought</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>send</td>
<td>sent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>write</td>
<td>wrote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>find</td>
<td>found</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>get</td>
<td>got</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A. Unscramble the words to write sentences.
1. sent a I fax Barbara
2. sent My brother an me email
3. address, me his Find email
4. new Jim a computer. I bought:
5. a your mom give call.

B. Read the situations and make requests. Use the verbs in parentheses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Situation</th>
<th>Request</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>You lost your friend's phone number.</td>
<td>(send) Please send me your phone number.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You want your friend to call you.</td>
<td>(give)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You want your parents to buy you a printer.</td>
<td>(buy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You ask if you can pay someone by check.</td>
<td>(write)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You want your friend to fax you a chart.</td>
<td>(fax)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conversation

A. Listen to the conversation. How did Ken communicate with Chris?

Ken: Hey, Chris. I sent you an email yesterday and you didn’t answer.
Chris: Email? What email? You didn’t send me an email.
Ken: Come on! You got it. Then I sent you a text message.
Chris: Text message? What text message? You didn’t send me a text message, either. Honest!
Ken: OK, well you’ve got no excuses now. Where’s the $15 you owe me?
Chris: $15? What $15?

B. Practice the conversation with a partner. Switch roles and practice it again.

C. Practice the conversation again. Change the underlined words.

Goal 1 Talk about personal communication

Write a list of all the types of personal communication that you use. Compare it with your partner’s list.
Page 78 (Figure 3.5.1.2D) indicates that a new goal is to be achieved: “GIVE AND WRITE DOWN CONTACT DETAILS.” This begins with having students listen to a non-authentic example of a radio program. The activity is designed to check student comprehension through a single-answer multiple-choice question. Exercise B asks students to listen to the passage again and to write down the specific details requested in the boxes. While the drills move to “pronunciation” (Activity A), the exercise is still driven by aural input, as students are prompted to listen and record the end sounds of numbers. Activity B of the pronunciation activity is essentially the same, but requests students to listen and repeat the numbers aloud.

Page 79 (Figure 3.5.1.2E) turns to a communicative task in which students should record their personal contact information and then talk to three classmates to request and record their information. On the right margin, there is also a language point related to “real-language,” which is essentially about how to politely ask someone to repeat something if they did not hear or understand. The unit continues with several more pages that possess functionally the same activities in the same organizational structure: Vocabulary is presented and practiced, followed by an explicit, isolated grammar lesson in which the teacher is required to provide an explanation. Then, a gap-fill grammar practice exercise is presented, along with a listening to a recorded dialogue activity that, after a single comprehension question, asks students to practice the transcribed conversation with a partner.

The competency-based framework and the multi-syllabus design are evident. The competencies in focus in the pages above include (as is stated on the unit’s introductory page) students discussing different means of personal communication, providing and writing down contact details, understanding the characteristics of different kinds of communication, and comparing different types of communication (Milner, 2010). It incorporates a lexical syllabus (Activity A, p. 76 and Activities A/B, p. 78); a grammatical syllabus (Activity 76~ 77); listening activities (pp. 77~78) and communicative practice tasks (pp. 77 and 79). Later in the unit there is also a National Geographic video which includes a reading and writing task.
Listening

A. Listen to the radio program. Circle the correct answer.

This is a ___.

a. talk show
b. music show
c. phone-in program

B. Listen again and complete the chart.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Telephone number</th>
<th>Fax number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Email address</th>
<th>Text message address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mailing address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pronunciation: Endings -ty and -teen

A. Listen and circle the word you hear.

1. thirty ______
2. forty ______
3. fifty ______
4. sixty ______

5. seventy ______
6. eighty ______
7. ninety ______

B. Listen and repeat the numbers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>thirty</th>
<th>sixteen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>thirteen</td>
<td>seventy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>forty</td>
<td>seventeen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fourteen</td>
<td>eighty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fifty</td>
<td>eighteen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fifteen</td>
<td>ninety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sixty</td>
<td>nineteen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Communication

A. Write your contact information in column 1 of the chart.

B. Ask three of your classmates for their contact information. Complete the chart.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Me</th>
<th>Classmate 1</th>
<th>Classmate 2</th>
<th>Classmate 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home phone number</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fax number</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cell phone number</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email address</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mailing address</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Goal 2** Give and write down contact details

Give the contact details of a friend or family member to a partner.

**Real Language**

We say sorry. I missed that or could you repeat that, please when we want someone to repeat something.
For the textbook-driven curriculum in this study, students covered most of these tasks as they progressed through the unit. The Teacher offered a significant amount of verbal instruction, called upon students to answer questions and read dialogues, and helped students complete the tasks as needed. For the most part, students adhered closely to the textbook and used the activities provided as the core of the syllabus and language practice.

3.5.2 Project-based Learning Curriculum

In consolidating the definitions of a number of other scholars, Bender (2012, p. 1) rather concisely poses that “Project-based Learning is an instructional model based on having students confront real-world issues and problems that they find meaningful, determine how to address them, and then act in a collaborative fashion to create problem solutions.” A significant transformation in PBL from its earlier iterations is the recognition that it must accommodate specific learning objectives to be applicable in today’s standard-driven educational outcomes and assessments practices. Newell (2003) attempts to address the necessary compromise between policy-mandated aims and the need for a more learner-centred focus by promoting PBL as a change in emphases, including in the list: in-depth investigation and understanding rather than mere content coverage; a consideration of the interest of the students rather than a firm adherence to a fixed curriculum; the inclusion of primary and original sources rather than texts or lectures; and information and materials developed by students rather than by the teacher (or the textbook). Each of these priorities are important facets to the PBL curriculum designed for this study.

Finally, Wolpert-Gawron (2016) offers this lengthy but thorough exposition (italics original):

PBL is the ongoing act of learning about different subjects simultaneously. This is achieved by guiding students to identify, through research, a real world problem, local to global, developing its solution using evidence to support the claim, and offering the solution using a multimedia approach to presentation using skills based in a 21st-century set of tools. Kids show what they learn as they journey though the unit, interact with its lessons, collaborate with each other, and assess themselves and each other.

This definition expresses many of the core tenets that are integral to the design of the PBL framework used in this study. The second sentence of Wolpert-Gawron’s (2016) definition embraces several key features of the PBL curriculum in this study: the teacher is to guide not instruct the students towards completing the projects; students are responsible for deciding upon many of the major elements of the projects; and students should find new and creative ways and incorporate different resources and technologies with each project. The last sentence, again, highlights the importance of collaboration, but also adds the critical element of self and peer assessments for personal and collaborate reflection.
Newell (2003) highlights another aspect essential to the PBL approach in this study: students extend their capacity to think by engaging the emotions through the senses which helps develop their imagination and creativity. Perhaps most importantly is that what they learn and what they create are personally meaningful. This idea is also at the root of the experiential learning paradigm of second language development, which asserts that learners, once exposed to genuine language use, can be motivated by a real sense of participation, empowerment, and achievement through communicating with the language while learning it (Tomlinson, 2001a, 2012). This claim has made PBL increasingly popular in second language classrooms as a means to enhance communication and collaboration and foster more purposeful and dynamic interaction amongst learners (Dörnyei, 1997).

While most of the existing frameworks had something constructive to offer in terms of teaching philosophy and specific learning strategies, none, in my opinion, adequately suited the language learning environment. Thus, I designed the model used in this study, which I call *The 10Cs of Project-based TESOL Curriculum*, by amalgamating several existing models of PBL, incorporating various elements from the interdisciplinary literature on creativity, and adding some of my own components that I felt specifically addressed elements needed in language learning.

3.5.2.1 Theoretical Underpinnings & Design of the Project-based Learning Curriculum: *The 10Cs of Project-based TESOL Curriculum*

*The 10Cs of Project-based TESOL Curriculum* is intended to tailor PBL to the language learning environment in a way that would emphasise creating opportunities to interact and communicate in an authentic context (G. Beckett, 2002). The following explains each *element* in the creative process framework used in this study. The word ‘element’ is used here rather than ‘step’ to indicate the process, while progressing along different stages from beginning to end, is not step-by-step in nature. There are no arrows, but they are numbered to help students know where they are in the process and what they have yet to complete. The process is flexible and iterative as students may return to the various elements when necessary or even skip elements and cycle back later. Essentially, it is intended as a guide for completing the project while simultaneously developing their English skills and not as a rigid step-by-step procedure.

As the name suggests, there are ten elements in the process, with six completed in class (marked in orange) and four being completed as homework (marked in blue). It should be noted that “six elements completed in class” does not mean that the project is necessarily completed in six classes because some steps may take more than one class (the *Creation* element, especially). Indeed, the number of classes a project takes to complete is by no means definitive, but rather depends on the project demands, the time allowed per class, the students’ proficiency level(s), and numerous other factors.
This section aims to delineate the purpose and theoretical rationale for each element in the process (Figure 3.5.1.2). In addition, a summary explanation of each element can be found in the appendix (Appendix J), along with the accompanying worksheets for the Comprehension and Critique Stages (Appendices K and L, respectively). The explanation of each element given below was the essential information I provided the teacher when conducting the training prior to the commencement of the study.

When Coaching, the teacher’s first objective is to familiarize students with the necessary language points for the unit project. There are many ways to achieve this, but this element often takes on more of the appearance of the textbook-driven approach with the teacher going over key language points from the textbook to assess students understanding and knowledge of the major concepts (Douglas & Jaquith, 2015). At this point, teachers must also do their best to spark motivation and inspire students to become invested in the projects (Kelley & Kelley, 2013). During this process, teachers should make it clear to the students that during the project they will act as guide in the process rather than as a knowledge provider (Bender, 2012), and the students will be primarily responsible for generating the objects of learning. Therefore, another important consideration for the teacher when Coaching is how much input and choice to give students in deciding upon the project theme and learning objectives. Some scholars advocate for near total control given to the students (Barell, 2006) while others feel teachers should take more responsibility for determining many of the main parameters of the project (Bender, 2012). This decision will depend on
numerous factors such as the students’ English proficiency and level of experience with PBL, but it is important for teachers to bear in mind that PBL is student-driven (Bell, 2010). Thus, not everything has to be learned before starting because learning through the project is the main objective (BIE, 2017).

Next, **Concept Generation** targets the development of divergent thinking (DT) which, as addressed earlier, means exploring many possible ideas and solutions to a problem (Sawyer, 2013). Concept Generation asks students to first brainstorm ideas individually as research has consistently shown that this strategy generates more original responses and a larger number of responses in general than when students brainstorm together (Mullen, Johnson, & Salas, 1991; K. Sawyer, 2012; Thompson, 2013). This stage is assigned as homework after the first class. For each project, students are assigned a minimum number of ideas they will need to produce, although they are encouraged to generate as many as they can; each project requires progressively more ideas. In this study, the first project required 3 ideas from each student with each subsequent project increasing by 3 (meaning the fifth and final project required 15 ideas). Students emailed their list to the teacher the day before the next class. After receiving the students’ Concept Generation lists, the teacher decided on the groups and then collated the ideas into an anonymous list for each group. When students arrived the next class, the teacher handed them each a copy of their group’s list. The students were given 10 to 20 minutes to independently decide on the ideas they liked best. Next, the teacher informed them of the teams and allowed them to assemble; group members then shared the ideas they liked best and attempted to assimilate all their favourite ideas into one project concept (Nagai, Taura, & Mukai, 2009; Ulrich & Eppinger, 2015). The goal was to initiate debate about which ideas to use, which is the primary objective of the next element.

The **Confrontation** element is based on the idea that team conflict can help facilitate the creative process (Kurtzberg & Amabile, 2001), and that the right amount and the right kind of criticism leads to more novel ideas (Nemeth et al., 2004). While conflict prevents conformity and improves group performance, students must learn that it can only be successful in a culture of fairness, trust, and open communication amongst group members (Thompson, 2013). This means that to foment risk-taking, a community of trust must be established so that criticism is a welcomed part of the creative process (Piirto, 2011). Another benefit of team conflict is that it manifests the need to renegotiate goals and clarify challenges leading to better and more original solutions (Redmond, Mumford, & Teach, 1993). Ultimately, students should try to ‘blend’ several of their favourite ideas into one larger idea through negotiation to figure out which ideas best coalesce and how to combine elements. The cognitive and linguistic challenge of combining ideas is also intended to engender authentic and creative language use. An entire class session is devoted to this stage and if students finish early, the teacher should assist by posing questions to stimulate additional exploration and dialogue amongst group members.
Next, the **Comprehension** homework required students to listen to their recorded conversations from the Confrontation stage and complete a worksheet (Appendix K). The teacher emailed the audio recording for each group to members of that group only (i.e. students received the recording only of their own group). The worksheet asked students to think more deeply about the purpose of the project, their vision for it, the steps that will be required to bring it to fruition, and included several questions regarding their contributions and communication skills during their group’s discussion. This homework task was primarily designed to help students become more aware of their thinking process, recognise progress (or lack thereof), and make decisions about how to best manage their time and effort (Chamot & O’Malley, 1996; Halpern, 1998). The teacher provided feedback on the Comprehension Stage homework, most of which requested more details about what students noticed and asked why they felt as they reported.

When students returned the next week, they began the **Creation** element, which is essentially the construction of the project. This stage allows the learner to connect the learning objectives and knowledge to something physical and facilitates a deeper engagement with the objects of learning (Papert & Harel, 1991). Furthermore, the making of the project is deep, experiential learning that brings knowledge into reality; put simply, it is learning by doing (Dewey, 1933). In this part of the project, students are likely to be focused on constructing the project and may be relatively quiet. There are a few things teachers can do to activate dialogue during this process. The first is to talk with students individually about what they are working on and why they chose to work on this dimension of the project. This gives the student an opportunity to talk one-on-one with the teacher and to articulate their thoughts about the project and their own contributions. The teacher can ask questions such as, “Tell me a little about what you’re working on” and “how did you come up with this idea?” A strategy to promote learner-learner interaction is to have students report to their group members what they have finished and what they have yet to do or to have them take turns doing a short “think-aloud” about what they are doing as they work.

After students make the project, the opportunity to **Critique** it allows them to make critical judgments and ask questions about their work (Douglas & Jaquith, 2015). It is essential that students learn to self-assess their own work and accept the critiques of others in order to feel that their work is important and their efforts appreciated (Gladwell, 2008; Thompson, 2013). The Critique Stage is a homework assignment (Appendix L) in which students record up to five changes they would like to suggest to their group members. This step allows students to think about what they have done as still being a ‘work-in-progress’ and to cultivate a penchant for risk-taking. A willingness to take risks and make changes is fundamental to a creative mind as it emboldens students to extend beyond what they have done and explore new possibilities (Hetland, Winner, Veenema, & Sheridan, 2007; Robinson, 2011). With this objective in mind,
students return to the next class with the worksheet, ready to share and debate their ideas for modification with their group members.

The Change element allows students to realize that creativity is an iterative process that almost always requires alterations, and that criticizing and modifying your own work is an important part of the creative enterprise (Hetland et al., 2007). Change is essentially a consolidation and reiteration of two previous stages, Confrontation and Creation. First, students debate the changes that they suggested on the “Critique” worksheet; they seek to find overlap that most agree on, then make their recommendations for additional changes through critical reasoning and negotiation. Once they agree on the changes, they will work together to add, subtract, correct, or reorganize the elements of their project. While creative works and innovation in the real world often require several cycles of change and adaptation, the language classroom offers only limited time so students need to stay focused and working towards the Culmination element. Thus, only one class is usually given for Change; if more time is required, it typically needs to be done outside of class.

The Culmination is the presentation or performance of the project. This allows students to showcase their hard work and to better appreciate and understand the work done by other groups (Robinson & Aronica, 2015). Burton and McGraw (2001, p. 31) posit that when students exhibit their art, they learn to view it “through the eyes, minds, and hearts of others.” The need to produce something tangible and to present or demonstrate it in front of others is based on the “…the idea that [knowledge construction] happens especially felicitously in a context where the learner is consciously engaged in constructing a public entity, whether it’s a sand castle on the beach or a theory of the universe” (Papert & Harel, 1991, p. 1). Dougherty (2012, pp. 12-13) offers this rationale for generating concrete products to demonstrate learning:

> Kids today are disengaged and bored in school, and as a result, many see themselves as poor learners. We should be framing things in our schools not just in terms of “how do we test you on that?” but on “what can you do with what you know?” When you’re making something, the object you create is a demonstration of what you’ve learned to do, thus you are providing evidence of your learning. The opportunity to talk about that object, to communicate about it, to tell a story about it is another way we learn at the same time we teach others.

This sums up well the primary reasons why students should not only be engaged in the collaborative act of making something, but why it should also be a tangible product or production they can share with others. Both the creative process and the now materialized product become the focus of the final two elements.

Collaborative Reflection is a second opportunity to reflect and critique, but involves the whole class assessing their own work as well as the work of other groups. The main goal during this stage is to empower students to ask each other questions regarding the projects and the process of making it, which
provides the students and teacher deeper insight into what has been learnt (Cummings, 2000). The teacher can lead the discussion, particularly when first introducing PBL, but should increasingly encourage students to ask their own questions and offer feedback as well as suggestions for improvement. This allows students to reflect upon their ability to solve problems and how they might apply what they have learned through a project to future learning situations (Halpern, 1998). Evaluation entails assessing not only the product but the experience and knowledge gained both on a personal level and from working as a member of a group (Tsiplakides & Fragoulis, 2009). The primary purpose of this element is to provide students with the opportunity to understand, acknowledge, and share the strengths and weaknesses of their projects, as well as their own strengths and weaknesses, as a foundation for future improvement (Hmelo-Silver, 2004).

For an element of closure to the project, students write a Composition about their experiences and self-assess their performance, helping them construct meaning by relating what they learned through the project to their own lives, interests, and values (Hetland et al., 2007; Tuttle, 2009). It also allows them to share what they have learned with the teacher (Douglas & Jaquith, 2015; Grant, 2002), but the most important aspect of writing about the project is to encourage thoughtful reflection about the creative process and the learning aims. To initiate this process, the teacher would pose several open-ended questions that could help steer students’ minds towards deeper introspection about the project (G. H. Beckett & Slater, 2005). Some examples of these questions included

- What are the main things you learned by doing this project?
- What was your favourite part of the project?
- Explain what you think you can do better in the next project.
- Explain a conversation that you had with your group members that helped improve the project.

Another less explicit goal of the composition was to help students think about how they can use their newly acquired linguistic knowledge to make learning more effective and enjoyable (Oxford, 2002), therefore, the Teacher was encouraged to include at least one question related directly to the language used in the unit/project. For example:

- What new words did you learn in this unit and what do they mean?
- Use [X grammatical structure] to tell about your usual day.
- Give examples of situations where you would use the language you learned in this unit.

Before continuing with an example of the curriculum, it is necessary to point out some challenges and limitation with the approach. While the open-ended, ill-defined nature of the projects and the aesthetically-inclined enterprise of generating something tangible is conducive to creativity (Redmond et al., 1993), there are undoubtedly challenges in implementing such a curriculum. One obstacle is meeting rigorous
curricular objectives (Bender, 2012; Robinson, 2011; Wolpert-Gawron, 2016). Sahlberg (2009, p. 340) points out that education is often bottled in the same conceptual framework as economic and intellectual models, meaning, “Teaching and learning are steered by the principles of efficiency and rationalism and are therefore sequenced into manageable units and programmed by a predetermined schedule.” Additionally, even when creativity is appreciated in the classroom, teachers may not know exactly how to foment it in their students and will need training to learn how to inspire creativity in the classroom. They will also need to get students to buy into an environment that is much different from what they are accustomed to and that at first may seem irrelevant and disconnected from their learning objectives. The following example of students undertaking a project in the 10Cs Curriculum will begin to illustrate some of the advantages and challenges addressed above and elaborated upon in the Findings chapters.

3.5.2.2 Example of a Project in the 10Cs of Project-based TESOL Curriculum (PBL Curriculum)

One example of a project in the PBL Curriculum used in this study was a Mixed-Media Collage. This project was based on Unit 7 of the textbook (same as the unit described above for the TB-driven Curriculum) and required students to use pictures, symbols, and numbers (with limited text) to convey a story through their collage design. They were given a list of minimum requirements of key linguistic and thematic items that they had to include in their collage, but the story itself was limited only by their imaginations. More details about this project are given in Chapter 4, but the goal here is to simply explain the process they undertook in completing the project.

On the first day of the project the teacher selected 3~5 pages of Unit 7 in the World English 1™ textbook that would best help students understand the main language points that would become part of the project requirements. This instruction took approximately 45 minutes of the 1.5-hour class, after which the teacher introduced the theme and requirements for the project. This took most of the remaining class time with some time left at the end for students to ask questions. The students were then given their homework for Concept Generation which was to come up with 12 original ideas (as this was the fourth project). The next class was the Confrontation element in which students debated and attempted to fuse their ideas. The Creation element for this project took three classes. In the first class, they drafted a plan on the whiteboard (Figure 3.5.2.2A).
After making the plan, they painted the canvas (pink) and this was essentially the end of the class as the paint needed to dry before they could continue. In the next class, they pasted on the colour print-outs of various items, including communication devices, social media sites, and animals (Figure 3.5.2.2B).
In the next two classes they painted various figures on the canvas, including a female character, and pasted a number of paper cut-outs onto the canvas. During the Change element they decided upon several changes, with one major change being the addition of another character to the collage (the female character’s love interest) (see Figure 3.5.2.2C).

On the Culmination day (Figure 3.5.2.2D), they were given approximately 30 minutes for rehearsal and then gave a 10-minute presentation in which they told the story they had written and explained what each item on the collage represented. After their presentation, the teacher asked them questions about why they decided on some elements (like a pink background) and what they debated most when painting and preparing their story. She also provided feedback about what she liked and what she felt they could improve for the next project.

Figure 3.5.2.2C: Change -Day 4: Students add another character and repair the border
In the Collaborative Reflection stage students expounded on the unique opportunity to paint and use symbols as a form of communication, and the excitement of developing and telling their story through pictures. The teacher provided additional feedback, but focused more on asking questions about the development of their ideas and what they liked the most and least about the final collage and how the project helped them learn the language points from the textbook. She also gave them time to ask each other questions. Their final homework assignment was to write a short journal about what they learned from the project, focusing on the how working and collaborating with others helped them learn, how trying new things sparked their interest, and how they found the projects challenging, yet interesting and enjoyable.

3.6 Qualitative Data Analysis

Qualitative analysis is used to gain a more in-depth understanding of creativity in the classroom and the similar and different effects of the Project-based Learning Curriculum and the Textbook-driven Curriculum on creativity and L2 learning. Two overlapping qualitative approaches are used in this study: ethnography and multiple case studies.

Before describing the methods used in this study, it is important to attend to the issues of validity and reliability that are often employed as criticism of or scepticism in qualitative research paradigms. First, as
the final report is ultimately interpreted and composed by the researcher, this account is rarely “objective.” The background of the researcher creates an inherent bias, yet the researcher should suspend criticism and attempt to take a non-judgmental orientation towards analysis to prevent inappropriate or inimical value judgments (Fetterman, 2010; J. McDonough & McDonough, 2014). Such a position requires attention to researcher reflexivity, meaning the researcher is fully cognizant of their role in the study (and subsequent analysis) and the impact their presence has on the people and situational context of the study (Creswell, 2012). It is essential that ethnographers call attention to their role in the study and identify the analysis as a point of view, despite all efforts being made at objectivity (Denzin, 1998). Researcher reflexivity is a recognition that understanding other people is “messy” because the way the story is interpreted and told is mediated through the researcher’s lens (Kaplan-Weinger & Ullman, 2014, p. 20); there is no such thing as obvious or transparent meaning of facts (Eisenhart, 2001). Reflexivity, in summary, is a researcher’s commitment to acknowledge their role in the study and the interpretation of the report, as well as a responsibility to privilege and accurately represent the participants’ perspectives (Kaplan-Weinger & Ullman, 2014).

A final consideration when using ethnography is the so-called Hawthorne Effect, in which the presence of the researcher (and the camera) influences participant behaviour causing them to behave in a way they believe is expected by the researcher. Dörnyei (2007) suggests that this is a serious issue in applied linguistics, particularly in studies that examine spontaneous language use. Although this study does examine classroom communication in-action, there are two primary reasons why the Hawthorne effect does not significantly impact the data collection in this study: 1) the adolescent participants did not know how creative behaviour was being defined by the researcher, nor do they have a clear understanding of the concept of creativity; and 2) creative thinking and behaviour is generally not something you can spontaneously manifest on cue. Nonetheless, it is acknowledged that the researcher’s presence may have affected what transpired in the classroom, as may the presence of the video and audio recorders. Following D. Atkinson (2002, p. 539) definition of ethnography as an “attempt to honour the wholeness and situatedness of social scenes and individuals-in-the-world,” this study attempts to understand and value the perspectives of the young participants. Further, ethnography strives to see emergent patterns in complex, embedded, and deeply inter-connected phenomena. I agree with the assertion of Rodrigues-Junior and Paiva (2009) that ethnography provides the best option to investigate the numerous and varied complexities that exist in the dynamic fields of education and second language acquisition. Fetterman (2010, p. 39) argued that, “Working with people, day in day out, for long periods of time is what gives ethnographic research its validity and vitality.” Given that my primary interest was the actions, experiences, and perspectives of individuals in the study and how they understood and engaged in the
creative enterprise, and given the extensive amount of data collected “in the field,” it is my opinion that ethnography and Case Studies were the best methodological options for exploring creativity in the language classroom. Following is a concise definition of each.

3.6.1 Ethnography

Hammersley (2006, p. 4) defines ethnography as “a form of social and educational research that emphasises the importance of studying at first-hand what people do and say in particular contexts.” Watson-Gegeo (1988) argues that ethnography in language education must embody and stay true to the anthropological traditions from which it derived. Accordingly, it must provide a description that is an ‘interpretative-explanatory’ account of the setting, what people do, how people interact, and how participants, including the researcher, understand what is happening. This usually requires extensive time in the field in order to become familiar with social and cultural practices and to develop a thorough understanding of the people and conditions of which the ethnographer is trying to comprehend, interpret, and describe (Eisenhart, 2001).

The ethnographer’s data which informs their social scientific take on reality, usually referred to in ethnographic terms as the etic (outsider’s) view, is a detailed description and careful interpretation of phenomenon from the viewpoint of the researcher (Creswell & Poth, 2017; Fetterman, 2010). Ethnography often applies the etic perspective to the analysis of the emic view, or the world and events as seen from the participants’ perspective (Fetterman, 2010), which is collected in the form of participant interviews or other sources of data (Creswell, 2012). The emic perspective “is at the heart of ethnographic research” and strives to understand why individuals and groups do what they do (Fetterman, 2010, p. 20). Farah (1997), however, calls attention to the difficulty of balancing insider and outsider perspectives because it is impossible for the researcher to completely shed their identity. Further, a researcher may have more difficulty if they have become too familiar with the culture they are studying as important characteristics may go unnoticed, while too little knowledge may result in the researcher excluding the insider’s perspective due to a lack of understanding. The researcher must also strike a balance in how much to be involved in the environment under investigation, as too much participation may influence the outcome of events and too little may prevent them from obtaining important information (Hornberger, 1994). One way to highlight the emic view is to select and focus on a few, specific individuals and to concentrate on drawing out and understanding the issues, events, experiences, and emergent phenomenon through their eyes; this type of inquiry is termed “Case Study.”
3.6.2 Case Study Approach

Case Study is a type of ethnography, although it has several specific features (Creswell, 2012). First, it may focus on individual student’s involvement with the activities, events, or programs rather than the entire group (Stake, 1995). This study looks at both individual cases, as well their interactions in groups and with the learning environment as a whole. Similarly, instead of analysing the shared patterns of behaviours of the group, the research focuses more on the individuals’ activities within the group. In this way, the case study is the investigation of what Creswell and Poth (2017) calls a ‘bounded system,’ referring to the idea that the participants (or some other distinct episode or phenomenon, which can also be considered a case) are separated out for research based on some specific characteristics (M. B. Miles, Huberman, & Saldana, 2013).

While there are many ways a Case may be abstracted, this study uses two means of classification. The first is to explore in-depth the thoughts, experiences, and behaviours of individual students. Six cases were chosen using “conceptually driven sequential sampling” (M. B. Miles et al., 2013, p. 31), which is to define boundaries in order to select the cases; the cases in this study were chosen based on the criteria discussed in Section 3.3.1. The second way the concept of case is represented in this study is through the frame of the learning process — two curricular processes are examined in depth. These two frames are used to evaluate how specific learner characteristics of creativity are elicited through classroom activities and in the course work related to the curriculum.

3.7 Assessments for Creativity and Language Proficiency

Standardized assessments were used to measure creativity and English language proficiency (see Table 3.7 for specific testing dates). As previously mentioned, this study administered the Torrance Test of Creative Thinking™ (TTCT) in the students’ native language, Korean. The TOEFL Jr™, produced by the Educational Testing Service™ (ETS), is the English language proficiency assessment used in this study. However, because the nearest ETS™ testing centre is more than an hour from Andong (and given the overall cost of the test), the TOEFL Jr. Practice test produced by Darakwon™, a long established and reputable educational company in Korea, was used on-site and marked by the researcher. The TTCT and Darakwon™ TOEFL Jr Practice Test were taken by all student participants at the beginning, middle, and end of the course. This was used to investigate changes in creativity and language proficiency for each individual learner and between groups in the two curricula.
Table 3.7: Creativity (TTCT) and English Proficiency Test (TOEFL Jr) Testing Dates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Group</th>
<th>Pre Date</th>
<th>Mid Date</th>
<th>Post Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PBL Group</td>
<td>1 Nov 2014</td>
<td>30 May 2015</td>
<td>5 Dec 2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.7.1 Torrance Test of Creative Thinking

The TTCT that is produced and widely used in the United States comprises two tests, the TTCT Figural™, in which written responses are elicited through the use of pictures/figures, and the TTCT Verbal™, which uses word prompts to provoke creative written responses. However, the Korean version (produced in Korea by FPSP™ [http://www.fpsp.or.kr/]) uses a combination of these tasks. The Korean version of the TTCT Type B takes 40 minutes to complete and consists of six tasks (see Appendix M, and the English translation in Appendix N).

The TTCT uses a norm-referenced assessment, which is a measure of test-takers performance based on the relative performance of some known group (Linn & Gronlund, 2000). The TTCT assesses for both age-related norms and grade-related (school-year) norms, which are developed by the local author(s) in the different countries in which it is available (K. H. Kim, 2006). As mentioned earlier, the Korean TTCT version assesses creativity as three criteria, which are flexibility, fluency, and originality. These scores are used to calculate the composite score by converting them into T scores. However, Torrance himself was wary of how well the sub-scores could be meaningfully aggregated because of the dependency on inter-rater reliability for each of the sub-scores, which varied depending on the training and experience of the raters (Zeng, Proctor, & Salvendy, 2011). The Korean company (FPSP™) which assessed the TTCT scores affirmed that they ensure inter-rater reliability by using two raters. A Cohen’s Kappa coefficient between the two raters is calculated to determine inter-rater reliability, if there is a large discrepancy, they use a third rater to resolve the final score (I was not permitted access to each individual rater’s score). Again, it should be acknowledged that the scoring, while done by trained raters, is inherently objective and a level of caution is given in interpreting the validity of the students’ scores.

Furthermore, Torrance himself did not believe creativity to be a static characteristic of a learner, nor did he intend for the TTCT to be interpreted as a statistical score; rather, he believed the test could be used to understand the students’ creative strengths so that creativity could be nurtured and further developed (Hebert, Cramond, Spiers Neumeister, Millar, & Silvian, 2002; K. H. Kim, 2006; E. P. Torrance, 1974).
Nonetheless, it has become the most well-known and widely used assessment for creativity, for both educational and research purposes (Almeida, Prieto, Ferrando, Oliveira, & Ferrándiz, 2008; Chase, 1985; Clapham, 2004; Kaufman et al., 2008). This ubiquity of use has led to several studies that evaluate its reliability and validity (both its construct validity and its success in predicting creative individuals through empirical data from longitudinal studies) (Baer, 2011; K. H. Kim, 2006; Lubart & Sternberg, 1995; Zeng et al., 2011). In terms of reliability, it has been well addressed in the literature that creativity is dependent on a myriad of temporal, situational, and local factors, so caution is urged regarding its usefulness for determining the creative potential of individuals based on one-off scores (Clapham, 2004). E. P. Torrance (1974) also recognized motivational conditions could have a significant effect on test-takers creative competency and this could explain low test-retest reliability. Despite these criticisms, longitudinal studies have shown that TTCT scores can be significant predictors of later creative achievements (Cramond, Matthews-Morgan, Bandalos, & Zuo, 2005; K. H. Kim, 2006; Mark A. Runco, Millar, Acar, & Cramond, 2010; E. Paul Torrance, 2004). Therefore, it can be said that the validity has been questioned largely due to the fact that creativity is a complex, multidimensional, and situated phenomenon that cannot be measured with a single instrument (Zeng et al., 2011); however, there does appear to be compelling longitudinal evidence for its predictive validity of creative achievements.

3.7.2 TOEFL Jr. Standard Test [Darakwon™ Publisher Practice Tests]

According to the ETS™ website (2016), the TOEFL Jr. Test is a multiple-choice English Language Proficiency exam available for students ages 11+ (https://www.ets.org/toefl_junior/about/) that is based on the same criteria as other ETS™ English proficiency tests such as the TOEFL iBT (internet-based test) and is also mapped to the Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR™) levels to allow students to compare their scores to “international standards.” Again, because the official ETS™ TOEFL Jr. testing centre was not in near proximity to the research site, a practice test produced by Darakwon™ Publishers was used and scored locally by the researcher. The three subsections of the test, detailed below, are all multiple-choice answer types, which are the same for ETS’s™ TOEFL Jr. Standard Test version. The answer guide provided by Darawkon™ Publisher was used to mark the answers.

It is recognized that, as this was not the official test and the material was not produced or licensed by ETS™, the test items and scoring may differ some from that of the official ETS™ TOEFL Jr. Test. The Darakwon™ Level 1 Test book (the easiest version of the practice text books produced by Darakwon™) was used. It included three separate complete tests, all of which were administered to students: the first complete test was administered for the pre-test, the second for mid-test, and the third for the post-test.
The official ETS™ TOEFL Jr. scoring measurement converts scores to a scale score of 200-300 for each sub-section to form a combined score of 600-900. Score descriptors for each score range, which explain the English proficiency skills and strengths of test-takers within that range, is available at the ETS™ (TOEFL Jr. Standard Test website). The structure of the text (see Figure 3.7.2 for time allowed) is composed of three sub-sections, Listening Comprehension, Language Form and Meaning, and Reading Comprehension. The Darakwon™ Practice TOEFL Jr test contains 42 questions (for a total of 126 questions), each with four possible answers, one correct answer and three distractors. The score is based on the number of correct answers, with no penalty for incorrect answers. As on the official ETS™ Standard version, the three sub-scores of the Darakwon™ Practice tests are summed to provide a combined score. Darakwon™ Publishers provides a convenient conversion scale from aggregate possible scores of 0 to 126 on their test to the 600-900 range “scale score” of the official ETS™ test (Appendix O). The table below summarizes the structure of the test.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Listening Comprehension</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>40 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Form and Meaning</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>25 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Comprehension</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>50 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>126</strong></td>
<td><strong>1 hour 55 minutes</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 3.7.2: TOEFL Jr. Standard Test Question/Time Structure*

Table 3.7.2 contains the assessment objectives and instructions for each subsection as described in the Handbook for the ETS™ TOEFL Jr. Standard Test produced by ETS™ (2015): The objectives and instructions are presented here verbatim so as not to misinterpret, misrepresent, change, or omit the information as prepared by ETS™.
Table 3.7: Objectives and Instructions for Subsections of the ETS™ TOEFL Jr. Standard Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Listening Comprehension Section</strong></td>
<td>The Listening Comprehension Section tests a student’s ability to listen for basic interpersonal, navigational and academic purposes. There will be 42 questions in this section of the test. Students are asked to answer questions based on a variety of conversations and talks recorded in English. The first type of talk will have a teacher or other school staff member talking to students. Each talk is followed by one question. The student will be asked to choose the best answer to each question and mark the letter of the correct answer on the answer sheet. Students will hear each talk only one time (p. 11). The second type of talk will contain short conversations. Each conversation is followed by three or more questions. Students will be asked to choose the best answer to each question. The conversation will be heard only one time (p. 12).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Language Form and Meaning Section</strong></td>
<td>The Language Form and Meaning section tests a student’s ability to demonstrate proficiency in key English languages skills such as grammar and vocabulary in context. The section contains 42 questions. Within each question are boxes that contain four possible ways to complete a sentence. Students will be asked to choose the word or words in each box that correctly completes the sentence. The testing time for this section is 25 minutes (p. 15).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reading Comprehension Section</strong></td>
<td>The Reading Comprehension section tests a student’s ability to read and comprehend both academic and non-academic texts written in English. There are 42 questions in this section of the test. The testing time for this section is 50 minutes (p. 18). After the students read each passage, they will read the questions that follow it and the four possible answers. They will choose the best possible answer (p. 18).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While the assessment served its purpose of providing a basic assessment of students’ English language proficiency (particularly since quantitative measurement is not the focus of this study), it should be acknowledged that research studies regarding the reliability of the TOEFL Jr test that were not either funded or directly conducted by the company that produces it (ETS™) proved difficult to find. Papageorgiou, Xi, Morgan, and So (2015) empirically validated the TOEFL Jr band scores based on the
test performance of 2,931 students, from which they based “performance descriptors” on the band levels. A study by Y. So (2014) examined the validity argument by gathering score interpretation perspectives and feedback from teachers of English in Korea, with a main goal of gathering the opinions of relevant stakeholders about what may affect validity arguments of the assessment instrument. As the test is relatively new compared to other ETS products, longer term validity studies have not yet been carried out. Nonetheless, the test claims to be based on “45 years of Expert Research” (ETS, 2017), and, whether or not a strong validity argument can be made, the test is analogous to many of the English proficiency tests students take throughout their educational career in Korea.

3.8 Use of the Assessments of Creativity and Language Proficiency

This study employs a Single-Subject research design, which is traditionally defined as evaluating the effects of a treatment on a single subject or a group of single subjects, or as Horner et al. (2005, p. 166) put it, “the individual participant is the unit of analysis.” This relies on the pre-test (or baseline) data in comparison to post-test data to determine if changes occurred as a result of any kind of treatment on individual subjects (Horner et al., 2005). However, it is important to reiterate that students’ TTCT and Darakwon™ TOEFL Jr Practice Test scores, which ostensibly represent the variables of creativity and language proficiency development, are not taken to isolate the variables to demonstrate causality or propose definitive proof of one curriculum being superior to the other, rather they are taken at numerical value and incorporated into the holistic analysis of the Case Studies. This study does not interpret changes in test scores as concrete, cause-and-effect verification of the “effectiveness” of any treatment, and does not interpret the curriculum to be “treatment” in the traditional experimental sense; rather, it investigates how the two curricula similarly and differentially provide affordances for creative behaviour and language use and how students interact with these affordances. Hence, the reason for studying two curricula is for juxtaposition rather than to create experimental conditions or to offer any element of the teaching approach as an independent variable.

Furthermore, individuals are seen as having their own learning competencies, preferences, and trajectories. This means that even if the single-subject effect for the development in creativity and/or language development reliably demonstrates greater improvement in one curriculum or the other, it should be recognized that this is the result of an individual and cannot be reliably generalized from the minimal quantitative data collected in this study. Analysis instead focuses on incorporating the multitude of learner and contextual factors obtained from the intensive qualitative analysis to aid in explaining the differences. Essentially, the TTCT and Darawkon™ TOEFL Jr Practice test are used to generate areas of inquiry for
qualitative analysis and to provide insights into the students’ development of creativity and language proficiency, but cannot be used as explanatory in isolation from the overall analysis of classroom interaction and each individual student’s personality and learning experiences.

3.9 Ethical Considerations

A critical ethical issue involved in this study is the use of minors as research participants. Parental/Legal Guardian consent was required for participation in the study (see Appendix A4) and confidentiality was paramount. The results of all test scores and writing assignments have been assigned a pseudonym and these are the only identifiers used throughout the research. Myself and my doctoral supervisor, Tan Bee Tin, were the only ones with access to the students’ TTCT and TOEFL Junior scores while the study was in progress. Students (and their parents/guardians) were given access to their own test scores at the conclusion of the study. The administrator, Teacher, parents/guardians, and students were permitted to see scores and feedback on their homework assignments and projects completed during the study. The Teacher was not given access to the TTCT scores at any time during or after the study, but was presented the scores of the TOEFL Jr test at the end of the study so they could be discussed in the final interview.

All video and audio recordings and transcripts of classroom interaction have been anonymized. Any content that might identify a speaker has been removed from the transcript. I possess one unaltered copy of the recordings as a backup and the research itself was conducted using the anonymized versions. Participants were free to withdraw from the project at any time. Indeed, three students unenrolled from the Textbook-driven Group and six unenrolled from the Project-based learning Group during the study. Data collected up to the point of withdrawal is used in the research; as this study observed/recorded and subsequently analysed/transcribed classroom interaction, input, in whole or in part, could not be removed as doing so would affect the coherency and flow of the interaction. However, the confidentiality of the collected data from any student that withdrew is maintained.

An important factor affecting potential research bias was the Teacher’s preference for one curriculum or group of students over the other. This was continuously analysed by the researcher and is addressed further in the Findings chapters. Another bias is the subjective nature of qualitative research which, as has been pointed out, can potentially be regarded as the researcher merely finding what they are looking for (Seale, 1999; Silverman & Marvasti, 2008). However, naturalistic inquiry, such as ethnography, presumes an element of bias and subjectivity and this is an accepted part of being human and formulating observations (P. Atkinson & Hammersley, 1994; Larsen-Freeman & Cameron, 2008a). Furthermore, Troman and
Jeffrey (2010) assert the subjective lens allows the researcher to focus on the meaningfulness and emotional responses of being part of the social and collaborative process of creativity.

However, even with the recognition of the embedded subjectivity of qualitative research, there is nonetheless a concern that participants may feel misrepresented or misinterpreted, or that inaccurate generalisations are made and/or only a ‘selective’ sampling of the data was conducted. Therefore, in accordance with the ethical ideals of ethnography, this study attempts to portray the participants and findings openly, comprehensively and accurately and hence a debriefing and question and answer session with participants was conducted at the conclusion of the study (Fetterman, 2010; Hammersley, 2006; Kaplan-Weinger & Ullman, 2014). Additionally, participants and parents/legal guardians were offered the opportunity to stay abreast of the researcher’s findings, presentations, published articles, and any other professional work and subsequent research using data from this study and were given the contact details of the researcher to address any concerns that arise.

Video and audio recordings and subsequent transcriptions introduce their own ethical concerns. As stated above, confidentiality of all participants is of tremendous concern, and all efforts have been made to ensure confidentiality. Parents/Guardians were provided full disclosure of the nature, intent, and elements of the study. No deception was embedded or intended at any point in this study and there was no potential for physical, psychological, or emotional harm outside of normal school/classroom situations. Parents/Guardians, as well as the students, teachers, and administrators were required to read and sign consent forms. Only pseudonyms are used for student-participants throughout this thesis.

In order to compensate the Teacher for her work, energy, and commitment (M. B. Miles et al., 2013), remuneration was paid by the researcher at a competitive rate which was determined cooperatively with the Teacher and administrator. Compensation for the students was participation in this English course for free. Private English education is expensive in Korea, averaging around $200/month for several hours of study per week, so this was an excellent opportunity for students to receive free extra-curricular English lessons with a qualified native-speaking teacher. All students who completed the one-year of study received a high-quality certificate of completion (Appendix P) for partaking in the course.

With a thorough understanding of the research design, participants, and contexts, the data collection instruments, methods, and modes of analysis, and a recognition of the caveats inherent in data collection, I now turn to the findings chapters. The main objectives of the remaining chapters are to exemplify and define creativity in the L2 classroom, expound on the participants’ perspective on creativity and the
curriculum, and to evaluate the learner/environment differences that emerged between the two curricular approaches.
CHAPTER 4: FINDINGS 1: EXPLORING THE CHARACTERISTICS OF CREATIVITY IN THE L2 CLASSROOM

“Creativity isn’t the way I think, it’s the way I like to live.”
—Paul Sandip

This chapter is dedicated to answering the first Research Question, which is:

When viewed through the Modified Systems Model of Creativity for the L2 Classroom, what are the essential characteristics that can define creativity in a language learning environment?

What constitutes creativity in any context is contingent upon how it is defined, therefore it was first necessary to determine the characteristics of creative behaviour in classroom interaction that would be the focus of evaluation. A template of possible creative traits, built upon the extensive multi-disciplinary literature on the topic, was drawn at the outset of the study (as detailed in Chapter 2) with five key characteristics eventually determined to be the most salient and critical in fostering creativity in the language learning environment in the current study. They are: (1) Original and Appropriate; (2) Process-(but not step-by-step)-Oriented; (3) Openness to Experience; (4) Meaningful Work; and (5) Collaboration.

The following sub-sections use one example from each curriculum to describe each of the five characteristics. The analysis for this chapter began as an exploratory investigation into what “characteristics” constitute creativity in the language learning classroom, and each subsection first deals with the qualifying examination of each curriculum and how the characteristics manifested in the empirical data. The last subsection of each “Creative characteristic” employs the Modified Systems Model of Creativity for the L2 Classroom, which was constructed following several rounds of deductive analysis of the classroom data, to investigate the ways in which affordances for each characteristic were and were not exploited in the given examples. This chapter aims to demonstrate the important consideration that must be given to affordances when activating the characteristics of creativity. While the extracts exemplify that creative potential is possible in most classroom activities, they also illustrate that the different foci of the curricula substantially affect the students’ and teacher’s perceptions of affordances for creativity and language-use.

4.1 Originality and Appropriateness

In Chapter 2, Originality was defined as being novel to the creator (or group of creators) and Appropriateness is defined as creating something befitting to the task while working within a set of conventions or established constraints (Amabile, 1996; Beghetto & Kaufman, 2007; Robinson, 2011). In
the language classroom, students are expected to learn the core language objectives of a unit, and it is within these guidelines and requirements that students have opportunities to infuse novelty, individual knowledge, and their personal interpretations of the activity or project. These two attributes co-exist to operationalise opportunities for students to expand their linguistic repertoire by using new language. “New language” here refers to using lexical items or grammatical structures not found in the current or previous textbook units (and not given as examples by the teacher), but may also include applying previously learned language in new ways or to new situations (for example, converting a noun to adjective form or applying a vocabulary item to a different context); it is important to point out that “novel” language use does not require correctness. It should also be acknowledged that it is impossible for a teacher (or the researcher) to know the full extent of a students’ current lexical repertoire, hence it is entirely possible that a student already knows the words being considered “original” by this definition; nonetheless, while perhaps not “original” to them, they are introducing new language into the learning environment and perhaps to other learners. Both the Textbook-driven Curriculum and the PBL Curriculum provide structure within the activities and projects, but grant opportunities for creativity as well, as the examples below intend to demonstrate.

4.1.1 Originality & Appropriateness: Project-Based Learning Curriculum

Unit 1 of the textbook introduces different nationalities, occupations, and descriptive adjectives. The project in the PBL Curriculum required each group (of three students each) to create a brochure for an imaginary international school. As part of the project, they were to include sample courses and a design of the building, and were also expected to incorporate three key grammatical structures and thirteen vocabulary items in their brochure/presentation, although they had flexibility in which vocabulary words they chose (see detailed project requirements in Table 4.1.1A).

On the first day of the project cycle, the Coaching Stage on 15 November 2014, the teacher went over the main theme and key language of Unit 1, and explained the concept and requirements for their first project. At the end of the session, students were informed that their homework would be to independently produce three ideas for the project (Concept Generation Stage), and to email them to the teacher at least one day before the next class. However, only three students completed this homework assignment, so, on 22 November 2014, the teacher allowed approximately 15 minutes at the start of class for students to finish.
Table 4.1A: Project #1: Design Your Own School Project - Requirements Checklist

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thematic Requirements</th>
<th>Vocabulary Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Design a brochure for an international school that everybody in your group would</td>
<td>• At least 3 countries with national adjectives (Nationalities)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>be interested in attending – can be for any age, but it must be a school</td>
<td>• At least 5 occupations from Unit 1 or other occupations you would like to include</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The brochure must be in colour</td>
<td>• At least 5 descriptive adjectives (rich, dangerous, interesting, difficult, etc. –</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The brochure must have at least 4 pages</td>
<td>from pp. 8–10 or use your own words)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Remember, the brochure is an advertisement for your school so it should explain the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>school, the courses, the campus/facilities, the students and the teachers – the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>brochure should convince new students to come</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The school can be in a real place (city/country) or a fictional place (e.g. an alien</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>planet)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grammar Requirements</th>
<th>Presentation Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• At least 2 Contractions of “Be” verb: I am = I’m; he is = he’s; you are = you’re;</td>
<td>• Presentation must be at least 5 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>etc.</td>
<td>• You should have your brochure when you present, but you do not need a PPT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Also use several examples of “Be” + adjective: It’s boring; He’s happy; She’s</td>
<td>• Everybody in your group should speak during the presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tired; etc.</td>
<td>• Be Creative! Do not just read from the brochure, be creative in how you present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• At least 2 Possessive nouns</td>
<td>the information – think of your presentation as a commercial for your school</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Following this, the teacher announced the groups (chosen by the teacher) and the students arranged themselves into their groups and began the Confrontation Stage. Two of the Cases, Julie and Kevin, were together in Group #2 along with another student named Ailee. After Ailee and Julie shared their three ideas, Kevin, remained silent and, as his group waited for his contribution, the following dialogue ensued:

**Julie:** (To Kevin) Please say active. I want to listen to your ideas. This is not me and Ailee’s project. This is our project, okay? Please say something. Oh really.

Kevin remained silent.

**Julie:** I want to make the school really creative. I haven’t, like, ‘I haven’t seen this school.’

**Ailee:** Imaginary?

**Julie:** Yeah. Imaginary.

**Kevin:** (excitedly) Alien School!
Julie: Alien School? Oh (laughter from the whole group). Then we study about alien and UFO, unidentified flying object? Like that?

Ailee: How about other ideas?

Julie: You know what, in Seoul there is a chicken university.

Ailee: Really?

Julie: Yeah.

Ailee: That school makes chicken?

Julie: Yeah, but I don’t know really. I just watched the word, but I think it’s not real university.

Kevin: Pizza University.

Julie: Pizza University. They just make pizza?

Ailee: Research . . .

Kevin: Creative pizza.

Ailee: Research about pizza.

Julie: Okay. Let’s write and choose. I will write and say, our first idea is Pizza School, oh, Pizza School.

A few other ideas were offered by Julie and Ailee (which they read from their prepared list) and Julie recorded them in a notebook. Then, Kevin made another suggestion:

Kevin: Detective school!

Julie: Detective School! Ooh! That’s really cool! Really cool.

The group decided to proceed with the detective school idea (see Figure 4.1.1 below for the final project design). First, it is interesting that unlike the alien and pizza school ideas, the detective school was not on Kevin’s pre-written list. Certainly, drafting the idea in the Concept Generation Stage would not have disqualified it from being “original,” but it is notable that after his first two ideas were not well received, he volunteered a new idea spontaneously rather than simply suggesting the third idea from his list. When asked after the presentation five weeks later how he came up with the idea, he replied, “I just thought of it suddenly.” Further, there appears to be little thematic connection between his other two ideas, or the ideas offered by the group members earlier in the conversation, or the occupations listed in the textbook (there is no mention of “detective” anywhere in Unit 1).

The detective school concept satisfies the requirement of “appropriateness” as well. The brochure used a “Sherlock Holmes” theme to give it an international appeal as the books, movies, and television show are widely popular around the world, including Korea (one requirement was that it be an “international school” that students would like to attend). The group was creative with the school design requirement as
well, making the inside a maze, inventing courses such as “Criminals’ Psychology” (p. 3), and deciding to have “math and history” courses (believing detectives need a well-rounded education) (p. 4). The brochure was eight pages in total (only four were required) and the group covered most of the major components of the project checklist (a list of completed requirements is listed in Table 4.1.1B)

Table 4.1.1B: Completed Requirements for Project #1 (Group #2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5 Occupations</th>
<th>3 Nationalities</th>
<th>3 “be” verb Contractions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ Prosecutor (pp. 3, 5)</td>
<td>✓ New Zealand (front)</td>
<td>✓ Hello. I’m Sophie (p. 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Police Officer (pp. 3, 4, 6)</td>
<td>✓ France (p. 5)</td>
<td>✓ Isn’t it dangerous (p. 6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Private Investigator (p. 3)</td>
<td>✓ Japan (p. 6)</td>
<td>✓ So I’m quite famous (letter insert)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Detective (p. 3, 4, letter insert)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Doctor (letter insert)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, they did not fulfil all the requirements; for example, they were expected to incorporate three national adjectives, but included only one, “Japanese” (p. 6). Nonetheless, they demonstrated originality in both the design aspect as well as language use, and engaged the chosen theme to enact most of the project elements, generally meeting the “appropriate” provision in terms of the project constraints, with perhaps some room for improvement (this was the first project after all).
Figure 4.1.1.: Design Your Own School Project: Group #2 – A Detective School
4.1.2 Originality and Appropriateness: Textbook-Driven Curriculum

On 19 December 2014, the TB-driven Group were at the end of the same unit (Unit 1). Students were asked to first work alone to complete the activity of the Communication section of the unit, which appears on the last page of Unit 1 (see Figure 4.1.2). The instructions of the exercise are: Write jobs in the chart, dividing jobs that women do well, and jobs that men do well (Milner, 2010).

Figure 4.1.2: Heinle Cengage World English 1™ Unit 1 (p. 13)
To complete Part 2 of the exercise, the Teacher asked the students to work in groups of three to compare their lists. She placed two of the Cases, Ann and Kellan, in the same group with another student named Stella. She then provided instructions for the group activity:

**T:** How should we start out? One person can say, oh on my list the jobs I think women do well are nurse, doctor, babysitter, teacher, cook, seamstress, stewardess, and waitress. Then, another person can say, oh, me too. I also said babysitter and teacher. What about nurse and doctor? No, I didn’t say that one. Okay? So, each person, say what you chose for your women list, then you talk about it in English. What’s the same? What’s different? Okay? Then, after you finish talking about women, do the men’s list, okay. Alright? Ready go.

**Ann:** Teacher, singer (the rest of her list is inaudible). (Teacher then approached them, and picked up Kellan’s book). It’s not in English (referring to Kellan’s written answers).

**T:** Kellan. That’s in Korean, isn’t it? Stand up. Go over there (points to the corner of the room).

**Kellan:** English! (Indicating that he had in fact written his responses in English)

**T:** Just because you wrote the Romanized version of Hangeul (the Korean language) doesn’t mean it’s not Korean. You wrote it. You didn’t speak it. Kellan you’re supposed to be speaking in English right now with your group, but you’re just playing. Kellan, please be serious about the work. Did you read the list that women do well? Did you finish reading (to Ann)? Did you (to Stella)? Why are you talking about it? Why are you talking about random words? Are your lists all the same? Did you say, what’s the same?

**Stella:** No.

**T:** What’s the same? No, do they also have stewardess and cook? Do they have it?

**Stella:** (Points to her own book) Cook. (Points to Ann’s book) Cook. All.

**T:** Okay, so why do you think women are good at being cooks? Talk about it.

**Ann:** I think women can make many delicious food well.

**T:** (To Kellan) What do you think about cook?

**Kellan:** Um, because I copied her book.

**T:** Why did you copy somebody else’s (Kellan laughs).

**Kellan:** I’m sorry. (Teacher puts her head down in frustration)

**T:** How about you Stella, why did you write cook?

**Stella:** Woman are good at using their hands.

**T:** So, what did you guys have that was different for women?

**Stella:** Writer.

**T:** Do you have writer. You too (indicating that Lily also listed “writer” in the “Woman” category). (To Kellan) You don’t have writer. Kellan, why do you think woman are not good at being writers?

**Kellan:** I can’t think of it.

**T:** What’s one that is different?
Stella: Designer.

T: (To Lily) You don’t have designer?

Kellan: I don’t have designer.

T: So, why do you guys think? Why? (The Teacher then walks away to speak to another group)

Ann: Ballerina. I think Ballerina, women ballerina. I saw so many women ballerinas.

The teacher had some difficulty keeping groups on task and speaking in English and because of this, she decided to end the activity before Ann, Stella, and Kellan could compare the men’s occupations list.

In terms of Originality, neither “cook” nor “designer” appear in the textbook unit, but the teacher used the word “cook” for several examples when discussing occupations earlier in the lesson, and again in the instructions for this activity; however, Stella’s inclusion of “designer” on her list seems to constitute originality as it was not extracted from the textbook and had not been mentioned by the Teacher. With this lone exception, all other responses by group members were directly from the textbook until Ann submits “Ballerina,” which does not appear in any unit of the book but did emerge in the previous class lesson when Lily volunteered it as a response to an image of a woman in a dance studio (see Figure 6.1.1 for context). Nonetheless, as nobody else in the group possessed this answer, and it is not taken directly from the textbook, it would constitute originality as defined in this study. There may be an argument that, given this definition, “cook” could also be considered original. However, the word “ballerina,” which does not appear in the book, was taken from one context/activity and applied to another, which is often considered an aspect of divergent thinking while cook was given as an example by this teacher as an example for this specific task. In fact, students jotted down nearly all the occupations that the teacher gave as examples in her pre-activity instructions (nurse, doctor, babysitter, teacher, cook, and waitress).

Students’ written responses and subsequent conversation were also appropriate for the task. Stella and Ann adhered to the task requirements, wrote acceptable responses, and answered the teacher’s request to validate their answers with reasons. Kellan, however, violates task appropriateness by writing his answers in Korean (although he did use the English alphabet, which might itself be considered a form of divergent thinking) and copied his answers from Stella, which visibly upset the Teacher. Despite Kellan’s transgressions, new language was used during the task (e.g. “designer and “ballerina”), and, for the most part, they worked within the task constraints, therefore Originality and Appropriateness were achieved. Although speculative, it is likely that had they continued the activity (in English) more original language would have been evoked as the students were searching their phones when the teacher terminated the activity.
4.1.3 Originality and Appropriateness: Comparative Analysis of Affordances

Following the Modified Systems of Creativity in the L2 Classroom (shown again in Figure 4.1.3 for easy reference), this analysis compares how originality and appropriateness are enacted in the two curricula, and indeed, how they may be perceived differently by the participants.

In the PBL-Curriculum, students were able to be “original” with their school design, the courses they chose, and the language they used both in their projects and in their discussions. Because of this flexibility, the two-way flow between the curriculum/materials (Domain) and the students (Persons) was activated—the students became important actors in interpreting and making decisions about the projects. The two-way flow between the teacher (Field) and the curriculum/materials (Domain) is also present as the teacher required specific criteria, but also permitted flexibility in the design and encouraged novelty and imagination (Affordances). However, in terms of appropriateness, certain learning objectives were omitted in the final project, such as the number of “nationality adjectives.” This could be problematic in an environment where test-preparation is imperative and providing adequate instruction and practice with specific content is emphasized. Nonetheless, the learning environment in the PBL Curriculum offers affordances for students (Persons) to exercise their creativity and use English to express their ideas.

As can be seen in the PBL-Group transcript, the Teacher (Field) is not involved in the entire 4-minute conversation, yet, because she was essentially absent from the interaction, it might be argued that students (Persons) were not receiving adequate feedback; that is, the two-way flow between the language that was being produced as a result of language-use affordances and the Teacher’s (Field) affordances for feedback, regarding both the students’ project ideas and language use, was not being exploited. Moreover, students may have needed more time to adjust to this new learning environment as the limited interaction with the Teacher and lack of feedback arguably caused some discomfort,
particularly for those who were more self-conscious about their English-speaking abilities. My field notes on 22 November 2014 point to the difficulty some students were having in this new classroom dynamic:

*Group #1 (Taylor, Amber, and Diana) have long bouts of silence. Each time this happens, the teacher steps in and begins asking them questions. I think she should let them sit there and struggle, but maybe they are not really trying to talk. This is the lowest level group (in terms of English proficiency).*

This is an example in which the ill-defined nature between students (Person) and the Curriculum/Materials (Domain) hindered productive engagement; when students did not have the familiarity of a textbook exercise, they struggled to understand exactly what was expected of them.

However, two of the three groups appeared to communicate well and took advantage of the language-use affordances. In regards to Kevin, Julie, and Ailee, I noted:

*Group #2 works diligently. Uses laptop to find ideas for classroom design roles. Kevin begins design with Julie and Ailee to use the classroom laptop to find ideas. Students appear to be engaged. They stay in English and decide on materials.*

Students (Persons) in this group seemed to better understand that the Teacher (Field) was placing the impetus on them to create something novel, with the project constraints in mind. As they worked, the materials (Domain) provoked affordances for both language use and creativity and, in turn, the opportunity to use English to communicate with little input from the Teacher — this was essential to the process of ideation and to the eventual construction of the project.

In the Textbook-driven Curriculum, the materials/curriculum (Domain) are clearer and there is evident organisation of the lesson (page by page). There is no modification of the material by either the Teacher (Field) or the students (Persons) and this has the potential to restrict creativity, particularly as it relates to originality. Yet, in the sample above, the textbook activity on page 13 does provide affordances for creative language use. Lily and Ann appear to exploit this opportunity, while Kellan does not.

The greatest restriction to promoting more original language use in the TB-driven Curriculum is that the interaction is predominantly controlled by the Teacher (Field). As seen in the transcript, the Teacher speaks nearly every other turn in a question and answer format and this limits students’ opportunities to speak (Affordances), and in particular to interact with each other (Chou, 2010). Reciprocally, the lack of language-use affordances appears to condition students into waiting for the Teacher to ask a question and call on them by name. In my field notes on 19 December 2014, while observing the TB-Group, I indicated:

*T holds the book, prompts Ss to answer questions from the textbook. Ss give short responses – teacher corrects their answers. T very much in control of interaction as students wait to be called on to respond. [...] Fascinating dynamic of interaction: T prompts and Ss answer. T does not ask for much elaboration, probably because Ss are producing only*
While the Teacher does not ask students to elaborate on their answers, I noted that she does offer frequent feedback, albeit mostly regarding grammatical accuracy and whether the students’ answers to the textbook questions were correct. This activity, composing a list of jobs men and women do well, has the potential to create affordances for originality, however students mostly adhered to the information provided by the book, suggesting that appropriateness is being conflated with correctness: students use the jobs that have been previously discussed because they have not been advised that novelty is valued in the context of this textbook activity. Again, the Teacher’s management of the interactional sequence also seems to be limiting student responses, or at least, it narrows the variety of communicative affordances available for students to express their ideas.

The Teacher indicates that the structure of the TB-driven Curriculum is more comfortable for her as well as a result of her teaching experiences. After stating that she felt uneasy when she was not talking in the PBL-Curriculum, I asked if teaching this way was a changing role for her; she responded (Interview, 29 November 2014):

**T:** Definitely. Because, uh, especially with the way our academy works, I’m encouraged by my boss to really step in there to give them patterned sentences. Like, uh, to give them English patterns and for them to follow my dialogue and I have to do it all the time. And if they don’t do it right, I have to keep making them do it again and again so they do it right. I’m used to being the only speaker in the class, basically.

The comment, “And if they don’t do it right, I have to keep making them do it again and again so they do it right,” suggests that she equates appropriateness with accuracy and it can be argued that it is difficult for originality to emerge from repeating patterned sentences. Although Ann and Lily demonstrate some originality in the TB-driven Curriculum activity, coming up with words beyond the textbook to complete the task, there is a stemmed flow between language-use affordances and the curriculum/materials (Domain). The Teacher expresses that this approach is reflective of her regular teaching context; when asked to compare the two curricula, she remised (29, January 2015):

**T:** I would say that the class where we’re just doing the textbook is just, it’s just like any other class that I would have at [this academy]. I just talk to them about the book. Um, it seems like they’re not really excited to be there and they’re not really thrilled by what we’re doing in class. […] It just seems like any other class that I would have. I thought it would be more engaging, but it doesn’t seem like, they, they don’t care. It’s just any other book that I would normally teach them.

While affordances for originality exist in both curricula, the Teacher appears to interpret “appropriateness” differently in the two classes. It can be argued that it is this interpretation that causes the contrast in the interactional dynamic more than the activities themselves.
4.2 Process-(but not step-by-step)-Oriented

When students take a process-oriented approach they become aware that trial-and-error is part of the learning endeavour and that creativity arises out of the process of trying something new and progressing towards enhancing one’s skill (Götz, 1981; K. Sawyer, 2013). It is this process of risk taking, when a learner produces an utterance that does not conform to linguistic norms but is nonetheless appropriate in context, that makes learner language inherently creative (Densky, 2015; Ellis, 2015a). When creativity is seen as a process, the focus becomes the thinking and decision-making practices that are directed towards producing something that the maker(s) consider creative (R. Jones, 2014). There are numerous examples of how students and the Teacher took a process-oriented approach in both groups throughout the yearlong course. The example provided from the PBL-Group demonstrates the progressive ideation and modifications during group discussions as they adopted and developed their third project of the year, the Mini-Drama. The extracts taken from the TB-driven curriculum highlights the process the students undertook as they completed the unit activities and learned the major linguistic and thematic concepts from the textbook.

4.2.1 Process (but-not-step-by-step)-Oriented: Project-based Learning Curriculum

The following conversation excerpts are from the first day of the Creation stage of Project #3 as students in the PBL curriculum iteratively developed their script for an original drama about traveling to a foreign country. Two units were combined for this project, Unit 3 (Going Places) and Unit 6 (Destinations). The project required groups to write and perform a 20-minute Mini-Drama about travelling to a foreign country. The excerpts occur on 4 April 2015, in which only two members of the group were present, Kevin and Julie (Jane and Matt were absent):

**Julie:** What about this? Each person does something. For example, father drives a car and he has a car accident, and the mother loses her suitcase, and the son lost his passport, and daughter just disappeared. Finally, they meet together and go to Spain, but there, they lose something again.

**Kevin:** Many problems.

**Julie:** Yes.

**Kevin:** So, that’s good.

**Julie:** Yeah, I like this. Do you have some other ideas?

**Kevin:** Not yet.

**T:** Did you guys choose what you want? Do you have a good idea? Now you need to outline it. Don’t make a detailed story, you don’t have enough time [today]. You can do that next time with your group, just make an outline of the story you’re gonna make when you know how many characters there are. What kind of costumes do you need? What kind of
props do you want to make? If you want to make a background, it is up to you because if you have an outline then you can make a plan for each person to do what you need them to do . . .

**Julie:** Think about the background we need. Somewhere we go, winter, spring, autumn.

**Kevin:** When is the Tomato Festival?

**Julie:** Let’s search about that (Julie picks up her phone and searches for the date of the Tomato Festival in Spain; Kevin looks on). It’s in August.

**Kevin:** August. Okay.

They proceeded to record information about the Tomato Festival in Buñol, Spain (which does not appear in the textbook) on the internet, but discussion waned as they copied down the information. After they had written the details of the festival, they began to discuss more about the characters in their drama. Approximately 22 minutes after the discussion above, they had the following exchange:

**Julie:** If you want to do this one or this one [referring to character roles], you can do it. But, I don’t . . . I think we have to give them [Jane and Matt] very hard roles because they are absent today (Julie laughs).

**Kevin:** I think Matt is Taxi Driver.

**Julie:** (Laughing) How about Jane is Mom, and Matt is Dad? I think it’s good, right (Kevin nods in agreement)?

**Kevin:** And we need more characters.

For the next 15 minutes, they continued to write down and discuss ideas, after which the Teacher clarified the requirements for the performance and suggested that they work on creating different scenes for their drama. Based on the Teacher’s explanation about the performance, Julie and Kevin had the following exchange in the final six minutes of class:

**Kevin:** Let’s change the part, Part 2.

**Julie:** So you didn’t like that play and you didn’t like that play either (referring to what they had previously written)?

**Kevin:** Yes.

**Julie:** Okay, then, what about Mom? Actually, my character, uh, I like that play and . . .

**Kevin:** How about the mom says, “But it was a good experience.”

**Julie:** That sounds nice. Good. Then, start the story. This is the beginning of the story, let’s go on to the next part. This is about the vacation.

**Kevin:** In the past? (Kevin verifies that the event occurs in the past because the script is written as a “flashback” sequence in which the family is remembering the day that their trip began)

**Julie:** Right, in the past. In the morning, hmm . . .

**Kevin:** Father says, “Today, the date has come.”

**Julie:** “We have to get there by 9AM.” Kevin, um, can he say, “The taxi is waiting outside?”
Kevin: They are taking the taxi to the airport?

Julie: Oh right, (looks at the project requirement’s checklist), oh right, we should say, “Did you pack your bags?”

Kevin: How about son saying, “No, I didn’t?”

Julie: Your lines? (Kevin nods).

Kevin: How about saying, “Where is my passport, Mom?”

Julie: Yeah, that’s good.

The process-orientation of the PBL-Curriculum allowed students to discuss various options, preferences, and obstacles and iteratively develop and refine their work (Hetland et al., 2007; K. Sawyer, 2012; Stoller, 2002). This is evident when they change the characters that the group members will play and decide to alter elements of the characters’ personality to match the student who will play the part. Julie and Kevin progressively added to the script by suggesting new lines and then expanded on them, at times becoming conscious of the project requirements (Kevin reminded them that the script should be in the present tense despite the events in the story taking place in the past). The procedure they followed embodies trial and error — Kevin and Julie took turns suggesting ideas, and then they worked to clarify their ideas and write the dialogue for the script, making further revisions after the Teacher clarified her expectations for the performance. At this point they were still unsure of the overall plot or the characters that they would include in the story, but eluded to these ideas and understood that they would need to be developed as they worked toward completing the script.

4.2.2 Process-(but not step-by-step)-Oriented: Textbook-driven Curriculum

Chapter 3 pointed out that ELT textbooks can provide certain advantages for teachers and students, such as a concrete lesson structure, a convenient means of presenting new materials, and a way to help the teacher ensure cohesion, continuation, and organization through a series of language forms and features (Tomlinson, 2001a, 2001b). There is evidence of the textbook providing such structure as students engaged in the process of completing the exercises and the Teacher followed the textbook plan and activities. The following extracts, from 13 February 2015, are taken from when students were completing pages 34-35 (Figures 4.2.2A and 4.2.2B, respectively) in Unit 3, entitled Going Places. As the TB-Group advanced through the units more quickly, there was no need to combine units (recall that the PBL-Group consolidated Units 3 & 6):
Reading

A. Answer the questions.

1. Do you think the author enjoys traveling? ____________________________
   ____________________________
   ____________________________

2. Why should you check the expiration date of your passport? ________________
   ____________________________
   ____________________________

3. Why should you tie a sock to your bags? ________________________________
   ____________________________
   ____________________________

4. Why should you take a good book when you travel? ______________________
   ____________________________
   ____________________________

5. Write a list of snacks you would take when traveling by air. ________________
   ____________________________
   ____________________________

Real Language

We use the expression share some pointers to say give advice.

Word Focus

expiration date = The expiration date of a document is the date it comes to an end or can no longer be used.

EXPERT OPINION

In his book Easy Travel, Mike Connelly, shares some pointers on making travel easy:

- DOCUMENTS Make sure you have all your documents: passport, visas, tickets, traveler’s checks, etc. You should always check the expiration date of your passport. Many countries won’t let you enter with less than six months left on your passport. Don’t forget to buy medical insurance. Medical bills

Figure 4.2.2A: Heinle Cengage World English 1™, Unit 3 (p. 34)
can be very expensive, especially in the United States and Europe. Finally, you should make copies of all your important documents and credit cards and keep them in another bag.

■ PACKING My advice is—always travel light! I hate to carry heavy bags. Just take the minimum. There is an old saying: Breakfast in Berlin. Dinner in Delhi. Bags in Bangkok! So don’t pack anything important in your check-in bag; put important things in your carry-on bag. You don’t want to arrive home without your house keys. Another tip—don’t use expensive suitcases. People don’t steal dirty old bags. Finally, here’s a good little tip—tie a sock or brightly colored string to your bags. Why? So you can quickly see your bag on the airport carousel.

■ THE AIRPORT My first piece of advice is that you should always carry a good book. It helps to pass the time as you wait for your delayed flight. Don’t forget to take a sweater or a jacket on the plane. It can get very cold on a long night flight. And then there is airline food. Take a snack (cookies or fruit) with you. Sometimes the food is late, sometimes it doesn’t arrive at all, and it’s never very good.

B. Circle T for true and F for false.
1. You need a lot of documents to travel. T F
2. You need to take a lot of clothes in your bag. T F
3. Bags can be hard to identify at the airport. T F
4. Flights are never late. T F
5. Airplane food is always good. T F

Writing
Write some travel tips for your country. Think about the following topics:
- transportation
- how to carry money
- Can you drink the water?

Thailand is a safe country and the people are very friendly. But, like most places, you should be careful. Here are some tips:
- Taxis are cheap, but ask the price first.
- Many tourists use tuk tuks. However, they are dangerous. Be careful.
- Don’t use the buses. They are slow and crowded.
- Don’t carry a lot of money with you. Most shops accept credit cards.
- The water is not safe to drink, so you should buy water in bottles.
- Don’t go out alone at night.

Have a nice stay!

Goal 4 Share special travel tips with others

Read your travel tips to a partner. Then share them with the class.
Go to page 34 and 35 and let’s continue. So, today we’re going to learn how to share special travel tips with others. […] Alright, so reading. Answer the questions after we read. Before we read, I want you to look at the “Real Language” and the “Word Focus” box on page 34. Okay, real language, we use the expression, “Share some pointers” to give advice. Share some pointers, like, oh, I’ll share some pointers with you; don’t bring too many credit cards, they can be stolen. Can you share some pointer with me? Oh yeah, sure, the last time I went to the Bahamas, I got malaria. Be sure to get vaccine before you go. These are how you give advice and tips to others about traveling. What about expiration date? The expiration date of a document is the date it comes to an end and can no longer be used. Most documents have some kind of expiration date, especially the ones we learned about in the book. Now, look here at the picture, what do you see in the picture?

Stella: A man.

T: A man. What does he look like?

Lily: A business man.

T: He looks like a business man. Is he carrying lots of luggage?

Stella: Ah, he wears shoes.

T: He just has two carry-on bags, he’s got a suit. Okay. The title is Smart Traveller. Okay. So expert opinion. In his book, Easy Travel, Mike Connelly shares some pointers on making travel easy (this is read directly from the picture caption on p. 34). So, I assume this is the author or just an example of how to travel easily. Okay, um, Max, Michelle, and Emma, please read to us about documents. Ready? 1, 2, 3 . . . Why is it only Michelle reading? Max, Michelle, and Emma, please. 1, 2, 3 . . .

Max, Emma, and Michelle read the first paragraph in unison.

T: Okay, thank you guys, but next time please make a higher volume and speak more clearly. I had a hard time understanding you. Michelle your voice was okay, but Max definitely you have to be louder and don’t mumble. You too Emma, you’re so quiet, okay? Lily, Ann, and Stella, please do PACKING. Ready? 1, 2, 3 . . .

Lily, Ann, and Stella read the PACKING paragraph (p. 99) in chorus. The Teacher then asks Kellan, Danny, and Holly to read the final paragraph, THE AIRPORT (p. 99). The Teacher spends approximately six minutes asking students comprehension questions from the passage, which she formulates on her own (i.e. the questions are not from the textbook). She then moves to the READING A section on page 34: Answer the questions. The Teacher read the questions aloud, asked students if they understood the questions, and instructed them to write in complete sentences. She gave them a little more than five minutes to record their written answers, then began to ask the questions from the textbook.

T: For the first question, do you think that the author enjoys traveling. What’s an author?

Danny: A writer.

Lily: A person who writes.

T: He’s a writer and especially in this article we just read, he’s the writer for this story, so because he’s writing about traveling, do you think he enjoys it? Do you think he likes it or not? It’s not asking to give any details or support your answer. You can just say yes he does, or no he doesn’t. Like that, okay? If you want to say because, like the way he writes, that’s okay too. I like that, but that’s not what the question requires. Alright, Max finish, Lily finish, Ann finish, Emma finish, Stella finish, Holly finish . . . you guys finished (to Kellan and Danny)?

Danny: One question (he says this to indicate to the teacher that he wants to ask a question).
T: Which one are you having a hard time with?

Danny: Five.

T: Number five. You just have to write down a list of snacks that you have to take with you on the airplane. What snacks do you like?

Danny: Snacks?

T: Yeah, types of snacks, brands if you want to. Okay? Make a list. Okay, did you finish your list? (She then encourages Danny to hurry up and finish).

The Teacher continued to ask questions 2~5 on page 34. After question 3, Michelle asked the Teacher:

Michelle: Teacher, the question says you, so I have to use “I”?

T: The way that you should write the sentence, is that what your question is? Ah, you can say “won’t let me enter with less than . . .” When they say “you,” they mean a generalized “you,” everybody. Okay? (To another student) Oh, you did “me” too? Alright. That’s fine, that’s fine. Number 5, write a list of snacks you would like to take when travelling by air. Um, Stella, which snacks would you like to take with you on the airplane?

Stella: I would take peanuts and crackers.

The Teacher proceeded by asking students question number 5 (*Which snacks would you take on the airplane with you?*). She made a brief comment about each student’s list, and then mentioned rising and falling intonation pattern. Students completed Part B, question number 1, as a whole class (True and False questions on page 35), and the Teacher instructed them to complete questions 2~5 on their own.

The Teacher followed the textbook lesson plan rather precisely, but did provide additional questions, as well as correction and feedback to their responses. As Tomlinson (2001b) points out, textbooks designed around a competency-based ESL framework combine explicit learning of specific language features and opportunities for practical use; this section of the unit is intended to provide such opportunities while also incorporating the vocabulary from earlier in the unit. While the lessons are directed by the textbook and primarily led by the Teacher using the IRF format (Teacher Initiate › Student Response › Teacher Feedback), students are encouraged to write their own individual responses and were given opportunities (as designated by the teacher) to read the text and relay their written answers. The Teacher also provided feedback to students’ responses and expected them to modify their answer when incorrect.

The lesson is clearly structured and students can measure their progress through the unit, first understanding the main objectives, then learning the vocabulary items and grammar, and finally reading and applying the language to the textbook’s questions on pages 34 and 35. There is a Writing section on page 35 that asked them to report their own traveling tips, an activity which gave students the opportunity to go back through the steps in the unit and retrieve the grammatical concepts and lexical items that were pertinent, while also using some of their own ideas, knowledge, and language. The students’ responses,
however, were rather short at least in part because the Teacher directly told them that “yes” or “no” answers were suitable to the task and because she permitted only about five minutes for completing the task.

4.2.3 Process-(but not step-by-step)-Oriented: A Comparative Analysis of Affordance

In the PBL Curriculum, Kevin and Julie took advantage of opportunities for iteration in the creative process, and the “not step-by-step” caveat is reflected in their task planning. They began by consolidating ideas, then, after considering how many characteristics they would include, jumped ahead in the script to the location of the “family vacation” and conducted research on the Tomato Festival. Following this, despite being uncertain about exactly how many characters they would have, they began to assign roles (who will play which part), and these decisions informed the script. Next, they first revised parts of the script, changing and adding dialogue, before continuing with the story.

In this project cycle, the Teacher appeared to be more conscious about how students (Persons) incorporated the project requirements (Domain) and examined their ideas at various points during the class. In doing so, she activated the two-way flow between the teacher (Field) and language-use affordances by providing more feedback, yet she continued to encourage creativity as an essential part of the process (prompting them to think about costumes, props, and backgrounds) (Domain). The Teacher’s greater attention towards offering guidance and evaluation is complemented by increased affordances for feedback through the script (Domain) and the discussion (Affordances) produced by Kevin and Julie (Persons).

In composing the script, which they eventually performed, Kevin and Julie (Persons) made an effort to inject humour (“Many problems”; “No, I didn’t [pack my bags]”) and continuously clarified events in the story (“Think about the background we need”; “In the past?”; “They are taking the taxi to the airport”? Throughout the process, they shared their opinions and ideas openly and showed a willingness to make changes (Affordances). The Teacher (Field) made a concerted effort to allow students to dictate the topic and flow of discussion (Affordances), on which Kevin and Julie readily capitalised. However, it may be argued that relying on students to be autonomously responsible for the reciprocal flow between the curriculum/materials (Field) and decisions about language-use (Affordances) in collaborative projects permits more reticent students to not participate, creating what Thompson (2013, p. 43) calls the “free-rider effect,” meaning some students do not do “their fair share.” This was a concern, particularly early in the study, because less proficient students tended to depend on the higher-level students to complete the
project and were reluctant to participate in discussions. This was a source of concern for the Teacher. In an interview on 7 August 2015, I asked the Teacher what her biggest challenges were up to that point; she responded:

T: For the [PBL] class, um, when they, definitely when they were making the project not everybody was contributing as much. I think, mostly from Jane and Julie, I’ve seen a lot of really creative ideas as far as making stories. […] the girls are very consistently creative as far as coming up with story lines and the plays they had to write especially about travelling and stuff. Julie brought in outside materials and she actually did a lot of research about the country they had to write about. Everyone relied upon her and I think she’s shown the most initiative towards being creative in the class. […] I think right now I’m sensing a lot of frustration in the PBL class because they want to get really, uh, a lot of input from every member of the group when it’s time to talk and make plans, but some people just won’t talk or they don’t even show up.

The Teacher recognized that the lack of participation on behalf of the students affected the performance of other students, their attitude towards the class, and the process of project-making. My own frustration about this issue began to surface as I bemoaned the issues of poor participation and attendance of some students. On 4 April 2015, I remarked in my field notes (quotation marks original):

It’s really difficult to create that “buzz” with only two students – especially when they speak, then record their answers, and as they are writing, we only hear the sound of traffic passing by. Julie and Kevin communicated fairly well about their ideas for the project with some long gaps of silence as they look over their ideas.

At that moment, I felt that Julie and Kevin spent too much time writing rather than talking, but later in the class period, they discussed their ideas more thoroughly. Despite periods of silence, they communicated well as they proceeded in the script. While periods of silence were anticipated, interaction amongst students was essential in the PBL-Group because the language-use affordances were largely dependent on student engagement —the Teacher provided the materials, but students were “expected” to contribute to the group — when they did not, this negatively impacted the classroom climate.

In the TB-driven Curriculum, the process was less contingent on the students’ independent language production because the Teacher initiated interaction by directly calling on individuals and also tended to dominate classroom interaction. The textbook guided the organisation of the lesson, with completion of the activities in the book essentially functioning as a confirmation of engagement. (i.e., the Teacher would ask them to complete the activity, then check their textbook to ensure it was completed correctly.) The Teacher adhered closely to the textbook; however, she did include additional questions of her own, provided more details about phrases and vocabulary (“share some pointers” and “author,”), and encouraged students to ask questions when they did not understand.

Csikszentmihalyi (1999) explained that at times, the Domain (what is presently valued in a particular culture, symbol system, or discipline) can dictate the Field (those who make judgments about what is creative and valued), essentially meaning that those who wield influence in a Domain resist change in
order to maintain the status quo. Novelty is unlikely to emerge if the Field determines that replication is to be rewarded, while innovation is to be rejected. This appears to be true, although not entirely intentional, in the case of creative production in the TB-driven Curriculum; when students perceived opportunities to expand their language-use as being limited, they tended to confine their answers to what they believed the Teacher wanted—the “correct” answers. In the interview on 7 August 2015 (same as above), the Teacher and I had the following discussion:

**Researcher:** Do you see creativity in the Textbook Class?

**T:** Well, I don’t think the Textbook Class has, well, I guess they do have a chance to be initiative, to show initiative, but they don’t.

**Researcher:** So, how, what do you mean they don’t show initiative?

**T:** They don’t, they just come and do what they have to do and then they don’t like, sometimes like, I tell them like you should check this out on the internet when you have time. This is something we talked about in the book or something you saw on the video. If you want to, you can look it up and learn more. They never do it. But Julie (in the PBL Group) actually, just, out of both classes, yeah, she shows more initiative towards trying.

In the same interview (7 August 2015), I asked her what she thought of students’ attitude towards the curricula; she unwittingly alludes to the sense that students in the TB-Group are attempting to seek out additional affordances for language use, and possibly for creativity as well.:

**T:** I think for the Textbook class they treat it like any other class, like, they don’t like it, they think it’s boring. Every time we start class, before even greeting me, they’ll be like teacher, let’s play a game. They don’t even want to study anything. They want to play hangman, which is, uh, an elementary school level game. I mean anybody can enjoy hangman, but they want to do it every day. They would rather play hangman than study what we have to study in the book. Like some of them have even asked me to play bingo with them, and they’re in middle school, you know.

She interprets their desire to play a game as not wanting to study “what we have to study in the book.” As a follow up question, I asked her about her use of textbooks in her regular teaching context and its relationship to her instructional practices (Interview, 7 August 2015):

**Researcher:** With most of your classes, don’t you normally do the textbook? So, is it similar to the textbook class?

**T:** Yes, but I will usually take a break every so often; like, okay let’s just forget the textbook for a day and we’ll just review everything that we did but we’ll do like a journal entry and you’ll draw a picture about it and you’ll talk about it or you’ll, you’ll play a game or something like that to review.

She suggests that in her regular context she employs a more flexible, iterative process, taking entire classes to review and to play games, however she rarely employed this strategy in the research class. This is likely, in part, due to how she interpreted the distinction between the two curricula in terms of the research focus. I did ask her at the commencement of the study not to do anything that might resemble a “project” in the TB-driven Curriculum but did not direct her to avoid playing English-related games. Further, I had given
her explicit permission several months earlier to use more games and varied activities at her discretion in the TB-driven Curriculum.

While the two-way flow between the Teacher (Field) and materials (Domain) was limited, adhering to the textbook provided numerous opportunities for feedback (Affordances). However, this feedback embodied the typical IRF pattern and thus could be interpreted as “step-by-step”; the Teacher would usually ask a question, call on a single student and wait for them to reply, then provide corrective feedback immediately after their response. Also, because students (Persons) were primarily responding to the textbook’s instructions (Domain) and the Teacher’s (Field) request for answers, there were fewer affordances for novel, emergent language-use. In my field notes on 13 February 2015, I wrote:

_This is fairly systemized – T reads some instructions, provides some information/explanation, and Ss complete the exercise in their book. Teacher tells Kellan to “Silently do your work.” Ss do a writing task in which they give advice to a visitor to their country, mostly reading lines from the book. This goes on for about 10 minutes._

It should be noted that I never told the Teacher that she had to complete the units, or the exercises in the unit, in any particular order, nor that she had to do every unit or exercise in the book; she was informed on multiple occasions that decisions related to organization and content were entirely hers. Yet, for the most part, she chose to follow the lessons as formatted by the textbook. In the interview on 7 August 2015, I asked the Teacher which class she felt was more difficult to prepare for; she answered:

_T: Definitely the PBL class because I’m not used to having a class that’s structured like that. Like, I’ll look at what I have to do and I’ll like envision what I’m going to do that day, but sometimes I go to start the class and I’m like, uh. It’s not my routine, but that’s not a bad thing. I mean, I don’t mind it. I just keep feeling I’ll get used to it._

She indicated that the lack of structure in the PBL Curriculum gave her less confidence in preparation than the more familiar context and structure of the TB-driven Curriculum, which she refers to as “my routine.” Her perception of the “routine” is further disclosed when I asked her what she would like to change about the TB-driven Curriculum in terms of process (7 August 2015):

_T: The textbook class (laughs)? What would I change? I guess . . . I don’t know what I would change because I don’t know that many ways to go about that kind of curriculum. So, what I’m doing now is the textbook curriculum._

_Researcher: _What do you mean you don’t how to go about . . .

_T: _I mean I don’t know how to go about alternative methods, like, besides what I’ve already been doing. So, when I say that I don’t know what changes to make it’s because what I’m doing now is a result of a lot of trial and error from my very early teaching career so, if there’s something better I could do, I wish I could, but I’m just not aware how I could make it better at this point._

Because of this notion of what teaching a textbook entails, the Teacher is reluctant to make changes to “what she’s already been doing,” and interprets the students’ requests for variation as dissatisfaction with the class and/or materials, or even as being disinterested in learning English. In feeling both that the PBL
Curriculum was challenging to prepare for and that her past teaching experiences had adequately equipped her for the TB-driven Curriculum (as the “result of a lot of trial and error”), she preferred to move through the lesson as it was organized by the textbook, creating a unidirectional flow with the materials/curriculum (Domain) governing language-use affordances.

While she seemingly delimits affordances for more iteration and innovation in the learning process in the TB-driven Curriculum, it should again be acknowledged that most textbooks are designed and written by skilled and experienced teachers and researchers and I by no means intend to suggest that following a textbook is inherently ineffective or even restrictive in terms of producing opportunities for creative language use. Indeed, it is clear that the publishers had given tremendous consideration to the organization and design of the units and activities. However, more flexibility on behalf of the Teacher and instilling in students a sense of empowerment in interpreting classroom activities would have likely created more affordances for students to use their own, and new, language resources.

4.3 Openness to Experience

Openness to experience in this study has been defined as a willingness to share one’s ideas while engaging in classroom activities and to seek out the opinions, thoughts, ideas, and insights of others (K. Sawyer, 2007). A particularly effective way to nurture this creative skill is to enhance students’ ability to ask more open-ended questions (Berger, 2014; Walsh, 2011), questions that seek out new answers and new meaning. “Openness to Experience” also refers to instances of students encouraging each other to contribute their ideas and feelings and to be involved throughout the process of learning (K. Sawyer, 2007). This personal involvement in classroom activities can stimulate a student to seek out new experiences, to actively participate in the learning process, and to engage in personal reflection (McCrae, 1987). The following extracts aim to provide an example from both curricula in which students are exploring and discovering new understanding through question-posing, participating in new experiences, sharing ideas, displaying genuine interest, and creating new meaning from their experiences.

4.3.1 Openness to Experience: Project-Based Learning Curriculum

Project #2 in the PBL Curriculum, designed around the learning objectives of Unit 2 of the course book which is entitled Work, Rest, and Play, involved the use of online blogs. The project required each student in a group to write three blogs on an online blogging website, one for each element of the title (Work, Rest, and Play), and to include a picture of themselves doing something related to each theme. They would then
write a summary of what they were doing at that moment (this was the homework for the Concept Generation Stage). When students assembled again the next class, they would combine all the blog entries from every group member into a fictional story. For example, Julie took a picture of herself at the movie theatre for the theme of Play, which was then incorporated into her group’s story (see Table 4.3.1 for more details on the project’s requirements and instructions).

The following dialogue between Julie and Jane occurs on 7 March 2015, which was the fourth class of the project cycle, the Change stage. At this point, they had already spent two classes discussing and writing the first draft (Confrontation and Creation), and are attempting to clarify, revise, and improve their story. The conversation begins with Julie and Jane deciding what changes to make and then cooperatively augmenting their story:

Jane: So, do we change our script?

Julie: Okay, what about this. He (the character in their story) says, “It was nothing.” Write this.

Jane: (Jane writes the sentence, “It was nothing.”). Next day?

Julie: Oh, to the next day. Oh right, it must contain these words (referring to the project requirements). Oh, I have a good idea. Good to go with (it is unclear exactly what she meant by this last sentence).

Jane: Ah, what about this one? You start the story, start the story about Andrew’s life and we say, we say, “It was the same day, but . . .”

Julie: Ahh. Okay, just, everything was the same as yesterday?

Jane: Yes, same as yesterday.

Julie: You mean perfectly it is the same? Mother is same, mother’s clothes is the same? Repeat again, please.

Jane: No (Jane laughs). That is a good idea too, though. That is a good idea. Same day. It was same day, but when he gets out of his house, he met a boy, the ghost.

Julie: We name his name is name.

Jane: Huh? His name is “name?”

Julie: No (laughs). Actually, that’s pretty funny. But how about “Grape” (they both laugh)? (Julie writes something on a piece of paper)

Jane: Why? Just?

Julie: I don’t know. The two girls . . . (It is not clear what Julie means by, “The two girls,” but she may have been referring to other characters in the story because she points to the paper that they are using to record notes).

Jane: Ah. So, the same day this is happening and, but he met a boy and they became friends and, because it is the same day they will go to the theatre again, but this time not alone. Ah. This . . . (Again, pointing to something on their paper).

Julie: Ah, there is a movie theatre. Okay then, start with this.

Jane: Yes. In the bus, the fat boy pushed him, but the fat boy cannot see the ghost, but Andrew can see the ghost, so Andrew said to the fat boy, “There is a boy, so you cannot sit here.” So, the fat boy think he is crazy so that fat boy go away. Is it good?

Julie: Yeah.

Jane: Okay, so the next day?
Julie: Yeah, the next day. What about, will you use my idea? What about this: Andrew felt strange, so he asked his mom, “Why did you wear the same clothes as yesterday?” And his mother says, “What, how did you see these clothes, I bought it yesterday.” (They both laugh at this idea).

Jane: That’s good. Okay. So, not the next day, just Andrew wake up?

Julie: Okay. But he felt . . .

Jane: Strange? How about, he felt strange?

Julie: Odd. Let’s say “odd.”

Jane: Okay. He felt odd, because of his mom?

Julie: Hmm, at this time [in the story] no reason, just, he felt odd.

Jane: Okay. Okay.

Julie: He went to downstairs to eat breakfast, but everything was the same. Father and mother and even the breakfast menu.

Jane: Right.

Julie: Hey, you just wrote the script sentence.

Jane: Because it is your idea, it’s good. Um, breakfast menu and, what? TV program. And Andrew asked to his mother, why do you wear the same clothes as yesterday? “Did” is right grammar (she asks this as she is writing the sentences)?

Julie: Change to “do” here.

Jane: Oh, and same newspaper, too. Why again?

Julie: I’m confused with this (pointing to a part of the script they have written).

Jane: Oh, so Andrew washed his face, but it is still odd . . .

Julie: But nothing was changed (they laugh again). Same as yesterday. Is the [news]paper Sunday or Saturday?

Jane: Saturday.

Julie: Okay.

Jane: Can you speak again?

Julie: Same as yesterday, it was Saturday. So, he went out, went out. But you . . . He went out to find a friend . . .

Jane: And he met a strange boy in front of his house?

Julie: Yeah. Ah, in front of his house there was a boy.

Jane: (Jane repeats Julie’s last sentence as she writes it down) He looks as the same age as Andrew.

Julie: And this boy will talk first.

Jane: Okay. And he sim, simmed, seem . . .

Julie: Seemed.

Jane: Ah, he seemed the same age as Andrew . . .

Julie: But a little taller than Andrew.

Jane: Taller?

Julie: He was taller than Andrew. How old?
At this time, the Teacher interrupted the students to discuss the upcoming class schedule. Following this, they took a break and resumed working on the project 10 minutes later:

**Jane:** I think it is good, but it is better to be like a dialogue.

**Julie:** Yeah, okay (continues typing – they both laugh). So, good (Julie says something inaudible to Jane as she types). Would you like to come with me and . . . ?

**Jane:** And the boy said, sure I can.

**Julie:** Of course I can.

**Jane:** And the first time, they enter. Um, Andrew doesn’t know what the boy’s name is. So, in the theatre, Andrew asks to him, “what is your name” and the boy says, “my name is . . . .” but the movie started so the boy cannot talk to him his name.

*Table 4.3.1: Project #2 Requirements Checklist: Blog Stories*

---

**Blogging: Go to blogger.com**

For each subject (rest, work, & play) you must write a diary style entry of what you did that day (IN ENGLISH!), or you can write in general, related to that subject. You must take a picture of yourself for that blog entry doing something related to that subject.

---

**What to do**

All the other blogs from each member must be put together and be made into a fictional story (can be fantasy, mystery, romance, whatever you want!) by the group. So if you have 3 members in your groups (3 blog entries x 3 members = 9 blog entries) that’s 9 blog entries you have to combine into one story! You can do it! The characters and setting must all be fictional! Also, the story must be at least 2 pages long, typed.

---

**The Presentation**

Third, after you write your story, prepare a PPT for it. You will make slides using the blog entries from your group members, and explain how you combined them to make a story. Also talk about how you got your ideas and the process of making your story together. I recommend you memorize it. Costumes to look like the characters and props to act out the scenes are required!

---

**Thematic Requirements**

- Characteristics must be fictional
- Locations must be fictional but related to the location of your blog post
- You must include 1 entry for rest, 1 for work, and 1 for play
- Present your story in costumes

**Vocabulary Requirements**

- Include at least four of the phrases in the vocabulary box on p. 16
- O’clock
- Morning, afternoon, evening

**Grammar Requirements**

- Story must be in present simple tense
- 5 adverbs of frequency
- 2 possessive adjectives (a review from unit 1)
After about 5 minutes, their conversation is again halted by the Teacher who wished to ensure that they had included all the requirements on the project checklist.

Jane and Julie appeared to be fully engrossed in the activity and wished to improve their story as evidenced by their continual modifications (“Change to ‘do’ here.”), clarification requests (“Can you speak again?”), elaboration (“So, the same day this is happening and, but he met a boy and they became friends and…”), use of humour (“But how about ‘Grape’ [for the character’s name].”), adjustments to the linguistic elements (“Odd. Let’s say odd.”), style changes (“I think it is good, but it is better to be like a dialogue”), the continual surveying of the project constraints (“Oh right, it must contain these words.”), and their willingness to constructively add to each other’s ideas (“And the boy said, sure I can.”). Many of the question types that define “Openness to Experience” appear in this extract. For example, Jane asks Julie why she wanted to name the character “Grape.” Jane also asks for more details about Julie’s ideas when she asks, “And he met a strange boy in front of his house?” She prompts a “what next” question when she inquires, “Okay, so the next day?” Jane also explicitly asked Julie for her opinion and feeling towards her ideas: ‘Is it good?’

Julie also made several linguistic contributions that demonstrated her capacity for risk-taking, suggesting synonyms which do not appear in the textbook, for example changing the word “strange” to “odd” and using the phrase, “Of course I can.” They also elected to change the literary voice of their story: Jane offered her opinion that they change the story from Third Person omniscient (the narrator knows all) to using more of a first-person point-of-view through the use of dialogue. Additionally, Julie added an element of suspense to their story, proposing that the reader does not learn the “ghost’s name,” until later in the story. Yet, perhaps most importantly, they were deeply engaged in constructing their story and, as this was only the second project of the class, it may have been challenging for them to fully connect story writing, which is not a typical activity in their normal learning context, to attaining the language objectives of the course book. In fact, this dissonance was at least partially responsible for some of the early attrition, but Jane and Julie remained in the course and seemed to enjoy the novelty of the activities.

4.3.2 Openness to Experience: Textbook-driven Curriculum

The following extract in the TB-driven Curriculum occurs on 16 January 2015 when the class was covering the Writing section on page 23 in Unit 2 (Figure 4.3.2A). The Teacher arranged students in two group of three and one group of two (there were 8 students present). She asked them to choose a festival that they would like to talk about and answer the following questions using the present simple tense:
1. What is the name of the festival?
2. When do you celebrate the festival?
3. Why do you celebrate this festival?
4. What do you do?

Students were given about 20 minutes to complete the activity and were permitted to use their phones to find the information. The Teacher began by clarifying the activity:

T: So, remember, answer these four questions. What are the four questions? You have to write three paragraphs, for example . . . (looks at Lily’s computer) this is just one paragraph. A paragraph has 3 to 5 sentences, so think about 15 sentences okay. Please speak English, Max. Please speak English.

Lily: (To Kellan) Let’s do the Jeonju Bibinbap Festival.

Kellan: Yeah, okay. (To the Teacher) Use the internet?

T: This one doesn’t have internet (referring to a laptop that would not connect to the school’s WiFi network). You can use your phone or this computer when they finish (referring to another group’s computer). Use your phone to do research, but you have to write in English, okay? Don’t use numbers because you’re writing paragraphs. Remember, you have to use the adverbs of frequency and the simple present tense. Just write this style like this, but you have to make it much longer, like 15 sentences, okay? Please speak English, please. The internet is also available here (gesturing to the computer at the front of the class).

Lily: Where? It is in Jeonju.

T: Please write in English, okay?


Lily: Teacher, picture?

T: No pictures. Just writing. You guys have 15 minutes to finish. Start typing.

Lily: I will search in Naver (Naver is a popular Korean search engine).

T: Please speak English (she says this after she sees Kellan whispering to Danny in Korean).

Kellan: I always say (inaudible) . . .

T: Are you guys almost finished? Please type now. Type now. What are the four questions?

Lily: I am searching.

T: Look at the questions? What is the name of the festival? (The Teacher’s voice begins to escalate in volume) Write that sentence! You know the name of the festival, right? Write it down!

Lily: This internet doesn’t work. (To Kellan) Give me your phone.
Around the world people celebrate Carnival in different ways. In New Orleans, musicians play jazz and people dance in the streets. In Rio de Janeiro, samba schools spend a year making fantastic costumes for the Carnival parade. In Venice, they wear beautiful masks. In some parts of Germany, for one day the women take control of the town and cut off men’s ties. Here in Trinidad, people party!

It is two o’clock in the morning on Dirty Monday and we are having a street party. People get dressed in old clothes and throw mud and paint at each other. But tomorrow the serious celebrations begin. People spend the whole year making costumes and writing songs for Carnival. Tomorrow is their big day. There is a competition for the best costumes and songs. The winners get money and a car. It’s serious business.

So, why don’t you come to Trinidad to celebrate Carnival?

**Word Focus**

**tie** = a long piece of cloth worn around the neck usually worn by men.

**Writing**

Write about a festival in your country. Answer these questions.

a. What is the name of the festival?
b. When do you celebrate the festival?
c. Why do you celebrate this festival?
d. What do you do?

**Songkran** is a very important festival in Thailand. It is the Thai New Year and we celebrate it from the 13th to the 15th of April.

We celebrate it to say goodbye to the old year and to welcome the new year.

Traditionally, at Songkran we visit old people to pay respect. And many people clean their houses. But the best part of Songkran is when we throw water at other people in the street. We even throw water at strangers, but they do not get angry. It’s just good fun.

**Goal 4**

Compare different festivals

Share your writing with a partner. Tell your partner how your festival is different from Carnival.
T: I don’t know the name of the festival, so type it. (Danny and Kellan speak Korean in the background) Why are you guys speaking Korean? Come on, speak in English, please.

Danny: I didn’t bring my phone.

Lily: Ah, ah, it’s in October.

T: Did you guys write anything yet?

Kellan: Here. Bibinbap Festival.

T: Okay, that’s the title. What else [did you write]?

Lily: Ah, ah, write this (Lily shows Kellan her phone).

T: Why are you guys speaking Korean? Danny, what are you guys doing now?

Danny: She is looking for happen.

Lily: Why do you celebrate this festival (Lily reads the question that was written on the whiteboard)?

T: Okay, why? No Translation. Why? You don’t need to look online for that. Why do you want to celebrate bibinbap? Because it is delicious and you want to eat it, right? (Loudly) Write that down! You don’t need to do research for that, right? Just think about it. Everyone, please speak English. You guys have 10 minutes, please speak English.

Lily: How about this? Write here. We should answer this (pointing to the whiteboard).

T: Danny don’t play on your phone!

Lily: Um, Kellan, what do you do at the Jeonju Bibinbap Festival?

Kellan: I don’t know.

Danny: Teacher, what do you call bibinpab?

T: You don’t have to translate bibinbap. Just call it bibinbap, okay?

Danny: Spelling?

T: B-I -B-I-N-B-A-P

Lily: It’s rice, okay? With many things. What’s in bibinbap (she asks this to the Teacher)?

Danny: I don’t know.

Lily: Please think about it.

T: What are the questions to answer? I told you. What is the name of the festival? When do you celebrate it? Why do you celebrate this festival? Please focus on your essay. Please speak English. Do it together.

Lily: How I should write this (Lily was asking this question to her group members)?

T: In a paragraph.

Lily: You can experience many kinds of bibinbap. It is usually in October.

Kellan: Early October. Early October. Many people . . . many . . . many people. Hey, what are you doing?

Lily: Let’s do more. Teacher, can we put image?

T: No, don’t put any pictures. Just focus on writing, okay.

Lily: Okay.

Approximately 10 minutes later, the Teacher asked them to read what they had written:

Danny: We will introduce Jeonju Bibinbap Festival. It begins in the end of October. It started in Jeonju. Because it is delicious and many people want to eat it. We eat binbinbap and compete who cook bimpinbap well. Also, let’s you know how binbinbap originated. Let’s eat binbinbap.
The Teacher confirmed that they had answered the four questions and moved on to the next group. Like the PBL Curriculum, students invested genuine effort in completing the task. This is illustrated when Lily requested approval from her group members, asking “How about this?” She also implored her group members, “Let’s do more,” and repeatedly asked the Teacher if they could include an image, which was not required, but Lily believed it would contribute to the report. Another important element of openness to experience is that there is opportunity for students to demonstrate their curiosity about the learning objectives (Bronson & Merryman, 2010), which is granted in this activity by allowing groups to choose the festival that they would like to present. There are also examples of Lily asking for assistance with elaboration in their writing as when she asked the Teacher how they could describe what is in bibimbap, and when she requested help from group members, inquiring, “How should I write this?” In this activity, there is also the need for fact-finding to contribute to the learning endeavour as students must learn about a real festival and present it to their classmates and most seemed genuinely interested in learning about the festival.

While the nature of the task (answering four specific questions) is arguably delimiting, it does allow students to be open to experience in that that they must choose a festival which sparks their curiosity. It also necessitates that they gather new information and ideas and that they share this knowledge with others. This activity could certainly have been improved by allowing students to create and answer additional questions, by promoting a more in-depth discussion about the festival, and perhaps by giving them greater freedom in how they presented the information (rather than just reading it to the rest of the class) so that the experience of the activity itself was more open-ended.

4.3.3 Openness to Experience: A Comparative Analysis of Affordances

The Group Story Writing project in the PBL Curriculum was an “open-ended” activity, allowing a significant amount of freedom for interpretation and creative expression, but again with some language and thematic requirements from the textbook unit (which were decided on by the Teacher). In terms of the two-way flow between the curriculum/materials (Domain) and the Teacher (Field), the discussions in the PBL Curriculum were monitored by the Teacher to ensure groups did not use too many examples from the textbook; this is essentially opposite of how the Teacher regulates the Domain in the TB-driven Curriculum in which she confirms that they have completed the exercises “correctly” according to the textbook examples and instructions.

Jane and Julie did not use the textbook when writing their script and took advantage of the affordances inherent in the activity, executing a great deal of control over the Domain (meaning the students were
responsible for producing most of the material for the activity). The Teacher directly referenced how this “openness” in materials generation differentiates not only the language produced in the classroom, but the classroom environment more generally. After stating that she believed the PBL-Group had a better attitude towards learning, I asked what she believed was the reason for the difference, she answered (Interview, 18 September 2015):

T: I think it’s definitely, I think the environment in the classroom has a really big effect on their progression or regression, you know. The more that they’re exposed to speaking, the better they’re going to get and the fact of the matter is in the textbook class, there is very little speaking time and when they do a partner exercises or games or whatever, they’re just regurgitating formatted sentences, they’re not creating any new language on their own so they just look at the script and they repeat it and they forget about it because they didn’t have to think about it in the first place; they just have to see in on the page and regurgitate it. But, in the PBL curriculum, I think they definitely have had more opportunities to get better because a lot of the time the conversations are, they have to make the conversations, they have to make the new sentences, they have to ask questions to each other. I never . . . they never ask me questions in the textbook class, never. And I think that when you’re just so in, in, in like script-mode, you’re just answering questions, you’re not really thinking about language, but I think when they’re having conversations and asking each other stuff and having to think about how I can ask this person in order to get the information I want, you know, I think if they just had much more time to talk, I’m usually just guiding them.

As the Teacher suggested, Jane and Julie asked each other numerous clarification and elaboration questions as they wrote their script and the impetus was on them to move the project forward. In asking group members questions, the students themselves created additional and arguably more meaningful affordances for language use. It was the Teacher’s belief that this need for autonomy and self-regulation had also benefitted their conversation skills, stating (Interview, 18 September 2015):

T: For the PBL curriculum, definitely there’s been some improvement [in their English ability], especially when I have a conversation with the students, um, you know, I can see them correcting themselves in class. Like, they’ll say something wrong and before like, in a normal textbook situation, I would have the urge to just like correct them right away, but I kind of like let it slide sometimes and can see them noticing it and kind of like, when they say a similar sentence, they’ll say it the right way. Like, ah, right, “it’s like this.” So, I don’t know where they get that. I mean, I don’t really step in that much. I feel like I should a little more with the grammar. I should do that.

The Teacher made a conscious effort not to correct mistakes when students were engaged in discussion in the PBL Curriculum, and this seems to have been recognized by the students, who do not expect the Teacher to initiate the interaction or to provide corrective feedback as they worked. The openness embedded in both the process (the teacher intervened minimally) and production seemed to maintain their interest throughout the class period; I remarked in my field notes (7 April 2015):

Julie and Jane work extremely well on making their story - they communicate throughout the creation of the story, negotiate their ideas well. Jane really seems to have a lot of fun making their story. It is clear that beyond just finishing the story, Julie wants to make it interesting and funny.

Jane and Julie, and to a lesser extent Kevin, could sustain discussion for increasingly longer periods of time, and remained in English through the entire class. It might be noticed that the Teacher frequently asked the students in the Textbook-driven Curriculum to speak English, but this was extremely rare in the
PBL-Group. This certainly had something to do with the personalities of the students, but was also likely related to the open-endedness of the projects, and the need to produce the language for the projects which made English necessarily the product and medium of learning and less so the ‘object’ of learning as it seemed to be in the TB-driven Curriculum.

The Teacher alludes to how the curriculum may have affected language production (or lack thereof), or at least how it affected the classroom climate, including her own motivation, in relation to the language being employed in activities; when asked what she had noticed about students’ behaviour in both curricula, she responded (Interview, 7 August 2015)

T: So, for the textbook curriculum, I would say I’ve noticed how repetitive, just really really really repetitive and not stimulating at all to the students. Even when I integrate games and some other assignments that aren’t necessarily strictly from the book, I don’t feel like it really makes that big of a dent in their having fun in the class. So, I just feel like it is a really boring, repetitive curriculum. That’s my key observation. And with the PBL curriculum, yeah, I’m definitely motivated personally too, uh, thinking of new ways to educate people and new ways because you’re not just talking at them and lecturing them, you have to impart knowledge in other ways. And also, you have to make them seek their own ways, their own knowledge.

The Teacher referred not only to how the lack of reciprocal flow between the materials/curriculum (Domain) and the students (Persons) stemmed creativity in the TB-driven curriculum, but also how an overreliance on the textbook material (Domain) obstructed her own pedagogical growth (Field): When asked which class she felt more comfortable teaching, she replied (Interview, 18 September 2015)

T: I think I feel more comfortable with the textbook curriculum just because it’s more familiar, not necessarily because it’s something that I’ve, I’ve gotten used to because I like doing it. It’s just something I’ve been doing so, it’s a routine. So, I feel comfortable because it’s the routine. But, it’s not stimulating at all, at all. Like, I’m, I think when I prepare for the PBL curriculum classes I feel like I’m having fun, like I’m excited, I’m anticipating what we’re going to do, and I think what’s really nice about the PBL curriculum is my curiosity is really piqued. I’m always curious as to what is going to happen with the kids: What are they going to do? How are they going to respond? Are they going to talk a lot? But with the textbook curriculum, it’s just... I’m just as fed up with the routine as the kids are. I feel like, you know, like, the [negative] energy they give to me, I also feel like man, when’s the break coming? When’s the class going to finish? It’s just really, really repetitive and not stimulating and I just don’t like being there.

Much of the Teacher’s frustration centred on the predictability and monotony seemingly (to her) implicit in the material. As a result of this routineness, she perceived the loop between language-use affordances and the materials/curriculum (Domain) as obstructed because the textbook essentially dictated what and how language would be used. However, this is not inherently the case. In the example from the Textbook-driven Curriculum above, the students chose which festival they wanted to present, were responsible for producing the language (facts and details) about it, and were given nearly 10 minutes to discuss it with their group members. Lily wanted to include more details (and a picture) and encouraged her group members to help her. Unfortunately, students seemed to have acclimated to the idea that the primary objective was to finish the activity by answering the specific questions given in the textbook. The Teacher commented on this orientation toward student attitudes in an interview on 29 November 2014:
T: Yeah, it’s a certain level, I mean like, I would say my general impression is that when I work with students in a textbook, we’re all just here to get it done. Like, the students who were really quiet and they paid attention and they complied, they’re doing it just for the sake of getting it done and the ones who just don’t comply it’s because they don’t want to do it that much.

However, it should be noted that she used remarkably similar language in the same interview to describe the performance of lower-proficiency students early in the PBL Curriculum:

T: I noticed, like, when we were actually making the project in the third class, that [lower-proficiency students] were just trying to knock it out, like they weren’t really talking to each other about getting new ideas, they just wanted to do what they, what they talked about in the beginning. They didn’t want to try different things, they just wanted to get it done. It seemed like they weren’t focused on enjoying the process. They were just trying to complete it.

In an interview more than eight months later, on 7 August 2015, I asked her to reflect on the challenges she faced with students early in PBL Curriculum, she affirmed:

T: [Students who dropped from the PBL-Curriculum] didn’t like being forced to talk. They just wanted to like give me the task and let me complete it. Like, that’s just what they want to do –like, okay, we have to make this thing, let’s just make it, I don’t want to talk about making it. That’s what I saw.

In both cases, the Teacher’s perception demonstrates her dismay regarding the students’ lack of engagement, particularly in terms of creativity in both curricula. However, as shown in the extracts above, open-ended language-use affordances can be structured into most curricula, but creating a classroom environment in which the students are open to new experiences takes a concerted effort and time for adjustment. It also depends on the teacher’s capacity to relinquish some control over the materials, exercise discretion with feedback and support, and develop the capacity to create more stimulating and meaningful affordances for learners.

4.4 Meaningful Work

“Meaningful Work” connotes a students’ investment in an activity that they find interesting, challenging, and rewarding (Amabile, 2001; Csikszentmihalyi, 1997). It also requires that participation in the activity possesses meaning beyond merely completing the assignment and involves instilling in students the confidence to exercise their creative abilities (Gladwell, 2008; M. A. Runco, 2010; Sternberg, 2003a). In communicative tasks, this means more than just talking, it requires that students have agency in determining the outcomes of the activity. As previously mentioned, Carter (2015) contends that many tasks claimed to be communicative are actually more functional in nature, using formulaic language, often presented in prepared dialogues (a technique used by this textbook in every unit). Many textbooks (this book included) also construct speaking activities around comprehension-type activities in which students are relaying known meaning (known either to them or their partner), which prevents students from
employing a wider range of expressions (Tin, 2013). Moreover, the ways in which students convey their creativity is unique, so opportunities to contribute personal ideas and to use their own language resources are important in nurturing creativity. The following examples from each curriculum show how meaningful work contributes to linguistic output, purposeful learning, and creative engagement.

4.4.1 Meaningful Work: Project-based Learning Curriculum

The Collaborative Reflection element of the 10Cs of Project-based TESOL Curriculum essentially asked students to relate their insights and feelings about the project. During Collaborative Reflection groups could ask each other questions for clarification and provide constructive feedback about the process of making and presenting/performing the project. They could also discuss whether the main language and learning objectives were met. The following Collaborative Reflection conversation is taken from 17 October 2015, the seventh and final day of the project cycle, following the class in which they presented their Collage Project. As previously detailed, the Collage Project required students to create a multi-media collage (using paint, images taken from the internet, construction paper, and any other forms of media they wished to incorporate). The project was formulated around the learning objectives of Unit 7 of the textbook, entitled Communication, and included a number of linguistic and thematic requirements (see Table 4.4.1). The main idea of the project was to create a fictional story through the collage to illustrate the different ways in which people communicate.

Collaborative Reflection was intended to be student-led, but even after 10 months in the program, students continued to struggle to facilitate this session on their own; however, the Teacher did become increasingly conscious of exercising too much command over the conversation and is seen in this example urging students to ask questions and provide each other feedback without her prompts. The following extract begins about six minutes into the class, after the students were given time to write down some of their thoughts:

T: So, Kevin, when we did the collage, how do you think it helped your English skills?

Kevin: On the presentation day, Julie didn’t come so Jane and I have to tell the teacher so, uh, it was quite tense and .

T: You can use the dictionary to help, if you want.

Kevin: (Uses his electronic dictionary) Tense and straining.

T: So, do you think it was tense and straining because it was just the two of you?

Kevin: Yeah.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thematic Requirements</th>
<th>Vocabulary Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Do not include too much text on your actual Collage – concepts should be represented symbolically by the images</td>
<td>• Communication Devices (email, fax, text message, newspaper ad, blackberry, letter, TV, phone)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• However, all the required language for the unit must be included in your “Collage Story” – the presentation you will give for the presentation</td>
<td>• Number (12-19; 20-90)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| • In your presentation, you need to do two things: tell your story AND explain what the images on your collage represent (from the story) | • Body parts representing the senses
Eyes = Sight
Nose = Smell
Ears = Hearing
Hands = Touch
Mouth & Tongue = Taste |
| • You need to include at least two different animals in your collage AND the way that they communicate | • Objects which can use the following adjectives (sweet, loud, soft, salty, wet, dirty, bad, green) |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grammar Requirements</th>
<th>Presentation Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Object pronouns (me, you, him, her, it, us, them)</td>
<td>• Presentation must be at least 10 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Use the following sensory VERBS (feels, looks, tastes, sounds, smells)</td>
<td>• You should NOT have a PPT – you will use the Collage to tell your story</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Use multiple descriptive adjectives in the same sentence</td>
<td>• Everybody in your group should speak during the presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Be creative in how you present the information – don’t just point to the elements of the collage, find different ways to make your presentation interesting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
T: How about you Jane, how did the project from the beginning to the end help your English skills?

**Jane:** Well, we talked about the collage and all of our ideas and we talked a lot in English so I can develop my English speaking skill. And also, I did with Kevin our presentation, on our presentation the teacher gave us a lot of questions and we answered in English and it was helpful.

T: How about you, Julie? How do you feel this project helped your English skills?

**Julie:** We have done many projects until now so we became very close to each other and now it’s not really uncomfortable when we use English in this class so it’s more, how can I say, it’s normal in this class, to use English, so I think the best thing about this project is that I can use English without hesitate.

T: So, no hesitation now?

**Julie:** Yeah.

T: Nice. I like that answer. Now, usually, we would have a few different groups, right? Like before when we had the criticism, we just talked about our group right and then on that stage we would probably ask the other group questions, give feedback, like what do you think? But now it’s just us, right? (Teacher laughs).

**Julie:** Yes.

T: So, last question, I want you to give your other group members feedback. Okay, so, Jane why don’t you give some first to Kevin and then to Julie. Just general feedback. Just, whatever you want to say about their work in the project.

**Jane:** Kevin, I think I did a lot with Kevin. We did a lot together, like the presentation day. And we searched pictures together, so I think we became more close. I think it was a good time.

T: Anything to say Kevin?

**Kevin:** Yeah, I think so too.

T: When you give feedback give your opinion about what you like that that person did, what do you think they can improve, what can they do better next time? You try to be the judge, like a teacher. Anyway, you’re closer now, like you said, so no hard feelings, nothing personal.

**Jane:** Kevin, I think you better say your opinion . . .

**Julie:** More! (Meaning she agrees with Jane that Kevin did not offer his opinion enough during the project).

**Jane:** And give us your ideas. (Now Jane turns to Julie) I know that you don’t like painting and you don’t like art, but you did well in this project so I’m proud of you.

T: What do you think she can do to improve?

**Jane:** You can practice painting arms (this was an inside joke amongst the group members because Julie painted a rather comical arm on the female characters in the collage painting).

**Julie:** (Laughing) Yeah, that’s what I wanted to say.

T: What do you think about Jane? What did she do well, what can she do better next time? Don’t be shy.

**Kevin:** (Thinks for approximately one minute without speaking) Um, before the presentation, you made some script before, so I was thankful for that.

T: What do you think she can do better next time?

**Kevin:** I think she is doing very well, so keep going (the whole class laughs).
T: What about Julie, what did she do well?

Jane: Actually, we wrote the script together (She is referring to her and Kevin writing the script together, not her and Julie).

Kevin: Yeah, she needs to draw arms better (the class laughs again).

T: Okay, so same criticism as Jane? Okay. Alright, Julie, give Kevin some feedback.

Julie: You printed a lot of pictures for this project, so I was really appreciate for that. Actually, most of the painting in the picture was yours, so I think you were creative, thank you for that.

T: What can he do better?

Julie: Yeah, um, when you don’t like something, just tell us because we just want to include your opinion too.

Jane: Yes, definitely.

Kevin: I will.

There are several examples in this extract that correspond with the definition of “Meaningful Work” as it pertains to developing students’ creative capacities. First, Kevin’s use of the words “tense and straining” meant that he found giving a presentation in front of an audience to be both challenging and rewarding (he mentions in an interview that he found the presentations to be the most helpful for developing his English; see Chapter 5). He also points out the fact that Julie did not attend class on the day of the presentation and that her absence required him to talk more than he might have otherwise.

In another example, Julie, who had never painted before and was quite timid with it at the beginning of the project, became less concerned about making mistakes as the project progressed and soon acclimated to the medium; the minor errors she made (poor rendering of a human arm) became a good-natured joke amongst the group members. Julie continued to try her best at painting and Jane stated that she was proud of Julie for her efforts. Finally, Jane and Julie strongly encouraged Kevin to share his opinion and ideas more throughout the project cycle and he affirmed that he would.

In terms of language development, the main aspect of Meaningful Work is that it provokes students to reach beyond their boundaries and use language constructively in new ways, and there are several examples of this in the extract. First, Jane declared, “we talked about the collage and all of our ideas and we talked a lot in English so I can develop my English speaking skill.” They used a significant amount of language that does not appear in the textbook and incorporated this language expansion into their presentation. Another instance of Meaningful Work is when Julie voiced her feeling that they have talked to each other so frequently that it now feels “normal” to speak in English in this class and that this improved her confidence and strengthened group cohesion. Jane also remarked on the relationship-building aspect of the curriculum and how it has helped her speak more and appreciate the contributions of her
classmates. Kevin, after agreeing that he and Jane have grown closer, expressed his gratitude for her help and commended her on her work. In interviews, Kevin also commented on how becoming more comfortable with Jane and Julie helped him speak more during the project cycle. He also appreciated how his ideas were valued by his group members. The Detective School (mentioned earlier) was also his idea and this personal investment appeared to make him more committed to the development and overall quality of the project. Similarly, Jane acknowledged Kevin’s integral contributions in producing the script for the Collage Story, and Kevin appeared appreciative of this recognition.

4.4.2 Meaningful Work: Textbook-Driven Curriculum

Again, the Textbook-driven class moved more quickly through the units and the following conversation extract from Unit 7 takes place on 7 August, 2015, a full two months earlier than the Project-based Curriculum. After teaching the various types of communication from page 76 (email, fax, letter, text message, phone, newspaper, and blackberry), and covering irregular past tense verb forms on page 77, the Teacher moved on to completing the information chart on page 79 (Figure 4.4.2). The teacher followed the lesson guidebook which suggested completing Exercise B as a communicative activity. The students were asked to complete the first column with their own information (Exercise A) which lasted about five minutes. Next, the Teacher asked them to stand up so that they could walk around and ask each other for the information. The Teacher started by presenting them with an example:

**T**: Okay, now first you (she is speaking to Danny) ask Max, “What is your name?”

**Danny**: What is your name?

**T**: My name is . . .

**Max**: My name is Max.

**T**: Okay, write it down. Next, “What is your home phone number?”

**Danny**: (Mocking the Teacher’s voice) What is your home phone number?

**Max**: I don’t have one.

**T**: Okay, so just put a line.

**Danny**: He doesn’t have a home (students all laugh).

**T**: Don’t say that. Okay, next, say, “What is your fax number?”

**Max**: I don’t have one.

**T**: Next, “What is your cell phone number?”

**Danny**: What is your cell phone number?

**Max**: I don’t have one
Communication

**A.** Write your contact information in column 1 of the chart.

**B.** Ask three of your classmates for their contact information. Complete the chart.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Me</th>
<th>Classmate 1</th>
<th>Classmate 2</th>
<th>Classmate 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home phone number</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fax number</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cell phone number</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email address</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mailing address</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Goal 2** Give and write down contact details

Give the contact details of a friend or family member to a partner.

**Real Language**

We say sorry, I missed that or could you repeat that, please when we want someone to repeat something.
T: What, I called you on your cell phone. Don’t lie. Don’t lie
Max: 010-9974-xxxx.
T: Okay, now ask him, “What is your email address?”
Danny: What is your email address?
Max: It is “addh7777777@xxxxx.com.
T: At. This is “at” (she is referring to the @ symbol). Say “at.”
Max: At.
T: Okay, Max, you ask Lily.
Max: What is your name?
Lily: My name is Lily.
Max: What is your cell phone number?
Lily: 010-8050-xxxx.
Max: What is your email address?
Lily: awaw9218@xxxxx.com.
T: Hey, you two, Ann, Emma, no. You cannot just copy, you have to ask each other. Erase it. Erase it and do it again. Ann and Emma you have to do it again, you have to ask, not just writing. Max, Max, ask Danny. Ask in English please (speaking to Danny).
Emma: What is your cell phone number?
Ann: 010-2827-xxxx.
Emma: What is your name?
Ann: s041@xxxxx.com
T: Okay, next.
Emma: Mailing address.
Ann: 509 Dong . . . (all students in the class laugh because in Korean “dong” means neighbourhood, but with a hard “d” sound –“ddong” – it is a slang term for faeces).
T: (Talking to Danny and Max) No you guys, right here, don’t play with the board please (Danny began drawing pictures on the whiteboard). Danny, come one. Max is trying to give you his information now. Write it down. Where is your pen? Where’s your pencil. Don’t play.

Again, Ann gave her book to Emma who writes down her phone number.

T: Okay, Ann, now you ask Lily.
Ann: Lily, what’s your name (class laughs)
Lily: My name is Lily.
T: Okay, Danny, now you come over here and ask Emma. Bring your book and come. Speak in English. Don’t play you boys. Don’t do that.
Ann: What is your cell phone number?
Lily: 010-8050-xxxx

At this point, Danny and Max playfully hit each other.
Max: Danny is homeless.

T: Don’t say that Max.

Danny: Yes. I’m homeless (Max and Danny laugh)

Ann: What is your email address please?

Lily: awaw9218@xxxxx.com

Ann: Say again, please.

Lily: Just write something.

As Danny talked to Emma, Max began to push him from behind.

T: Max, don’t do that.

Danny: Yeah, go away.

Max: What? I’m over here (Max steps back).

The Teacher ended the activity after approximately 12 minutes, primarily due to her feeling that students were not entirely on-task; the students were meant to complete the activity without the Teacher’s assistance, however she intervened numerous times to clarify the activity and for disciplinary reasons (writing on the whiteboard, speaking Korean, and copying information from each other’s books). Although the activity is essentially a jigsaw speaking task and the language is somewhat formulaic, the students were excited to move around the classroom and interact. They demonstrated their engagement through playful banter (“Danny’s homeless”) and word play (the use of “ddong” instead of “dong” as a scatological play on the pronunciation of a term commonly used in Korea).

While exchanging contact information is below the general level of English proficiency of the students in this study, expressing, comprehending, and recording a mixture of numbers, letters, and symbols was a fairly challenging listening activity, yet there was only one clear instance of a clarification requests (Ann: “Say again, please”). Unfortunately, when students had difficulty understanding each other they mostly waited until the Teacher was not looking then copied the information from their partner’s book instead of asking their partner to repeat.

The exercise may not seem particularly meaningful in terms of autonomy, complexity, and intrinsic reward (Gladwell, 2008), but the students seemed excited to have a reason to exchange personal contact information with their classmates after eight months together. And while the language demand of the activity was not especially open-ended, the Teacher did not specifically restrict students to requesting only the information on page 79 — they were permitted to ask any question they wanted and to provide any response they wished, as long as it related to the thematic topic of personal information. However, the only
instance of this is when Danny replied “I’m homeless,” rather than giving his home address (he was, in fact, *not* homeless). Nonetheless, throughout this activity, students exercised their creativity through humour and language play, finding different ways to convey the information (hand gestures to make the “@” sign and, regretfully, copying from each other’s books), and interacted playfully with each other and the Teacher. There is certainly room for improvement in making this activity more personally meaningful, but students seemed pleased to interact with their peers, exchange personal information, and use English for a practical purpose.

4.4.3 Meaningful Work: A Comparative Analysis of Affordances

In the *Collaborative Reflection* stage of *The 10Cs of Project-based TESOL Curriculum*, students were invited to reflect upon the process of making and presenting the project and to offer feedback to their peers. The extract above is taken from a Collaborative Reflection session in the tenth month of the program and, at this point, the familiarity amongst the remaining students (Julie, Jane, and Kevin) allowed them to more readily share their feelings and opinions. For example, Kevin revealed that he finds the *Culmination Stage* (the presentation/peformance), “tense and straining,” later elaborating that he did not mean this in a negative way, but rather that he felt it was challenging and made him prepare well for what he would say. Jane focused on how the projects helped her with her English speaking skill, which she acknowledged was a major reason she elected to take this class. She also stated that she valued feedback from the Teacher and her group members during the process of making the project as well as the evaluation that followed the presentations. Julie affirmed that the relationship-building aspect of the curriculum and the numerous opportunities to use English constructively made it, in her words, “normal in this class to use English, so I think the best thing about this project is that I can use English without hesitation.” Interaction with peers helped Julie build her confidence not only with speaking English, but also with taking on new challenges, such as painting. Both Kevin and Jane commended her for her efforts in painting the collage, and Julie likewise praised Kevin’s contributions, telling him, “…so I think you were creative, thank you for that.”

In this discussion, the students (Persons) conveyed how *Meaningful Work* was generated through their experience of creating the Collage Story (Domain), and how the opportunities (Affordances) to use new mediums in the learning process helped build their confidence to communicate in English during the class (Domain). In addition, they stated that it also encouraged them to use new language and to do their best to be creative. The work also became meaningful through the Teacher’s (Field) feedback, which the students found “helpful” (Affordances), and because the Teacher allowed a great deal of freedom in how students
interpreted the project (Affordances), although she did regulate the language and thematic requirements more closely in later projects (Domain/Field).

In the next chapter, I will turn to the students’ interview data to articulate their perspectives on how they found the work “meaningful” (or not), but here, I employ the etic view of the ethnographic analysis, observations recorded in my field notes, and convey the emic view through the Teacher’s impressions about how meaningful work was or was not enacted in both curricula. Thus, continuing with the PBL-Group, in an interview on 18 September 2015, approximately one month before the extract above, as students were in the middle stages of the Collage Project, I asked the Teacher whether she felt students in either or both curricula had improved their creativity, she replied:

**T:** With the PBL curriculum, yeah, definitely . . . especially with the latest project, it was really fun. It was all their first time painting. They, they, like, I saw them hesitating, like, they’d dip the paint brush in the paint and before they even let it touch the canvas, I could see them second-guessing themselves and they were slowly stroking and then they got more enthusiastic as they were painting. I mean, literally, they were just filling up a white space with pink paint so it wasn’t even that like, Avante Garde or anything. But after that, I could hear Jane talking to her friend on the phone, she’s like, “I like painting now. See I can paint. I didn’t know I could paint like this.” She said she felt really confident after that.

The Teacher recognized how the interactive flow between the construction of the collage (Domain), the opportunity to paint and to write a creative story about it (Affordances), and the students’ (Persons) new found confidence to communicate in English and experiment with new modes of learning (Affordances) all contributed to the “enthusiasm” in the classroom (Classroom Climate). The Teacher expressed that the improvement in students’ confidence was one of the aspects of the program that she enjoyed most. When I asked in our final interview if she felt that she had any “success stories,” she responded (30 December 2015):

**T:** In the PBL curriculum, I think maybe, maybe Julie because even though she was always consistently, like, skill-wise she was always very good but I think her attitude changed a little bit. Like, in the beginning she was kind of like, um, like she beat herself up a lot if she didn’t do as well as she thought she would and I kept having a lot of conversations with her, like, it’s not a big deal, like, you can do better next time and like, she just seems more laid back and I don’t know if that’s because of me or it’s her own personality.

**Researcher:** So, the fact that she kind of relaxed a little bit, how did that affect her performance in class?

**T:** I think that she was much more willing to enjoy the projects even if like she always considered herself not be a creative person and she didn’t want to, like, to do art stuff, but like, I think by the end she just, like, it wasn’t even that she was resigning herself like, “oh, we’re here, let just do it”; but she was more, like, I want to try it! Like, she was like smiling and enjoying the activities not because she was interested in the art per se, but just because she was not expecting that she should excel at all the projects. Like, she was just going to go with the flow of it.

The Teacher’s comments above suggest that there is a conflation (or perhaps an interrelationship) between Openness to Experience and Meaningful Work, however, there is an important distinction: while openness to experience essentially means a willingness to try new things, Meaningful Work moves beyond just being receptive and connotes a personal investment in the work through including one’s personal interests, ideas,
and identity and through recognizing the inherent value of intention and effort in the work (Gladwell, 2008; Starko, 2013). I have categorized Julie’s performance under Meaningful Work because it is my belief that the teacher’s encouragement helped Julie realize that purpose and effort in constructing the projects was more important than the outcome, and this allowed Julie to focus more on enjoying the process and infusing the projects with her own ideas and interests.

In the TB-Curriculum, the textbook (Domain) acted to limit the information that students requested from their peers, as the students (Persons) asked only for the contact detail information required to complete the activity rather than supplementing the activity with their own questions. However, Danny attempted to inject humour into the activity by stating that Max “doesn’t have a home,” but the Teacher disallowed this (presumably because she felt it inappropriate). The Teacher (Field) also regulated the activity rather closely to ensure they were responding appropriately to the prompts (Domain). On several occasions, she modeled a “correct” response and guided them through the activity.

Students did not always follow the “rules” of the activity (Affordances); for example when Danny asked Max, “what is your cell phone number,” Max replied, “I don’t have one (which was untrue because the Teacher had called Max on his cell phone earlier that day). In another example, when Ann did not understand Lily’s email address, instead of repeating it, Lily instructed her to, “Just write something,” recognizing that the ‘correct’ answer was not necessarily the point of the exercise. Although, the activity does not appear to capture students’ interest, it could be argued that affordances for creativity and expanded language-use were possible with some modification. At times, students seemed poised to exploit these affordances, but the Teacher focused students’ attention on accurate replication of the model answers, creating a one way flow between the design of the activity (Domain) and what the Teacher (Field) expected students (Persons) to do. The Teacher did not see students’ (Persons) deviation from conformity as a correlate to creative potential, but rather placed responsibility for their lack of improvement on their inadequate engagement in classroom activities (Domain): In our final interview on 30 December, 2015, the Teacher disclosed her concluding perception of the TB-Group:

**Researcher:** Do you think students improved their creativity?

**T:** For the textbook curriculum, not at all. I don’t feel like their creativity has gone anywhere. I don’t know about their [TTCT] tests or whatever. And, I speculate that if there was an improvement it would probably be on the behalf of that person, that person is just innately able to improve. I don’t think it was from using the book.

**Researcher:** Why not?

**T:** Because the parts of the book that are really creative and give them a chance to do something fun, they don’t care at all and they don’t participate. So, if they’re not practicing in the creative parts of the book . . . like, for example, at the end of the unit, um, there’s usually a software video that they have to watch and sometimes there’ll be little sections where they’ll be like, oh, uh, for example, there’s one where they were talking about communication and they gave
some examples of some symbols and how people could communicate with them. In the book, it’s like make your own symbols and tell us what it meant or whatever. They didn’t want to do it. I was just like, “let’s do this,” and they were like, “no we want to go home,” because if we had done the activity it would have been an extra five or ten minutes. I’m like, “Come on, let’s just, you guys want to do it?” They were like, “No, no, no, we want to go home, we want to go home.” They didn’t want to try it. Also, before that part in each unit, there’s an article that would be something like you would see in the National Geographic. It’s an article related somewhat to the topic in the unit. And, when I asked them questions about it, sometimes, after, like, afterwards, they don’t pay attention to the article for one thing and I think they’re really fun because it’s more like reading a magazine as opposed to a textbook. But they hate it; they don’t want to read it. And then after that there’s always a thing where you have to create some new text of your own. So, for example, if there’s an article about traveling, you’re supposed to write your own, um, advice on how to, um, like if somebody else was traveling to that place, giving them some traveling advice. You’re supposed to write it in the same kind of article way. They didn’t want to do it. They totally didn’t even listen. They just don’t want to do it. So, I can’t see how even a creative book could help them because they just don’t want to do it.

The Teacher’s comments were spurred by her frustration with the lack of engagement and mounting disciplinary issues from the TB-Group. She was not alone in her grievances; my field notes reflect that I experienced similar discouragement with their behaviour. On 7 August 2015, the day from which the extract is taken, I noted at the end of this activity:

Wow, students really do not want to do anything. How hard is it really to give each other contact information? Boys drawing on board, girls copying from book. Maybe this is too easy or maybe a different activity would be better – maybe they just don’t want to do anything.

Whatever the reason for the TB-Group’s perceived reluctance to engage in activities, the textbook did not intrinsically prohibit creativity or language expansion. While it can be argued that more attention by both the Teacher and students needed to be given to making the activities more challenging and finding ways to better incorporate students’ individual interests and ideas, ultimately, meaningfulness is not an object of the curriculum, but of the individual and how they immerse themselves in the process. Nonetheless, the teacher and activities play a critical role in facilitating this process and, in an interview one year after the start of the study (11 November 2015), the Teacher offered advice for novice teachers who may teach in a student-centred classroom:

T: I think that once you foster a positive attitude then maybe students will be more confident about their own abilities and I think once you, once you bolster confidence they’ll be more able to express their inner creativity and imagination rather than thinking, “I can’t do it,” so they’re not even going to try. I think that everyone has some inherent skill or, not skill, but like some innate ability to be creative to whatever extent, but they just don’t access it because they just feel like they can’t. So, I think if you had the correct leadership skills or communicative, communicative skills like you would be able to, you would be able to get it better across to your students and it would encourage them to be creative in that way. Not necessarily improving their creativity, but just letting it out and unleashing it, if that make sense.

In essence, she was conveying her feeling that the teacher must help students discover the confidence to believe they can be creative in the EFL classroom, and the teacher and students must cooperate to find suitable activities, and opportunities in every activity, to make the work more meaningful. While, this can be achieved in both curricula, the Teacher was less apt to see what students were doing in the TB-driven Curriculum as creative, demonstrating again that the Teacher’s perspective was instrumental in the type of affordances created through the curriculum and how receptive students were towards acting upon them.
4.5 Collaboration

Effective collaboration involves sharing, debating, negotiating, and fusing individual contributions during group-oriented activities to boost creative productivity amongst all members of the group. (Thompson, 2013). This requires openness to the opinions of others, making connections between one’s own ideas and the ideas of classmates and the teacher, and the development of a shared vision (Kurtzberg & Amabile, 2001; Rojas-Drummond et al., 2008). Working with peers can also boost students’ self-esteem, self-confidence and willingness to take an active role, and activate curiosity, empathy, compassion, problem-solving abilities and the capacity to negotiate, compromise, and debate effectively (Robinson & Aronica, 2015). Research on the role of conflict in bolstering creative production has shown that minority dissent and diversity within the group improves the quality of decisions and foments divergent thinking (Nemeth et al., 2004). Thus, disagreement and debate are not interpreted as group disharmony, but rather as part of the constructive process of elaboration and development. Essentially, group creativity can be described as the exploration of novel learning experiences and the acquisition of new knowledge through the process of working together to amalgamate the creative contributions of all members of a group (R. K. Sawyer & DeZutter, 2009). The following provides examples of creative collaboration from the PBL and TB-driven curricula.

4.5.1 Collaboration: Project-based Learning Curriculum

The following dialogue took place on the fourth day of the Collage Project detailed in section 4.4.1 above (see requirements in Figure 4.4.1A) on 3 October 2015. Students had finished making their collage during the Creation Stage in the previous class, and thus this extract takes place during the Change Stage, the step in the process which emboldens students to critique their semi-finished project and then debate, plan, and perform any modifications they believe would improve the project. To precipitate “confrontation” in the PBL Curriculum, group members were asked to explore the boundaries of the project constraints in order to recognise how they shaped what they had produced thus far and how they could now go beyond the requirements by extending vocabulary and other elements of the project. Jane was absent on the second day of the Creation stage and Julie left 15 minutes early, but Kevin stayed late to finish the border around the edge and add more colour-printed images —therefore, this was the first time Julie and Jane had seen the semi-finished version of the collage. The Teacher began the class by attempting to guide them into critical discussion regarding changes:

T: Think about what changes that you can make realistically . . . really . . . what can you change?

Jane: Her arm? (To the group members, rather than to the teacher)
Julie: Yeah.

T: That’s an easy fix, right. Let’s make that change number one. Okay. So, Kevin, do you agree to make that change?

Kevin: Yes.

T: How can we fix her arm? How can we change her arm?

Julie: Draw it again.

T: You mean, like paint it again?

Julie: Yeah.

T: Okay. You guys talk about some other changes you want to make. You don’t need me to say everything, right. So, that’s number one; the arm. Look at your worksheet (see Appendix K). It can help you think about what you guys need to talk about.

Jane: We need to finish the frame.

Julie: Yeah. Okay. (There is about 30 seconds of silence)

T: Finished?

Julie: Um, yeah . . . finish this (pointing to the outside frame of the collage)?

T: Yeah, so that’s your other change. What else? You guys talk. You don’t need me to say all of this. This is your group time. I’ll give you another 20 minutes. You talk about what changes you want to make.

Jane: Add a more . . . more of it . . . kinds of communication?

Julie: Uh. Yeah. Okay. We need fax and blackberry. (Kevin quickly takes out his phone and begins to search for these words).

Jane: And also a letter.

T: Make sure you guys write it down so you won’t forget what you talked about. Write it down.

Jane: You mean [inaudible]?

Julie: Uh, no. I mean the words. The group talk (referring to the word bubbles of the characters in the collage).

Jane: Okay. Yeah, that’s better.

Julie: And, so. Okay, Kevin. What do you think?

Jane: Change the colour? (This was a criticism Kevin made in the previous class. He was not present the day that Julie and Jane painted the background pink).

Julie: That’s really hard to change.

Kevin: Uh. The woman is . . . uh, need . . . her friend.

Julie: Oh yeah, her face.

Kevin: Face? No.

Jane: Her friend?
Kevin: I think we need more people.

Julie: Oh yeah.

From this exchange, they decided to add another character to the collage. Following the discussion above, the students worked cooperatively to create a plot for their story, which stimulated more open-ended questions:

Julie: What do you think the drawing should be? (Referring to the new character)


From this emerged the idea of a girl inviting a shy boy that she likes to her birthday party. Approximately fifteen minutes later, Jane seeks suggestions for one of the project requirements:

Julie: How can we use these numbers? Ideas?

Julie then proposed the idea of adding numbers to the various communication devices, putting the girl’s home address on the birthday invitation along with the date of her birthday (which was Julie’s real birthday). They also placed more cut-outs of birthday-related foods and chose to include their names on the collage by painting them.

In this example, the additive nature of collaborative creativity is apparent. Several ideas were offered and those agreed upon were incorporated into their finished project (Figure 4.5.1). Each group member made important contributions in modifying the project: Jane suggested repainting the arm, Julie recommended including more communication devices, and Kevin proposed adding another character. They also debated elements of the project as when Jane asks, “Change the colour?” because Kevin had previously criticised the pink background; however, Julie insisted that this would be too difficult to change (because they had already glued on the pictures). Also, when Jane says, “Finish this,” referring to the black border of the painting (see Figure 4.5.1), she was implying that it needed to be fixed because Kevin had not done a precise job of attaching it to the canvas. All group members took an active role in solving problems and their capacity for empathy, compassion, and compromise are exhibited, particularly in the way they are tactful with their criticism. The development of self-esteem and collaborative confidence is also present as they worked to improve the overall quality and completeness of the project (a feature also resonant in their conversation in Section 4.4.1) (Robinson & Aronica, 2015).

More than just posing suggestions, the students also prompt each other’s ideas and insights by posing direct questions, such as when Jane requested her group members’ opinions about changing the colour of the canvas and about how to use the numbers (“Ideas?”). Julie recognises the need for multiple perspectives and directly appeals for Kevin’s thoughts about what the new character should look like. The
final product is a composition of all their input, and the process of creative exploration through new experiences is evident from the beginning to the end of the process cycle. From their own assessment in interviews and in the *Collaborative Reflection* stage (section 4.4.1), the students were pleased with the outcome of the collage, proud of their newly discovered skills with painting, and cognizant of how the project improved their communicative skills in English and enhanced their capacity to work collaboratively.
Figure 4.5.1: Project-Based Learning Curriculum Collage Project: “Our Communication Party” (Project #4)
4.5.2 Collaboration: Textbook-driven Curriculum

The textbook used in this study is described as “A practical competency-based syllabus [that] gives learners the chance to practice language through communicative tasks . . . “ (Milner, 2010, back cover). It includes pair and small group discussion tasks in every unit and the teacher made effective use of these activities, requiring students to speak in complete sentences and frequently encouraging them to provide a degree of elaboration in their responses. The following communicative tasks are, again, from Unit 7, with the conversation extracts below taken from students’ pair work when completing Activities A and B found on page 80 (Figure 4.5.2).

The Teacher began the class by briefly introducing “the senses” (top of page 80), and prompting students to read the five senses (sight, hearing, taste, smell, and touch). She then proceeded to Activity A by first reading the instructions, then putting students into pairs. There were only four students present and she decided to place Lily and Ann together as one pair and Emma and Kellan together as another. She began by demonstrating how to ask and answer the questions:

**T:** Discuss these questions with a partner. What senses do you use to identify these characteristics (this is read directly from the textbook) . . . Ann, ask Lily, what sense do you use to identify sweet, ask her. I just told you the question: What sense do you use to identify sweet?

**Ann:** (Repeating after the teacher) What sense do you use to identify sweet?

**Lily:** I use taste.

**T:** Very good. Okay, now ask her about dirty. Okay. You guys too (to Emma and Kellan). Start.

**Lily:** What senses do you to identify dirty?

**Ann:** Touch (They look at each other, nod, and laugh).

**T:** Kellan, ask Emma. What sense (Kellan repeats) do you use (Kellan repeats) to identify (Kellan repeats) sweet (Kellan repeats).

**Emma:** I use taste.

**Ann:** What senses do you use to identify soft?

**Lily:** I use touch. What senses do you use to identify salty?

**Ann:** I use taste. What sense do you use to identify loud?

**Lily:** I use hearing. What senses do you use to identify bad?

**Ann:** Hmm. I use smell. What senses to you use to identify green?
Language Expansion: The senses

The senses are the physical abilities of:

- sight
- hearing
- taste
- smell
- touch

With the senses we perceive (see, notice, feel) characteristics and qualities of people, animals, places, and things.

A. Discuss this question with a partner. What senses do you use to identify these characteristics?

- sweet
- dirty
- soft
- salty

- loud
- bad
- green
- wet

B. Work with a partner to make a list of other things you can perceive with your senses.

Grammar: Linking verbs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>verb</th>
<th>adjective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The food</td>
<td>smells</td>
<td>delicious,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It</td>
<td>feels</td>
<td>soft,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You</td>
<td>look</td>
<td>cold,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It</td>
<td>tastes</td>
<td>salty,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He</td>
<td>sounds</td>
<td>tired,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Verbs of the senses are not action verbs.
*They are usually followed by an adjective.
*They are not used in the simple progressive tense.
Lily: I use sight. What senses do you use to identify when something’s wet?

Ann: I use touch.

T: Everything finished?

Ann & Lily: Yes.

T: Okay, let’s go to the next one. Work with a partner to make a list of other things you can perceive with your senses (this is read directly from the instruction in Activity B). So, see here, you have a blank space in your book, right (pointing to the left margin of page 80)?

Lily: Yes.

T: You guys talk together and try to make a list of more things you can see, touch, smell, hear, or taste. Okay? Do it now. Make as many things together as you can. You two, do it together. For example, Lily, you can ask Ann, “What are some other things (Lily repeats), we perceive with sight (Lily repeats). Like, what else can you see, right? We have to use adjectives, adjectives. Like clean, pretty, ugly, you can see those adjectives, right? You got it? Okay? Start. Maybe you should make a section for each one, this one, sight, hearing, smell. Make a section for each one, okay? You guys too. Remember, you have to find things that are like adjectives. For sight, we can see ugly, pretty, like that okay?


T: Good. Keep writing it.

Lily: Quiet, noisy.

Kellan: Gentle. (Kevin leans back in his chair and sighs). Clean.

T: Good.

Ann: Pretty, handsome.

Lily: Cute.

Kellan: Cute.

T: Don’t take all of theirs. Try to do your own.

Kellan: Sick.

Lily: Delicious. And chick. (Lily speaks Korean and Ann laughs -they try to explain the joke to the teacher, but the teacher does not understand).

T: I don’t get it. You mean “chic”, like fashionable? I don’t know that one. I don’t know. Try to use adjectives. Do as many as you can for each sense.

Lily: Disgusting.

T: I would think disgusting would be taste or smell, right.

Kellan: Fat!

T: You guys can use your dictionary too on your phone if you want to. It will help you a lot. Fat, you can see, right. Also touch, you can touch fat.

Lily: Love.

T: Love? Love is a noun not an adjective. It has to be an adjective. You guys can use your phone dictionary.

Lily: Smooth.

Teacher: Also colours. Colours and numbers can be adjectives.

After this, both pairs proceeded to list a series of colours (“red,” “yellow,” “blue”, referencing a poster on the classroom wall) and laughed as they spoke them.

Lily: What about taste?

Lily and Ann communicated in a mix of English and Korean as they tried to figure out the English word that Lily wanted to say.

T: What is that?
Lily: Not sweet, not sour, not spicy, not delicious . . .
T: Bland. B-L-A-N-D.
Lily: Sharp?
T: For taste?
Lily: No, no, not for taste.
T: Yes. Good.

This last exchange is a little confusing and I am unsure whether the Teacher understood what Lily and Ann were trying to convey, but it is a good example of students attempting to extend their linguistic resources through assistance from the Teacher. After about three minutes into the activity, students were mostly translating words using their phones and reading them to their partner; however, they did find and express a number of new words not in the textbook, including: “smoky,” “tough,” “frozen,” and “hard.” In total, the pair work (p. 80, activities A/B) lasted for approximately 11 minutes, before the Teacher decided to undertake the grammar section at the bottom of page 80 as a whole class exercise.

While the activity does not present much opportunity for dissent or negotiation, there are what Glăveanu (2012) called unexploited affordances for students to debate what senses are best used to detect certain adjectives (for example, asking if “smoky” is more of a sight, smell, or taste sense). The activity also does not appear to require much curiosity-raising, elaboration, or mixing of ideas, but this could have been reasonably built into the task by asking them to apply the adjectives in some meaningful way. The activity, however, did provide students the opportunity to expand their linguistic resources by looking up new adjectives (Originality), and helped improve their confidence by allowing them to share their lexical knowledge to complete the task. Pair and group work, even in relatively basic tasks such as generating word lists, can enhance the classroom atmosphere by allowing students to feel empowered and to benefit from the strengths of others. Additionally, in this excerpt, nearly all students took an active role in the learning process and coordinated their efforts to complete the task, which seems to have had a positive impact on the learning environment.

4.5.3 Collaboration: A Comparative Analysis of Affordances

Several aspects that characterize effective collaboration are reflected in the PBL Curriculum extract above. “Sharing” occurs when students offered their opinions about the colour of the background, the need to fix the outside border and adding more features (forms of communication, numbers, and
another character for their story). They “debated” (briefly) about whether to change the background colour; and they “fused their ideas” by continuously prompting suggestions and evaluating them. This extract also shows that they were not only open to, but purposefully eliciting the ideas of others, as in the four examples below:

• **Jane:** Add a more . . . more of it . . . kinds of communication?
• **Julie:** [...] Okay, Kevin. What do you think?
• **Jane:** Change the colour?
• **Julie:** How can we use these numbers? Ideas?

In the PBL Curriculum students (Persons) were largely responsible for deciding what the final collage would look like, and the Teacher (Field) allowed a great deal of freedom in this project (Domain). The deliberate ambiguity in the project description required the students to discuss nearly every element of the project design (Affordances). It took time for students to develop the rapport to communicate openly, but their progressive willingness to do so contributed to more ideas being generated in the later projects.

From early in the study, the Teacher recognized the potential that collaborative group work held for engaging students, particularly those at a lower proficiency level. In her first interview on 11 November 2014 (after both classes had met once), I asked what she noticed about student engagement in the PBL Curriculum:

**T:** As far as the PBL-based group even the students who don’t really talk very much, they were at least *thinking* about their project and making up ideas and laughing with their friends about it. And so . . . Maybe they didn’t want to engage with me, but I could see that they at least wanted to engage with each other.

Unfortunately, some students continued to struggle with this classroom dynamic and the expectation to constantly interact with their peers made it difficult for them to adapt, eventually leading to attrition (although other factors were involved in their decision to leave). However, for the PBL students that persisted, the Teacher felt that teamwork was an indispensable element in their continued interest in the class, as well as their language and creativity development. In an interview on 18 September 2015, I asked the Teacher to elaborate on why she believed students in the PBL-Group continued to work on their projects even when the she announced that it was break time:

Yeah, they’re not really asking for the time where they need their brain to take a break and they want to talk to each other because they’re talking to each other in class. Even if they go off subject, I don’t really mind because they’re still talking to each other. Sometimes they’ll go off in little tangents like, “oh yeah, this [the project] reminds me of this.” But they’re still staying in English. That’s another thing. I rarely have to . . . I can’t remember the last time I told them, “Hey, speak in English, don’t use Korean.” I can’t remember the last time. They’re just, they do it, they do it on their own . . .

She then quickly compares this to the TB-Group:

**T:** But with the Textbook class, it’s continuously, “Speak in English, speak in English. Stay in English!” They just keep . . . they won’t stop and they won’t stop asking about breaks.
Researcher: So, if you had to speculate, could you just give me your own evaluation, is it the curriculum itself or is it the students?

T: Definitely the curriculum.

Researcher: Yeah?

T: Because that’s a fun group [the TB-Group]. I think if they were doing stuff where they could make stuff and talk to each other, they might even be more motivated to speak more English, not go back into Korean to just have fun in class. I don’t think, I think there would be a similar effect. I don’t think they would care about the class time or taking a break. I think they would just enjoy being there and talking to each other.

There were opportunities for the students (Persons) in the TB-Group to work in pairs and small groups, but it usually involved completing an exercise in the textbook (Domain), which, as can be seen in the extract above, resulted in questions and responses (Affordances) that were directed, short, and formulaic in nature. Clearly, the Teacher’s (Field) expectation of language production (Affordances) was different in the two curricula. When I asked the Teacher to compare the learners’ qualities between the two groups in our final interview, she responded (Interview, 30 December 2015):

T: Um. Okay. Well, in the Textbook curriculum, I guess the way I would describe it is, uh, not involved, a little bit apathetic to what was going on. Just, there was no, like, there was no reward for them at all. And, uh, there was no incentive for them to actually try to learn any of the information that I was giving them so, it’s just a very passive situation. Like, their bodies were merely in the classroom and like maybe they were hoping that maybe by osmosis they hoped to absorb some of the English I was spewing at them. So, it was just a passive apathetic thing.

When discussing the PBL-Curriculum in the same interview, she recognized the difficulties faced by some students early in the study and commends the perseverance of the remaining students, referencing the role that increased confidence through collaboration played in their development:

T: Um, I guess with the like, in the earlier parts with some of the lower level students, it made them very vulnerable and it made them feel, uh, self-conscious and, uh, it wasn’t very good for their egos and I think, personally I wish they would have just gotten over themselves and stuck with it, but like, anyways, um . . . Yeah, and then with some of the stronger students I saw them getting more comfortable in their roles, I guess. Like, there was a comfort that I could see wash over them as they were getting used to the demands and the steps of what they were expected to do. You could see in their posture as in their body language and, like, the way they would engage each other in conversation. Um, they just felt like, “Okay, I’m confident that I can do this now, even if we keep changing the project and I don’t know what’s coming; I don’t know what we’re going to do next, like, I’m still confident that I can do it.”

I also noticed this phenomenon and recorded in my field notes on 18 April 2015:

*Ss ebb and flow with conversation – they search for information on their phones, discuss the story, type it, refine it, etc. This demonstrates a working knowledge of “process” – although it is to some degree subconscious [to the students]. T asks if they want to take a break but they seem to have forgotten about the break and are surprised by the time. Ss are actually working extremely well and seem really interested in their project and have an easier time talking about it.*

But near the end of the study on 31 October 2015, I lamented in my field notes (brackets original):

*They are good when they talk about their project, but there are still too many long bouts of silence sometimes. How can I [in the design of the curriculum] fill this void?*

It is my belief that spans of relative quiet are inevitable in student-centred approaches like PBL, but when reviewing the transcripts, there were moments just as long (or longer) in the TB-driven
Curriculum when students were not talking primarily because the Teacher was giving long instructions and explanations. When I asked the Teacher in our final interview (30 December 2015) what advice she would give to teachers who might teach a PBL-oriented curriculum in the future, she immediately responded:

T: Uh, don’t fear the silence in the classroom. Uh, let it, let the void get to them. Don’t let it get to you. It should get to them so that they should want to speak. Yeah (Teacher laughs).

As exemplified in the extracts above, collaborative activities provide greater affordances for student discussion, but will require time for students to adjust and to understand what is expected of them. Indeed, even after students appeared to have developed confidence to communicate and a greater appreciation of the process through group work, they struggled to interact at times and effective teamwork was not a linear progression but rather an “ebb and flow” throughout the study. There is a myriad of reasons for the Teacher’s and students’ challenges in both curricula, not the least of which had to do with contextual factors and individual variation amongst the Cases. These two issues are highlighted in the next chapter through the participants’ own perspectives.

4.6 Summary of Main Findings

The extensive data gathered over the course of the yearlong study produced compelling empirical evidence on which to base a definition of creativity in the L2 classroom. The study determined the following five characteristics, conceived as both learner characteristics and features of the learning environment, to be the most pertinent and salient to creativity in the language learning classroom: 1) Originality and Appropriateness; 2) Process-(but not step-by-step)-Oriented; 3) Openness to Experience; 4) Meaningful Work; and 5) Collaboration.

Analysis of each characteristic found differences between the two curricula from the students’ and Teacher’s perspectives. For Originality and Appropriateness, the Teacher’s management of interaction and understanding of her role as teacher critically altered the dynamic of interaction. In the PBL Curriculum, she saw students’ input into the projects as building on the textbook content, but in the TB-driven Curriculum, she focused on the textbook objectives as the main learning aims. Both a cause and corollary to this is that she conflated appropriateness with correctness in the TB-driven Curriculum, while allowing for more exploration in the PBL Curriculum by permitting mistakes without immediate feedback. The way she corrected students in the two curricula was also distinct, giving error correction and requesting repetition of the accurate form in the TB-Group verse engaging in conversations and asking for elaboration in the PBL-Group. The Teacher’s comments show that these distinctions were deeply influenced by previous teaching experiences, a different conceptualisation of curricular goals
between the two curricula, and a different relationship dynamic developed with students, affirming that she had a more favourable opinion towards students in the PBL-Group.

The Teacher’s different perceptions of the curricular goals, and to some extent her more amicable relationship with students in the PBL-Group, were arguably the result of the differences in the learning process. While providing order and structure to the class, the over-dependence on the textbook lessons in the TB-driven Curriculum limited affordances for creativity and novel language use. However, this had less to do with the design of the textbook, and more to do with students’ perception of the work as something to complete. Adding to this view was the Teacher’s adherence to the textbook process which contributed to students seeing the Domain as something prescribed and transmitted rather than mutually shaped through interaction; however, in the later months of the study, the Teacher realised that students’ disengagement was in part due to their perception that the textbook controlled the communicative dynamic of classroom activities. In contrast, the students in the PBL-Group understood project-making as a continuous and iterative process in which, following a sociocultural perspective, they learned in coordination with their Teacher and peers. Unfortunately, the perceived lack of pedagogical “structure” in the PBL-Group was largely responsible for the early attrition because the “openness” made it difficult for some students to understand the lesson objectives and to acclimatize to their new role in the classroom.

But for the students who remained in the PBL-Group, empirical observation, as well as the Cases’ own reports, support the claim that understanding their engagement as mutual interaction with the Domain, helped students recognise the importance of Openness to Experience. The Teacher also realised that her interaction with the Domain played an important role in the outcomes of the PBL-Curriculum as she mentioned on several occasions both the challenge and enjoyment she felt in devising new and interesting projects. For the TB-Group, again, students saw the experiences as being limited by the demands of the textbook activities (Domain) and the familiar nature of the textbook diminished the degree of openness they perceived in classroom interaction and made them see the activities as something to “complete” rather than something to engage with in a meaningful way.

Meaningful Work in the PBL Curriculum was integral in promoting the use of English in the classroom. All three Cases in the PBL-Group reported that continuous communication in English led them to see using English in the classroom as “normal,” purposeful, and enjoyable, hence developing their confidence to use English in class. In contrast, in the TB-driven Curriculum, the Teacher’s continuous focus on correct responses diverted students’ attention from meaningful language-use affordances (such as humour, playful banter, and seeking out novel and challenging experiences). While allowing, and occasionally encouraging, students to change words and use their own ideas in tasks, the Teacher’s
primary objective was ensuring accuracy rather than a personal investment in the task. Perhaps the most practical finding regarding *Meaningful Work* is that, in most cases, language-use affordances and affordances for creative engagement were present in the environment regardless of the curricular approach, but whether they are perceived and acted upon depends on how the teacher values and calls students’ attention towards them and how receptive students are to engaging with the learning environment and with each other.

The findings have demonstrated, in both groups, that *Collaboration* promotes creativity and language development. All Cases agreed that working with peers was a desired element and helpful for their language development. However, as (Robinson, 2011) pointed out, there is an important distinction between cooperation and collaboration — cooperation entails a synchronised effort and sharing of necessary information to complete a task, while collaboration entails sharing ideas, negotiating, debating, and interacting throughout the process in a manner that directly affects the outcome — empirical evidence demonstrates that the TB-Group mostly engaged in the former during group work while the PBL-Group embodied the latter. Indeed, students in the PBL-Group found this interactive dynamic as a major contributing factor in their language development, reporting that they learned to build on others’ knowledge, ideas and strengths, and improved their confidence to communicate in English and engage in novel experiences. It is difficult to see this type of collaborative interaction in the TB-Group, but again, this is seemingly more the result of the teacher and students’ perception of group activities than the activities themselves. Indeed, the next chapter focuses on the student and teacher’s perspectives in order to prioritise their thoughts, feelings, and perception of creativity in the L2 classroom.
CHAPTER 5 FINDINGS 2: EXPLORING THE PARTICIPANTS’ PERSPECTIVES OF CREATIVITY AND THE L2 CURRICULUM

“Creativity is not a talent or ability; it is the fruit of a person’s decision to matter.”

—Eric Maisel

This chapter is dedicated to delineating the second Research Question, which is:

What are learners’ perspectives and attitudes towards creativity in language learning and how does the curriculum influence these perspectives and attitudes?

This chapter begins by presenting findings from the students’ pre, mid, and post tests of the Torrance Test of Creativity (TTCT) and the Darakwon™ TOEFL Jr Practice Test which provided quantitative measures of their creativity and English proficiency, respectively. While these scores can offer insights into the participants’ creativity and L2 development (or lack thereof), it should be stated again that this study is not correlational in nature, and indeed aims to fill the gap of the many studies that have used a correlational design in assessing the relationship between creativity and L2 proficiency and given little attention to the learner or the learning environment. With this in mind, the quantitative data is weaved with qualitative analysis in order to relate, from the perspective of the participants, how creativity and the language curriculum influenced the students’ learning experiences and developmental trajectory over the duration of the study.

As mentioned in Chapter 3, six students, three from each curriculum, were selected as representative Cases. Choosing six specific students allowed for the data to be managed and articulated in a far more coherent and concise manner while remaining comprehensive enough to paint a relatively complete picture of language development and variability amongst participants, allowing for a more concentrated exploration of the attitudes, behaviours, and development of individuals and their interactions (Creswell & Poth, 2017). The main criterion for selection of the cases was based on: 1) Scores from the Darakwon™ TOEFL Jr. Practice Test (as only the highest scoring students remained in the PBL-Group, Lily and Ann were selected from the TB-Group because their scores were the highest in the TB-Group, while Kellan (TB-Group) was chosen because his erratic scoring on the assessments and fluctuation in classroom behaviour made him an interesting Case), 2) regular attendance; 3) satisfactory homework completion; 4) participation in classroom activities; and 5) comprehensibility and ‘openness’ in interviews.

Before examining each individual case, the TOEFL Jr. (Table 5A) and TTCT (Table 5B) scores of all selected Cases are shown together for comparison. Again, in terms of matched pairs, Kellan (TB-Group) and Kevin (PBL-Group) do not correspond on the TOEFL Jr or TTCT test scores (although
both regressed from mid to post tests on the TTCT), but they do match in terms of unpredictable and inconsistent classroom behaviour and a questionable commitment to the program. Ann (TB-Group) and Jane (PBL-Group) match well in terms of their TTCT score, but differ in TOELF Jr results, with Jane being at a higher level of English proficiency (according to the test results). However, the interesting divergence between Ann and Jane is their in-class performance and learning trajectories. Although Lily (TB-Group) scored significantly higher on the TTCT pre-test than Julie (PBL-Group), 93rd and 79th percentiles, respectively, they were similar in their pre-test scores on the TOEFL Jr, and also comparable in terms of their learning trajectories and, to some degree, their classroom behaviour.

Table 5A: TOEFL Jr. Scores for all Cases (TB-driven and PBL groups)

Table 5B: TTCT Scores for all Cases (TB-driven and PBL groups)
5.1 Cases Studies: Baseline Demographic Data

Table 5.1 displays demographic information collected at the outset of the study including the participants’ age, gender, and years attending a private English academy. It also includes a record of the participants’ self-indicated levels of motivation to learn English and improve their creativity. For the questions requesting their motivational levels, they were provided three options, LOW, MEDIUM, and HIGH.

Table 5.1: Cases Demographic Information and Motivational Self-Assessment (Commencement of Study)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Age/Grade</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Years Studying English at a Private Academy</th>
<th>Current Motivation for learning English (Self-described)</th>
<th>What best describes your motivation to be more creative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kellan</td>
<td>13 / 6</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>MEDIUM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann</td>
<td>13 / 6</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>MEDIUM</td>
<td>MEDIUM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lily</td>
<td>14 / 7</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>MEDIUM</td>
<td>MEDIUM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Age/Grade</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Years Studying English at a Private Academy</th>
<th>Current Motivation for learning English (Self-described)</th>
<th>What best describes your motivation to be more creative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kevin</td>
<td>14 / 7</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>MEDIUM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie</td>
<td>14 / 7</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>HIGH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>14 / 7</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>MEDIUM</td>
<td>HIGH</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Age/Grade</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Years Teaching in South Korea</th>
<th>Years teaching in this language academy</th>
<th>Motivation to become a career educator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>28 / NA</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>MEDIUM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Jane and Julie had previously studied at private English language academies for 8 and 9 years respectively, far longer than the other students in the study. However, they did not score higher on the TOEFL Jr test than the students at the same age/grade level, Kevin and Lily, whom had studied for only two years at private academies before the research project began. It is difficult to speculate on the reasons why this might be as there are many possible factors, including the quality of the private education received, their parents’ proficiency in English, the student’s level of commitment for learning English, their cognitive, affective, and motivational states when taking the assessments, and numerous
other considerations. However, in general, it effectively demonstrates the heterogeneity of the participants in terms of language learning experiences and English proficiency.

Their self-reported personal motivation for learning English and improving their creativity also indicates differences amongst the participants. However, there are evident psychometric difficulties with the simplicity of the LOW, MEDIUM, and HIGH options (or any Likert-scale type item). First, what precisely constitutes “low,” “medium,” and “high” motivation was not explicitly defined on the questionnaire. Furthermore, it is impossible to know the range of divergence on the continuum between “Low,” “Medium” and “High” in the mental conceptualisation of each participant (the degree may in fact be quite small for some participants and quite large for others; individual yardsticks cannot be deduced from the response itself). Nonetheless, it can serve as a general, self-ascribed statement of their motivation for improving their English and creativity at the beginning of the study.

The table shows that the two males in the study, Kevin and Kellan, were more concerned with improving their English than their creativity. As gender was not an element under consideration in this study and no students, either in interviews or in classroom interaction, mentioned anything related to gender in terms of their creative competence or language development, it is difficult to speculate on the reasons for this, and from only two male Cases, it not possible to make any reasonable generalisations. For the four female Cases, there was more diversity in responses. Jane indicated that she was more interested in improving her creativity, while Ann and Lily expressed ‘Medium’ motivation for both, and Julie marked that she had a high level of motivation to improve both creativity and her English proficiency. In terms of age, the Textbook-based Group had two participants in Grade 6, with Lily being the only Grade 7 student in the representative Cases, while all three of the Cases in the Project-based Learning curriculum were in Grade 7. A more detailed account of the differences amongst the groups and individual students follows in the subsections below.

5.2 Case Studies: Textbook-driven Curriculum

Students were administered both the TOEFL Jr. English proficiency test and the Torrance Test of Creative Thinking (TTCT) three times during the yearlong study. Tables 5.2A and 5.2C show the Textbook-driven Curriculum students’ individual scores on the TOEFL Jr test and the TTCT, respectively.
The more detailed account of their test scores, shown in Table 5.2B, reveals some anomalies worth noting for each participant’s performance on the TOEFL Jr test.

First, Lily showed only minimal improvement on her Language Form (grammar and vocabulary) score from pre-test to post-test with a curious 7-point decrease during the mid-test. Her improvement in reading was gradual with a 7-point increase over the course of the year. However, she achieved a marked gain in her Listening score, an improvement of 11 points between the pre and post-tests, leading to a total score 22 points higher (22 more correct answers) on the post-test. In contrast, both Kellan’s and Ann’s score in the Listening section of the test declined by 5 and 6 points, respectively, over the duration of the study. This supports the rather obvious deduction that there are factors beyond the curriculum that affect the development of students’ Listening skill (as well as their overall English proficiency). Indeed, Ann’s 6-point drop in the Listening section is something of an enigma considering her consistent attendance and generally active engagement throughout the research study.
Kellan’s total scores show a plateauing from pre-test to mid-test with scores of 47 and 48 respectively, then a decline to a total score of 40 on the post-test. More detailed analysis, however, reveals a conspicuously erratic scoring trajectory. On the mid-test, he increased his Language Form and Listening scores slightly, while falling drastically on the reading score, from 16 points on the pre-test to a 9 on the mid-test. He then inverts this trend on the post-test, falling in Language Form and Listening, while spiking on the reading score, with a sub-score of 18. It is difficult to interpret why this might have occurred, but motivation while taking the test likely played a role.

Also interesting is the substantial variability in Kellan’s TTCT scores (see Table 5.2C). He scored in just the 13th percentile (norm-referenced in Korea) at the onset of the research project, then achieved an acute leap into the 79th percentile on the mid-test before plummeting back to the 34th percentile on the post-test. This could possibly be attributed to randomness in the subjective scoring of the test markers, but the variance could also be ascribed to any number of cognitive, social, and, again, motivational factors (E. P. Torrance, 1974).

Ann also made a significant jump from the 75th percentile to the 89th in just 6 months, before stabilizing at a comparable 87th percentile on the post-test. Lily’s minor improvement is skewed by the ‘ceiling effect,’ scoring exceptionally high in the 93rd percentile on the pre-test, followed by scores in the 97th percentile on both the mid and post-test.

### Table 5.2B: Detailed Results on TOEFL Jr. for Textbook-based Curriculum Cases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Name</th>
<th>Language Form (42 items)</th>
<th>Reading (42 items)</th>
<th>Listening (42 items)</th>
<th>Total (126 items)</th>
<th>Total %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOEFL Jr. Pre-Test (11/2014)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kellan</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lily</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **TOEFL Jr. Mid-Test (5/2014)** | | | | | |
| Kellan | 19 | 9 | 20 | 48 | 38% |
| Ann | 22 | 21 | 20 | 63 | 50% |
| Lily | 22 | 29 | 30 | 81 | 64% |

| **TOEFL Jr. Post-Test (12/2015)** | | | | | |
| Kellan | 11 | 18 | 11 | 40 | 32% |
| Ann | 21 | 20 | 16 | 57 | 45% |
| Lily | 33 | 32 | 36 | 101 | 80% |
As with the peculiar fluctuations on the TOEFL Jr test, there are numerous factors that could have contributed to both the extreme vacillation of Kellan’s scores and the apparent levelling in Ann’s scores on the TTCT. To begin to explore these possibilities, I now turn to the individual participant’s own perspectives towards their performance, behaviour, and outcomes in this research study. These views are complemented by the Teacher’s opinions about student performance as well as my own (etic) observations.

5.2.1 Kellan

Kellan did not seem to be a particularly eager participant from the outset of the study. In my interview with the Teacher on 29 November 2014 (three weeks after the study began) she commented on having a hard time getting the Textbook-Group to focus, with specific reference to Kellan and the other boys in the class:

**Researcher:** What do you think you need to do for the textbook class to get it running more smoothly?

**T:** I don’t know because it seems like it’s, um, it seems… I don’t know what I can do because the students who aren’t doing well it seems to be just be their personal choice that they don’t want to be there and they don’t want to do it. So, um, I mean I’ve kind of talked to them on the side and been like this is your chance to get a free class. It’s not like the normal books that we’re studying, it’s supposed to be more exciting. And I tried to tell them like, you know, if you just kind of like had a positive outlook on it you could actually enjoy the class. It’s, it’s their personal choice not to enjoy the class. So, I’ve already tried to talk to them like on a one-on-one basis.

**Researcher:** Who? Which students?

**T:** Especially, Danny and Kellan because they keep joking around, and like I feel like Max just follows in with it because he’s part of their little clique.
In personal communication, the Teacher commented on Kellan’s poor attitude, his unwillingness to stay in English during class, and his “non-compliance” with homework on several occasions in the early months of the study. Attempts to interview Kellan at the beginning of the study were unsuccessful as he continually had to leave immediately after class. However, in an informal conversation with him before class started on 10 January 2015, he asked me if the class could be made shorter, when asked “why?” he responded, “It is too long and boring” (this adjustment to class time was made one week later, reducing both curricula from 2 hours to 90 minutes). On 22 May 2015, Kellan agreed to his first interview. When asked how he liked the class, he replied:

**Kellan**: So-so

**Researcher**: Why so-so? What’s good and what’s bad?

**Kellan**: Bad is class is no fun. Good is it helps study.

**Researcher**: Why is it not fun?

**Kellan**: Because we study only looking for the book.

**Researcher**: What would you like to change?

**Kellan**: I want to change how to study class.

**Researcher**: Okay, so how do you want to study?

**Kellan**: Make it fun.

**Researcher**: For example?

**Kellan**: Play games.

**Researcher**: And?

**Kellan**: And study fun.

In class, he did not readily engage during activities and often appeared distracted when the Teacher was providing instruction or when asked to complete work in the textbook. However, he did participate more in some games, but often used Korean. Kellan was a regular student at this academy, and based on the accounts of the academy’s administrator, this was not unusual classroom behaviour for him. In an interview conducted on 18 September 2015 with the Teacher, I asked if there were any students she wanted to talk about directly. Without hesitation, she began with Kellan, stating:

*T*: [Kellan] just keeps speaking Korean in class. Uh, every time I talk to him, he says something in Korean that is equivalent to like, “what. I don’t understand; what are you talking about.” And he’ll ask his friends, what is she talking about. He’ll ask them in Korean. When before, he used to be like, you can look at past classes, he’ll be like, “Excuse me teacher, can you say it again?” but now he just totally regressed into only his native language and his . . .he doesn’t even give me any sentence answers anymore. So, that’s definitely a regression.

**Researcher**: Can you speculate on why?

*T*: I think because of, you know, you use it or lose it. It’s like that with a second language, if you don’t practice it, you won’t keep it. So, even in the textbook situation where people don’t really get that much better, at least they haven’t really regressed that much, not like Kellan.
My field notes specify several instances when he repeatedly spoke Korean during class, did not respond to the Teacher’s questions, and did not participate in communicative activities. This behaviour contrasts with his self-reported “HIGH” motivation for learning English at the beginning of the study. In his final interview on 22 November 2015 he mentioned again his desire to improve his English and his reason for it:

**Researcher**: Do you want to learn English?
**Kellan**: Yes.
**Researcher**: Why?
**Kellan**: English is the international language.
**Researcher**: Okay, so?
**Kellan**: I want to learn English to travel.
**Researcher**: Okay, how is what you’re learning in this class going to help you when you travel?
**Kellan**: When I go abroad, I hear people speak English much.
**Researcher**: So, right now in school your main goal for learning English is to travel?
**Kellan**: Yes.

Throughout the study, Kellan had difficulties staying focused and speaking English during class, did not complete his homework regularly, and was rather curt in interviews. As the test scores indicate, he had the lowest level of English proficiency of the selected ‘Cases’, however, the school administrator insisted that he was a capable English student in regular classes at the academy (albeit with occasional behavioural issues). Despite his dubious commitment to the course, I selected him as a Case Study for two primary reasons, 1) his peculiar inconsistencies on both assessments, and 2) his oscillation in behaviour and engagement between classes and between different activities. Kellan seemed aware that his efforts in class were at times poor, yet insisted throughout the study that he desired to improve his English. In his first interview on 22 May 2015, he affirmed his belief that this class could help him:

**Researcher**: Do you think your English has improved since you started this class?
**Kellan**: Yes.
**Researcher**: Do you think this class has helped your English improve?
**Kellan**: Yes.
**Researcher**: Okay, how has it helped your English?
**Kellan**: I can think more English?
**Researcher**: What do you mean? [long pause]. More English words?
**Kellan**: Yeah.

However, his view that he had learned more English words was not well supported by his classroom performance. Despite his continued difficulties and his occasionally vexing behavioural issues, Kellan
did demonstrate progress at points during the study and, at times, displayed constructive playfulness and genuine enthusiasm.

5.2.2 Ann

Ann is something of a perplexing Case because, despite regular attendance and positive classroom behaviour, she is mentioned by the teacher just once in nine interviews; when the Teacher was voicing her annoyance that most students did not complete homework assignments, I asked if all students in the class were performing the same and she replied (Interview, 24 March 2015):

T: No, I think the, the three top students in that class they can do it on their own. Like, I could just give them the book and they could just finish the book on their own.

Researcher: What’s their names?

T: Lily, Ann, and Stella. I could give them the book and they could just go home and fill it out and it would probably be mostly correct.

Ann was a regular student at this academy and the Teacher had taught her for nearly one year before the study began; but this familiarity does not explain the rationale behind the glaring omission of Ann in her personal reflections of the class, and, perhaps makes it more of an anomaly. Curiously, Ann also appears only sporadically in my research field notes. Review of classroom video recordings revealed that she spoke infrequently during periods of Teacher instruction, but did speak at least as much as other students when called on by the Teacher or during communicative tasks. On several occasions (9 January 2015; 10 April 2015; 16 October 2015; 23 October 2015), I noted in my field notes that she finished the activity with her partner(s) before other groups and then engaged in casual conversation in English. When asked in an interview on 30 October 2015 what she enjoyed doing in class, Ann responded:

Ann: I like the activities?

Researcher: Can you give an example?

Ann: I love my friends and I’m glad to learn English with my friends.

Researcher: Okay, but can you tell me an activity that you like doing?

Ann: Conversations.

In an interview on 15 May 2015, I asked Ann how she felt this class was helping her with her English in her regular school classes, she responded:

Ann: Um, through this class, I can speak English more than before I came to this class

Researcher: So, does speaking helping you in school? How does speaking English help you with your school class?

Ann: Before I could speak connected words but now better.
Researcher: Do you do a lot of speaking in your regular school?

Ann: No.

Researcher: Do you speak a little?

Ann: Yes, but this class more.

Ann seemed to enjoy the opportunities to speak English with her classmates and participated consistently well in communicative tasks, but neither her engagement nor her language production in speaking activities seemed to increase much over the course of the study. She typically worked to complete tasks quickly, particularly when paired with other students she considered her friends. When asked if she believed creativity was important for learning English, she replied (Interview, 30 October 2015):

Ann: Yes, because when we don’t know what the words mean, we have to see Korean meaning.

Researcher: How is that creative?

Ann: Um . . . (long pause)

Researcher: Okay, let me ask you what is creativity?

Ann: Imagine.

Researcher: So, if your teacher says, “Be creative,” what does that mean.

Ann: Brainstorm.

Researcher: Okay, does brainstorming help you learn English?

Ann: When we learn English word, we can imagine the words seeing in our brain.

It is difficult to know exactly how she conceptualised creativity, but it seems that it involves the visual representation of lexical items (picturing the words in her head) and with ‘brainstorming’, presumably meaning coming up with more words and/or ideas. This perception of creative production may be reinforced by her TTCT scores (essentially a divergent thinking test) which show a respectable improvement moving from the 75th percentile to the 89th percentile between the pre-test and mid-test before levelling at the 87th percentile on the post-test which parallels her communicative production in classroom activities over the course of the study, beginning well through the first half of the study, but demonstrating a negligible increase over the entirety of the one-year program.

5.2.3 Lily

Lily had a higher level of English proficiency than most other students in the TB-Group and seemed to enjoy the class, yet she was not especially studious. She indicated in the pre-test questionnaire that she had a “Medium” degree of motivation for improving both her English and creativity. Notably, while her overall behaviour and attitude in class were satisfactory and she completed the book exercises
without much assistance from the Teacher, she repeatedly asked to play games or to do group speaking activities during each class period. She communicated this wish to play more games or to engage in more varied activities directly in our first interview on 29 January 2015:

Researcher: So, in the class, what do you want to do more of? Is there something that you want to do more of?
Lily: I want to play a game or eat.
Researcher: Okay. Is there any activity . . . you said play more games and eat. Eat’s not really an activity [researcher laughs] but do, do you want, are there any activities that you want to do in this class? Like today, you kind of did . . .
Lily: Yes.
Researcher: . . . group thing. Is there anything like that that you want to do more of?
Lily: Uh, the group activities is good for us I think.
Researcher: Why are they good?
Lily: Uh, because it’s more fun, um, and, ah, it, it raises society.

She felt that working together in groups improved group cohesion and the atmosphere of the class. She imparted this sentiment again eleven months later in her final individual interview on 13 November 2015:

Researcher: What part of this class do you like the most?
Lily: Games.
Researcher: Okay, why do you like the games?
Lily: Because the games are fun?
Researcher: Why do you think games are more fun than studying from the book?
Lily: Do you like studying or playing games?
Researcher: I like studying (Lily and researcher laugh). But, do you think these two things are separate? Is playing just playing and studying just studying?
Lily: Of course, there are many studying games. I also like studying games. For example, playing a game as a study for English, like hangman (Lily and researcher laugh).
Researcher: Do you think most of the games that you play in the class are they learning-playing or just playing?
Lily: No, no, learning-playing.
Researcher: Do you think playing helps you learn English better than what you would just studying?
Lily: Yes.
Researcher: Okay, why do you think playing games helps you learn more than using the book?
Lily: first, most people like playing game so, “let’s play game,” and we are “yay!” and happy minded so we can more study well with happy mind.

This belief was clearly reflected in her classroom performance as she often appeared uninterested when the Teacher lectured, but became reinvigorated during games and speaking activities. Moreover, when engaged in such activities, Lily would seek out new words by looking them up in her electronic
dictionary, asking the Teacher, or referencing other English textbooks that she had in her bookbag, and indeed appeared “happy minded.” Lily associated vocabulary growth with her perspective that this class was helping her become more creative, as evidenced in the following dialogue from our interview discussion on 11 September 2015:

**Researcher:** Do you think this class has helped you become more creative?

**Lily:** Yes, when the teacher asks me to explain [a] word in English, I can think another, another word, but the same meaning.

**Researcher:** So, you can think of another word with the same meaning. So, why do you think that’s creative?

**Lily:** I can think diverse ways to explain things.

**Researcher:** So, do you think becoming more creative has helped you learn English?

**Lily:** Maybe a little.

**Researcher:** Why a little?

**Lily:** I think not a lot, but little.

“I can think of diverse ways to explain things,” seems to indicate that her notion of creative engagement in English extends beyond changing lexical items or phrases. It could mean that she had learned to see things from various perspectives or could produce sentences with various meanings and feelings from the same key words. However, in previous interviews she asserted that she did not consider herself a creative person. In an interview on 22 May 2015, Lily and I had the following exchange:

**Researcher:** Do you think this class has helped you with creativity?

**Lily:** No.

**Researcher:** Why not?

**Lily:** I haven’t had the opportunity to check my creativity so I don’t know.

**Researcher:** Okay, but in class do you feel you’re being creative. You can be honest, it’s okay.

**Lily:** (long pause) um, a little.

**Researcher:** Okay, what do you think is creative that you’re doing?

**Lily:** Both English and Korean think, so I think it’s creative.

**Researcher:** Okay interesting. Do you think you’re more creative when you can use the Korean language? When you can use Korean, do you think you’re creative?

**Lily:** No, I’m not a creative person.

**Researcher:** Why not?

**Lily:** Because I keep rules, my personality is keep rules and brain, I keep rules.

It is noteworthy that she used the word “think” rather than “speak”, in explaining how learning a second language constitutes creativity, similar to how Ann conceptualised creativity as visualizing the word or concept in her mind. This idea is discussed in the work of Kharkhurin (2012, p. 88), who found
a significant advantage for bilinguals over monolinguals on the “richness and colourfulness of imagery” on the nonverbal domain of creativity of a creativity assessment (a prototype of the TTCT). It is also important to call attention to Lily’s feeling that her creativity is restricted in some way by her self-concept of “keeping rules.” As Lubart and Sternberg (1995) explain, there is a common misconception of the creative personality as being freewheeling and rebellious, and they insist that both a great deal of knowledge in a domain and the discipline to apply it while working within rules and constraints are important factors in creative production.

Lily, finished the one-year program with the highest English proficiency test score of all students in the study with a 101 on the TOEFL Jr post-test, and the second highest mark on the TTCT, ranking in the top 3rd percentile in Korea. It is also notable that, despite being in the Textbook-driven curriculum, she frequently requested games and communicative tasks, demonstrated an enthusiasm for creating and modifying dialogues during speaking activities, and incessantly declared her preference for group work over studying the textbook dialogues and exercises.

5.3 Case Studies: Project-based Learning Curriculum

The Project-based Learning Curriculum group also began with nine students, but experienced significant attrition within the first four months of the study, with 5 students voluntarily leaving the study. The sixth student to depart, Matt, attended the class irregularly between the months of June and August, and stopped attending in early September 2015, therefore he was enrolled for nearly 10 months of the study, albeit with sporadic attendance. All students that dropped from the PBL Curriculum, except for Matt, were regular students at this academy.

At the beginning of the study, the PBL-course consisted of students at mixed-levels of English proficiency, but the students that completed the course, Jane, Julie, and Kevin, had received the highest scores on the TOEFL Jr pre-test. However, Table 5.3A demonstrates variation on their language proficiency test scores over the course of the study.
The language proficiency development of Jane and Julie is compelling. Over the course of the year, Julie improved her score 22 total points on the TOEFL Jr test (as did Lily in the TB-Group). Similarly, Jane, after making a gradual stride from 71 to 75 between the pre-test and mid-test, increased her score 11 additional points on the post-test with a score of 86, raising her score a total of 15 from the pre-test. Kevin remained relatively consistent with scores of 84, 82, and 89 on the pre, mid, and post tests, respectively. A closer look at the detailed scoring (Table 5.3B) provides some interesting considerations.
Heterogeneity amongst the three students is manifest as each had their largest score increase in different subsections of the test: Kevin on Language Form, Jane on Reading, and Julie on Listening. Tracing a reasonable explanation for this lies in understanding how various instructional techniques and activities influenced students as individuals and the different effects of the activities on the students’ level of engagement and learning.

Another curiosity is Jane and Julie’s marked gains from the pre-test to the post-test, while Kevin’s score improved by only 5 points over the course of the year. From the Teacher’s perspective, evident discrepancies in engagement with the projects accounts for some of the variation between the students’ progress. The PBL groups’ scores on the TTCT (Table 5.3C) displays an intriguingly similar trend for each of the three students.

Jane’s substantial gain from the 82nd percentile (pre-test) to the 98th percentile (post-test) of the TTCT was the largest increase between pre- and post- test scores other than Kellan’s (which is skewed by an extremely low score on the pre-test), and the highest ranking achieved by any participant. Julie also had a similarly significant improvement moving from the 80th percentile to the 95th percentile from the pre-
test to the mid-test, but did not improve any further on the post-test. Kevin, on the other hand, declined from the 79th to the 72nd percentile from pre-test to mid-test and remained in the 72nd percentile on the post-test. Although he went in opposite directions on his language and creativity scores, generally speaking, Kevin stayed relatively flat on both assessments over the entirety of the course.

Table 5.3C: TTCT Test Results for Project-based Learning Curriculum Cases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TTCT Scores (percentile ranking)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project-BL Curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin (PBL)</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane (PBL)</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie (PBL)</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin (PBL)</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane (PBL)</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie (PBL)</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin (PBL)</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane (PBL)</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie (PBL)</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.3.1 Kevin

Kevin’s effort and attitude fluctuated throughout the study. He began positively, albeit with some difficulties with verbal engagement, but generally showed an attempt to participate in group discussions. When I asked the Teacher early in the study who she thought was performing best in the PBL curriculum, she asserted (Interview, 29 January 2015):

T: For PBL class definitely Julie and Kevin . . . Julie and Kevin it just seems they’re really excited and enthused about the work, so they’re willing to listen to instructions and to try their best to understand me because even though I’m only speaking in English, like, I see them reaching for their dictionaries when they don’t know stuff. I see them asking for clarification when they don’t understand something.

Kevin engaged well in the first project and seemed to enjoy the Confrontation stage when group members shared and debated ideas, particularly after his idea for the theme of the first project was selected by the group. However, in an interview on 24 January 2015, shortly after stating that he appreciated the creative aspect of the curriculum, he mentions two issues that become recurrent during the middle months of the study:

Researcher: What do you like about the class?
Kevin: I like that teacher want to, uh, think creative and talking with my friend. It was so good.
Researcher: Great. What do you not like?
Kevin: Not like? I don’t know. I don’t have here friend.

Researcher: What about what we’re doing in class, is there anything you don’t like? I want you to be honest so that I can make the class better.

Kevin: No.

Researcher: What about the book, do you find it helpful?

Kevin: Grammar and vocabularies. I don’t know about the grammar this class.

These issues were: 1) Although cordial with Matt, he had difficulties communicating with Julie and Jane and mentioned not having friends in the class in all interviews with the notable exception of the last; and 2) he was persistently concerned with his grammatical accuracy, particularly when preparing presentations for the Culmination. When asked why he wanted to improve his English, he responded (Interview, 18 April 2015):

Kevin: English is needed to take exam. And, also, if I travel to the foreign country, English can, I have to use foreign language to communicate and the English is common.

The practical concern of learning English for the test, as covered in Chapter 2, is to be expected for middle school students in Korea and it became clear that it directed Kevin’s attention towards a preoccupation with grammar in the first two projects. He also mentioned a more functional purpose for using English —when travelling abroad in the future —although his wording seemed to indicate that he saw this more as a necessity than as a mode of intrinsic motivation.

His participation in group discussions began to decrease regularly before a precipitous decline in the months of April and May (when Matt’s attendance was sporadic) which was during the Drama Project, a 30-minute mini-drama about, coincidentally, a family taking a trip abroad. Despite performing well in the presentation of this project, he did not contribute much to the script. After the Culmination, I asked why he did not share his ideas more during the preparation stages, he answered (Interview, 12 September 2015):

Kevin: You know, I don’t say a lot in class, but I have to say in the presentation stage a lot?

Researcher: Why don’t you say more in the other stages?

Kevin: Because I don’t know, I don’t many things, many things to say.

Researcher: You don’t have many ideas or you don’t know what they are saying?

Kevin: I don’t have many ideas. I have some ideas in my head, but I have a second thought and I say the idea carefully.

The Teacher was aware of Kevin’s reluctance to engage in group conversations, particularly in making decisions about the project design and theme. In an interview on 18 September 2015, the Teacher shared the following commentary on Kevin’s classroom performance.

T: I feel like he regressed a little bit, because in the beginning he had somebody in the class that he really liked talking to, Matt. And now that he’s with girls, he’s a little bit awkward with them. He doesn’t, I feel like he doesn’t feel like his ideas jive with them. Like, when he had his friend who was his partner or in a group that at least had
another guy or at least had a few other people, he was, he seemed more talkative especially when he was talking about his ideas and what he wanted to contribute. But, the last two project cycles, he’s been very quiet. So, I don’t want to say he got worse, but as far as his, the amount of time he spends speaking in class is definitely been reduced so that’s definitely a negative progression. That’s not progression, that’s getting worse – losing your confidence, not talking anymore, that’s a kind of regression, so, you know, um, I don’t know what to do with him because like I’ve talked to him a few times on the side, like, “what’s up with you, you know, like, why don’t . . . is it because of girls,” and he’s like, “yeah, I’m a little uncomfortable.”

In the Focus Group session with the school administrator at the end of the study, Kevin was also aware of his plateauing in terms of both in-class performance and the language and creativity assessments, even though they had not been notified of his TTCT or TOEFL Jr assessment scores at this point. When asked by the administrator if he thought this program improved his English, Kevin responded:

Kevin: I don’t think there’s much that changed.

However, when asked by the administrator if he thought this program helped develop his creativity, Kevin replied:

Kevin: I know it’s probably hard to judge by the result of the tests but when I took the final test I could think and write more than the first one.

Kevin had regular attendance throughout the class and appeared to want to improve his English, but was aware of his reticence and how it may have affected his L2 development (and perhaps his creativity as well). The Teacher reiterated several times that she did not believe it was Kevin’s motivation that was lacking, but instead it was his uncomfortableness that caused him to flounder in discussions with Jane and Julie. It is my observation that he started to overcome his timidity after his struggles during April and May. In the same interview with the Teacher on 18 September 2015, she commented that she could see how the girl’s praise of Kevin’s ideas and contributions helped build his confidence and he then proceeded to share his ideas more willingly in the final project of the study.

5.3.2 Jane

From the beginning of the study, Jane was an enthusiastic student and self-assured regarding her English test-taking skills, having recently performed well on her school’s English examination. Her interest in taking part in this study resided more in practicing her speaking skills and, as indicated on the pre-test questionnaire, she was highly motivated to enhance her creativity. Interestingly, she did not believe herself to be a creative person at the beginning of the study. However, from early in the study, the Teacher felt that Jane contributed significantly to group discussions and exhibited an influential role in the theme and direction of the projects. On 29 November 2014, after just the third class, the Teacher commented:
I’m a little sad for, I mean, for Diana, Jane, and Matt’s group because they had, I feel like they had a lot of potential but because Jane’s really taken the leadership position, it’s basically her pamphlet and she’s just delegating work to them.

Jane was instrumental in moving the group forward and she consistently assumed a leadership role in bringing projects to fruition, even when grouped with other high-level students. In an interview with Jane on 12 September 2015, she expressed her thoughts on how collaboration and novel experiences had bolstered her creative development:

**Researcher:** Do you think this class has helped you be more creative?

**Jane:** Yeah, oh yeah, because I really didn’t confident about painting and it is first time to make collage and I really didn’t know about what is collage and what should I do, but, and, during the project, I can share creative ideas with my friends and I can be more confident [with being creative].

**Researcher:** Do you think being more creative has helped you learn English? Do you think there’s a connection?

**Jane:** Yeah, yeah I think so. I think when people speak together, talk together, they can be more creative because they can share their ideas and opinions so they can be more creative like that.

Jane continued to be active throughout the entire project cycle and instigated conversation with her groupmates during each stage of the project. She was seemingly more conscious of and sensitive to long bouts of silence than other students and would ask groupmates questions regarding their progress, elicit opinions, and offer suggestions at various stages to spark dialogue. In the same interview on 12 September 2015, she shared her thoughts on how this might be helping improve her creativity:

**Researcher:** Has the way that you learned English since you’ve started taking this class changed?

**Jane:** I can develop my speaking skills and also in this project I can be more confident about painting, yeah. And, I, I was very enjoyed this project because I can cooperation with my friends and make a plan and share ideas. I like that process a lot.

**Researcher:** Do you think doing projects is a good way to learn English?

**Jane:** Yeah, I think so. I think speaking English is most important thing of learning English so this project is very important way.

Jane kept a positive attitude throughout the study, was open-minded about the projects, and understood that they were opportunities to experiment with new mediums of learning and new language, and to learn in cooperation with her classmates. In an interview on 21 November 2015, I asked Jane what other things she would like to do in this class:

**Jane:** I think trying new things in these projects is good for English and fun. I want to try other things.

**Researcher:** Like what?

**Jane:** I’m not sure, maybe a write story again or draw story, something like that.

**Researcher:** Can you draw well?

**Jane:** Um, I don’t think so, but I can try (Jane laughs).
Her classroom behaviour reflected this receptive attitude towards learning; she was an eager student when trying new learning methods and was an asset to her group throughout the study. She did have some attendance issues due to overseas travel with her family, however this did not appear to hinder her performance and growth, either in the quantitative assessments of creativity and language proficiency or in classroom interaction.

5.3.3 Julie

Julie also showed leadership skills during group activities, although in a different manner than Jane. Whereas Jane would generally take a more assertive approach to ensure the project was moving forward, Julie was unceasingly concerned about involving all members of her group. In an interview with the Teacher on 24 March 2015, in a question about whether she had experienced any ‘teaching breakthroughs’ in either of the curriculums, she acknowledged that she enjoyed seeing Julie help other individuals in the class become more comfortable with the speaking demand of PBL:

T: Yeah, especially with, um, who was it? Uh, when the . . . before the attrition . . . before when Taylor and Ashley were making . . . giving their ideas with Julie . . . like, even though Julie had to coax them into it, knowing that their entire story was based off Ashley’s idea when she’s so quiet in the group, I felt really good about that. Like, I’m sure that it’s mostly Julie’s leadership but I could see that day that Ashley was smiling a lot; she was having fun, you know.

Although Julie was great at encouraging other group members to participate more actively, in an interview on 23 May 2015 she expressed some frustration about the need to do this:

**Researcher:** What would you like to change about the class?

**Julie:** I hope that the two boys, they, I hope that they can do more, they can speak more English and I hope they can say something. Sometimes if Jane doesn’t come then I feel really angry because the only person who talks is me, only me. It’s not my project, it’s our project. But if they don’t speak anything then I will be upset and angry.

**Researcher:** What do you think about Kevin, does he help?

**Julie:** Yes, he did. He is okay, he really helps me well and his ideas are really good. Sometimes I think his idea and creativity is better than me. He is good at making something and he helps well.

**Researcher:** But just more?

**Julie:** Yeah. Just say more.

In terms of her own speaking, Julie expressed her feeling that the communicative nature of the class allowed her to more readily use and practice the English she had learned and to acquire new language from other students (Interview, 23 May 2015):

**Researcher:** Do you think this class has helped you improve your English?

**Julie:** Yes. I can learn useful expressions because sometimes teacher taught me and I always talk in English in this class so I can hear about the expressions and I can use in daily life.

**Researcher:** How do you learn these expressions? [the Teacher] doesn’t teach you all of them, does she?
Julie: We always speak, but she uses some expressions and sometimes I learn from the other students, like Jane. And they always use some useful expressions so I’m learning from all of them.

On multiple occasions Julie asked group members to repeat words and sentences when she did not understand well and would proceed to look them up in her dictionary and write them down in a notebook. She would also use her phone to translate words and phrases from the textbook that she did not know and occasionally implemented these words into the projects. Although Julie was confident with her English and had systemised learning strategies for developing her lexical and grammatical knowledge, she expressed that she was much less assured in her creative capacities, did not know how she could improve them, and had little experience with engaging in the creative process in school. In an interview on 28 March 2015, she cited her struggles with thinking of original ideas for the Concept Generation element.

Julie: I think I’m not a creative person. I’m not really creative so making a new thing and creative thing is actually hard for me, but I want to be creative.

Researcher: Why do you think you’re not creative?

Julie: I think I can’t think of new things. I always make something with impressions about movies, or dramas, or books, I can’t think of things myself.

When asked near the end of the same interview if she thought this class was helping her to improve her creativity, she stated:

Julie: Yes. At first, I thought I’m not really a creative person, but when I make something, it’s a little typical but sometimes I can think in creative ways. And the other students are creative so I get their ideas.

There was an evident shift in her attitude towards creative engagement as the program progressed. She seemed to enjoy trying new things, improved her ability to brainstorm, and showed ingenuity when troubleshooting obstacles with the projects. Julie continued to gain confidence in her creative abilities and maintained a positive attitude over the course of the program despite her expressed disappointment about the attrition and its effect on the classroom atmosphere, as well as her frustration regarding the lack of participation of some group members. The Teacher, in multiple interviews, commended Julie’s fortitude in dealing with her taciturn group mates and for her continued optimism throughout.

5.4 Influence of the National and Local Educational Contexts

In describing the individual Cases, it is evident that there are a large number of forces that influenced student behaviour and learning throughout this study. Therefore, it is necessary to elaborate on the Korean EFL context and how it directly and indirectly influenced the students in this research study. Understanding these environmental and situation conditions will help compose a clearer contextual rendering of the forces at work on the resulting phenomenon detailed in the next chapter.
The analysis begins with a brief review of the national educational culture in Korea and how it may have affected students’ attitudes, behaviours, actions, affective engagement, attendance, and attrition during this research project. It then expounds on the local context where this study took place, Andong, and the provincial attitudes towards education and English language learning. Finally, it examines the educational culture and learning environment of the English academy (a privately-owned franchise school) where this study takes place. Though outside the realm of direct observation and control of the researcher, understanding the effects of these contextual elements is essential to a holistic analysis of classroom level phenomenon as the context clearly cannot be disentangled from the interaction and attitudes of the students in this study. As will be demonstrated below, the participants consistently referenced how their English education in Korea influenced their circumstances and modes of learning.

5.4.1 The National Educational Culture’s Influence on EFL in Korea: Participant’s Perspectives

To briefly restate the present situation of English Education in Korea covered in Chapter 2, students, from as early as elementary school and continuing throughout their formal education, focus primarily on preparing for high-stakes tests (Choi, 2008). Despite the national zeitgeist of promoting cosmopolitanism and creativity through education (Lee & Jeon, 2016; K. So, Lee, Park, & Kang, 2014), the emphasis on testing continues to permeate all facets of a students’ schooling, and especially influences the teaching practices and focus in the private educational sector (S. Kim & Lee, 2010; Moodie & Nam, 2016). Clearly, the students’ circumstances at school and at this academy influenced their attitudes and commitment toward this study.

Although many students in the study recognized the value of both improving their English skills and in enhancing their creativity, they repeatedly acknowledge, implicitly and explicitly, how the emphasis on testing has shaped what and how they learn. For example, when asked to compare this class with her regular school EFL courses, Julie (PBL-Group) pointedly highlights her experience in studying English in school (Interview, 28 March 2015):

**Julie:** In the school, we just study with our textbook and we just listen to the instruction of my teachers and we don’t discuss about anything. Just, question, not even question, just listen and listen all the time and sometimes it makes me so bored and sleepy.

**Researcher:** Do you ever speak English in the class?

**Julie:** There was a native teacher when I was in the first grade [of middle school] but he went back to his country. Yeah, so just the Korean teacher teaches us in Korean. But, in this class we can speak in English only and we can discuss very much so this is good for my English.

Julie frequently mentioned how this class has benefited her in terms of speaking, but gives no indication that she believes it improved other language skills (other than vocabulary acquisition). This may be because she relates her past learning experiences of explicit instruction in isolated skills —
grammar, reading, and listening —as most pertinent for developing these skills. In inquiring about Jane’s (PBL-Group) perspective on the contrast between the Project-based Learning Curriculum and how she learns English in her regular school setting, she also refers to this difference in learning dynamic and focus (Interview, 12 September 2015):

**Researcher:** So, my first question, what helps you learn English in school? When you study English in school what helps you learn?

**Jane:** When I study English in school I can learn some grammar, some vocabulary, and some sentences that we use in our normal life, like that.

**Researcher:** Is it the same or is it different from here?

**Jane:** I think it is totally different because in my school I study English only for my school exam so, to be frank, after I take my exam I forgot all of it, or almost all of it. But, in this class, in the project I can speak English a lot with foreigner and our Korean friends and I can, I can develop my speaking skills a lot, and remember.

Like Julie, she is straightforward in her perception that English in school is dedicated to test preparation through directed instruction and that this class let her focus on speaking, which she perceived as being distinct from other skills. In a similar stream of inquiry with Lily (TB-Group), she discussed how the materials used in this class were different from her school textbook and how this affected her learning (Interview, 11 September 2015):

**Researcher:** How about this textbook compared to your school textbook, how is it different?

**Lily:** School book is Korean, but this book no Korean, but I prefer this book.

**Researcher:** You prefer the book with no Korean? Why?

**Lily:** Because it is so easy and it is suitable for children. I’m a children.

**Researcher:** Why does your school use such an easy book?

**Lily:** Originally, the level of the school test was right for us, but academy teach us, prepare many things for the university exam, so we learn many things since elementary school for exam so the school textbook is easy.

**Researcher:** Has the way that you learn English changed since you started taking this class, is it different or is it the same? So, before this class how did you usually learn?

**Lily:** We learned English in Korean.

**Researcher:** You learned English in Korean?

**Lily:** Grammar and vocabulary so although the native speaker class was available, I don’t, I didn’t feel that my speaking skill is improving, but in this class, a little, I feel speaking is a little improved.

**Researcher:** Okay, so you don’t feel you speak more, or maybe here you speak more, but in your class at school do you speak [English] more?

**Lily:** No.

Despite being able to practice her speaking more in this class and feeling that she had made some progress, there remained little opportunity for her to utilize this developing skill in her regular school context. In fact, nearly every student in the study mentioned their schools’ focus on grammar, reading, and listening, and how learning and teaching in their public schools and private academies are shaped by the pervading exam culture. This experience unquestionably affected the way students in this study
interpreted the goal of both the PBL and TB-driven curriculums at the beginning of the study and throughout. In discussing some of the students’ reluctance to engage in debate and conversation in the PBL Curriculum, the Teacher declared that students did not see the project as something they might enjoy, but rather as another assignment that must be completed. To this point, I asked (Interview, 29 November 2014):

**Researcher:** So, in their regular context, and maybe perhaps their other academies and stuff, is that what Korean students normally try to do it, to just get it done?

**T:** They were approaching it the way they would normally do it in any other situation.

**Researcher:** Efficiently?

**T:** As fast as possible.

**Researcher:** So, which curriculum do you think is more suitable to the Korean EFL context and why?

**T:** My gut tells me not say the textbook class because I can see how ineffective it’s been for so long. I mean, you can see people who have been learning English for more than a decade and they can’t even introduce themselves and they can’t just make simple conversation, right, you know. So, it can’t be, it can’t be the textbook one. There has to be something better. So, I think by default I only imagine that the project-based one can only do good in a Korean setting. And I mean, for me, it’s seems like, it’s good in any setting, like, regardless of culture or country.

**Researcher:** Do you think the textbook-based class really embodies the traditional EFL course in Korea?

**T:** Yes.

**Researcher:** But this textbook is a little different. What do you think?

**T:** I think that, uh, perhaps the way the textbook is and, for me, following it because it’s not exactly what they’re used to, maybe they will see, they’ll see that it’s a little bit different than what they’re used to, but I think they haven’t approached it that way yet.

Their rush to complete the projects in the PBL curriculum was possibly due to both their reluctance to communicate in English and out of habit of finishing tasks and assignments as expediently as possible. During the Focus Group sessions with the academy’s administrator at the end of the study, both groups expressed openly that their school work, other academy homework, and school exams took precedence over the homework and responsibility to this course, which was to be expected.

### 5.4.2 Andong, North Gyeongsan Province: The Influence of the Local Culture

It was difficult to determine whether some of the issues encountered in this study, such as attendance, attrition, and the students’ casual attitude towards the class, were the result of the national education culture (the external pressure of exams) or the local culture of Andong which, in some ways, is a microcosm of contrast. As addressed in Chapter 2, Andong is a small city in Korea not regarded as a centre of education and parents are not known to ‘pressure’ their children as they do in larger cities where there is more intense academic competition. None of the student participants directly reference the local education culture in this study, but they were certainly aware of the disparity in educational quality compared to larger metropolitan areas in Korea. In fact, at the conclusion of this study, several
participants requested completion certificates (Appendix P) to complement their application to high schools in larger cities.

Unlike the students, the administrator and the Teacher directly call attention to the local educational climate. When proposing this research project to the administrator, he asked why I was not conducting this study in Daegu (Korea’s 4th largest city, about one hour from Andong), sharing his opinion that students from larger cities are more proficient in English. Moreover, when discussing the attrition issue in the PBL curriculum several months later, he permitted me to call the mothers of his academy students to inquire why they had decided to drop from the study, but advised that “Andong mothers” were unlikely to press their children to return (to which he was correct). In the same conversation, he claimed that he also had to continuously walk a fine line between rigorously preparing students for their exams and not being overly demanding to the point where a parent might intervene.

The Teacher also gave consequence to the local context on several occasions. In an interview on 29 January 2015, she related her frustration over the lack of homework compliance:

T: One thing I would say is similar with [both classes] is I’m having an issue with compliance as far as outside homework goes. Both groups are not as compliant as much as I want them to be.

Researcher: Why do you think that is?

T: I think it just has to do with the educational culture in, in, in this region. I don’t think it’s, like, like, I’ve seen that with other classes that I’ve taught before, so. I think it’s just a general thing here.

Researcher: Okay. By this region, you mean this city?

T: Yeah, I mean like Gyeongsanbuk-do (the province).

Researcher: I see. What do you think needs to be done about this problem?

T: For the textbook curriculum, student accountability, definitely. There should have been more, there should have been a more concrete system of reward and punishment for doing work and not, not doing work, for performing on quizzes, and there should have been a lot of communication with the parents. So, I think just on the organization side of the class, there could have been better management, I guess.

Researcher: Yeah. Certainly, autonomy was my hope – that they would do it because they wanted to.

T: You don’t know Andong kids.

The Teacher’s disappointment deepened as the study progressed, offering a stark observation regarding the relationship between the local culture and the attrition in her end-of-the-study reflective essay:

*I did not anticipate this kind of reaction, and I attribute it to the local education environment. The educational environment in Andong is very relaxed. There is not much competition in schools, and the students do not seem to be very ambitious. I am comparing this to other reports I have heard of coming from educators who have worked in larger, metropolitan areas, so I cannot account for those from my own personal experience. Second-hand though, I have received comments, from mothers of students in my classes at the private language academy and also one of the students who took part in the study, that lead me to form my own opinions about students in Andong [...]. They have also made many excuses for their children when they are delinquent with homework or attendance, claiming their son or daughter is ‘tired’ or ‘too hungry’ to attend class or regularly do homework. They rarely say they will talk to their children to encourage them to do better.*
As previously mentioned, the Teacher had lived in this city for nearly three years before this study began, and had been a teacher at this academy for nearly two years, and thus had first-hand experience into the educational culture. However, broad generalities about the region may be antipathetic to understanding the classroom level circumstances and phenomenon or the actions of individuals in this study. There are innumerable reasons why students may have had difficulty completing homework assignments and why students in the PBL Curriculum struggled to adjust to a new learning environment that should be analysed in aggregate. When asked about the attrition during the Focus Group session with the administrator, Julie (PBL-Group) offered her insights.

Julie: I asked some students why they quit this class and they said it’s because of the time. They sometimes had to meet outside the class to complete the project but they felt burden, so they quit.

This sense of “burden” may be reflective of the local culture’s more casual attitude towards English education, but it is reasonable to assume that students elsewhere may have also had other priorities in terms of time and studies. While the regional mind-set is unquestionably a critical factor to consider, the academy that is the site of this research project also played an influential role in students’ learning experiences and attitudes towards English education, especially considering several students in the study attended this academy prior to the study.

5.4.3 The Culture and Learning Environment of the Academy (the Research Site)

As mentioned above, the administrator was deeply concerned about helping students perform well on school exams, but in personal communication at the beginning of the study he informed me that he also sought to improve his students’ communicative ability in English. Yet, when I asked Lily (TB-Group) about her previous learning experience at this academy, she responded (Interview, 11 September 2015):

Lily: I prepared for test at this academy. The teacher printed the practice test and we wrote.

Researcher: How about since you’ve started this class, same or different?

Lily: Same because [this] book is not test content, so not related, but [studying at this academy] is the same.

She also believed that because the primary focus was the school exam, remaining in English during activities or pair exercises was not necessarily prioritized (Interview, 22 May 2015):

Researcher: Do you think you speak more in a group than when you’re just doing the textbook with the teacher?

Lily: There is no English because [with] friends we use Korean, using Korean is more close and easy.

Researcher: But it’s English class, right?

Lily: But it’s habit, so it’s so natural so we speak Korean. (Laughs)

Researcher: So even in group work you want to speak Korean?

Lily: Yes. But we only do little group work.
In an interview on 13 November 2015, Lily conceded that she did not typically speak English during this research class because her focus in school and at English academy had not given her adequate practice in speaking. When asked what she likes about the book, Lily responded:

Lily: Usually, I know all of the grammar in the book because English academies make me study from Korean-English grammar book.

Researcher: So, the grammar was quite easy for you?

Lily: Yes, but I don’t know how to say and act and have a conversation in other countries, like USA, so natural conversation I need.

Researcher: So, do you think this class as helped you with that?

Lily: Yes.

Researcher: Okay. Why?

Lily: Korean education only have grammar and listening, so we have less opportunities to learn speaking and writing.

Although the Cases from the PBL-Group were not regular students at this academy, they were not exempt from this culture of learning, as most studied concurrently at other academies during the time of this research project. Indeed, Julie and Jane (PBL-Group) had a long history of attending private academies. In an interview with Julie, she related this experience to her current situation (Interview, 24 October 2015):

Researcher: In school, what helps you learn English?

Julie: Oh, um, we study English only in Korean. So, we just learn some words and grammar, and that’s all. We just learn expressions and grammar and take a test. Actually, taking a test is the most important part for us and sometimes we study just for that. Generally, studying for test is most helpful.

Researcher: So, you spend a lot of time at school studying just for a test?

Julie: It can be, but I like English class.

Researcher: So, how is it different in this class? No tests.

Julie: Yeah, no tests. Here I use English, but there I can’t use and even academies I can’t use because my friends don’t want to use that and my friends are not really good at English, so if I say like this, they look at me strangely.

Like Julie’s school, most classes at this academy were conducted in Korean by Korean instructors and although I did not observe any of the academy’s regular classes, students did not mention any communicative activities conducted in English other than in the Teacher’s classes. Also, students at this academy did not speak English outside of the classroom until June of 2015 when the administrator initiated an “English Only” policy for all students, requiring that they communicate only in English while inside the academy. When I asked about this new rule, the administrator stated that he wanted to encourage more speaking. In general, he seemed interested and open to experimenting with novel approaches, techniques, and strategies for improving students’ English, both for the exam and for more
practical purposes, which made the following comments written by the Teacher in her end-of-the-study
Reflection Essay rather unexpected:

I saw an opportunity for the private language academy I worked at to engage in something unique for which, in
return, they could provide the space for this class to take place. The director of my academy accepted the
arrangement, but not without some hesitation. He saw this program as unrepresentative of his school and the way
they teach English, and worried that whatever negative effects the class had on the students would reflect upon him
and his business. . . He saw something new which would carry the risk of alienating his student clientele, but I
didn’t immediately see why he felt that way. As time went by, I could see that some of his fears had some basis in
truth.

The “fears” to which The Teacher refers is that students who studied at this academy were not well-
prepared to communicate in English. It is my belief that the director was also concerned that if students
(or parents) did not like the PBL class, he may be criticised for its pedagogical approach, which, as the
Teacher put it, was “unrepresentative of his school and the way they teach English.” The school’s focus
on preparing students for exams and the students’ difficulties with adjusting to a new style of learning
were undoubtedly influenced by the national educational climate, which centres on test-preparation.
Although the local culture of Andong has a slightly more relaxed attitude towards education, parents
and students are clearly aware of the importance of performing well on school exams. The local
academy where this study took place was dedicated to helping students excel in this endeavour and this
had important consequences in the classroom.

5.5 Navigating the Learning Environment

The above factors unquestionably influenced every student participant, and while the focus is on what
transpired in the classroom in this study, these factors are not filtered out as inconvenient ‘noise’ nor
designated as extraneous variables (Larsen-Freeman & Cameron, 2008b). Rather, they are seen as
important considerations for the challenges of promoting creativity in the EFL context in Korea, and
are incorporated into the ethnographic analysis when referenced by the participants. Again, the
perspective taken in this study sees individuals as interacting with the environment and making choices
about how to engage with the properties of the environment (affordances) —from these decisions
emerge purposeful activity, such as communicating in the language classroom (van Lier, 2004). This
inter-dependent relationship between the environment and the person is by no means static, consistent,
or even logical; individuals fluctuate, sometimes unpredictably, from day to day, activity to activity,
and according to a myriad of intrapersonal, contextual, and environmental factors. One example is
Kellan (TB-Group) who was a reluctant speaker in class, but occasionally demonstrates constructive
energy during games and group activities. Kevin (PBL-Group) was similar in this regard; although he
was quiet and hesitated to share his opinions, when he was genuinely engaged in discussion, he did his
best to articulate his thoughts, use new language to express his ideas and opinions, and was receptive to
feedback from his peers. Lily (TB-Group) also recognized the need to talk more to improve her speaking skills and saw group activities as an effective means for learning new vocabulary.

All members of the PBL-Group call attention to communicative interaction as a vehicle for extending language-use and as a means of learning from others. The social function of creating space for new language-use allowed individual idiolects to enter the shared sphere of classroom discourse where students could learn from each other (Beckner et al., 2009). All Cases mention that they improved their English through communicative group activities and most specify that discussions encouraged them to extend their lexical repertoire – using both newly acquired language (often words and expressions they translated using their phones) to express their ideas clearly, as well as learning new words from other students. Kevin (PBL-Group) and Lily (TB-Group) both explicitly state that they improved their vocabulary by asking other group members the meaning of words they did not understand, and, as mentioned earlier, Julie is often seen writing down words used by her group members. Julie (PBL-Group) also felt that communicative exchange in the class increased her confidence to use English and emboldened her to speak more during all stages of the project.

In the TB-Group, some students perceived the curriculum as practical for developing all four skills (as the textbook publisher promotes it), some saw it as akin to their regular school learning environment (eliciting both positive and negative responses), and others like Lily saw the learning environment as somewhat flexible. Thus, she was persistent in seeking out affordances for communicative engagement and a greater variety in classroom activities. Indeed, the participants’ individual responses to the materials, activities, and feedback are an important consideration in their level of interaction and overall learning experience. Kellan (TB-Group) and Kevin (PBL-Group) were especially affected by who was in their group as neither seemed comfortable working with girls, and Julie was significantly affected by the attrition, mentioning it in several interviews and in the Focus Group session at the conclusion of the study.

Kellan’s (TB-Group) low scores on the Darakwon™ TOEFL Jr Practice Test suggests that he needed to first acquire more basic language skills, but in terms of classroom engagement, what seemed most constructive was finding activities, such as competitive games, that held his attention. Ann and Lily (TB-Group) may not have been stimulated enough by the relatively easy textbook to achieve growth in their language proficiency (and perhaps not even interested in the classroom activities). Ann may have felt the material was too easy or may have merely been reluctant to use the target language in novel ways, but she generally recited textbook dialogues verbatim in speaking tasks, and only communicated authentically in English with her classmates after she had completed the task and was waiting for others to finish. This disinclination to expand her language-use and her tendency to finish the textbook exercises and speaking tasks quickly may have played a role in the levelling of her language and
creativity assessment scores. This practice was likely habituated in her regular school context. When asked how this class was similar and different from her regular middle school English class, she replied (20 March 2015):

Ann: One thing is same, we solve the problem.
Researcher: In the book?
Ann: Yes.
Researcher: What do you mean?
Ann: Do work in the book.
Researcher: Okay, so what’s different?
Ann: Um, this class speaking is free, but in the school we should speak, uh, in, uh, [makes box motion with her hands] we can’t speak free, uh, when we do that we [makes a swinging motion] UH!
Researcher: The teacher hits you!?
Ann: No. We, we can’t pass the problem.
Researcher: You can’t pass the problem? What does the teacher do if you speak freely?
Ann: Just, no freely speak.

Ann seems accustomed to this type of learning and has carried it over into the learning context of this study. In contrast, Jane and Julie’s (PBL-Group) many years of studying English at academies may have made them more malleable to new curricula approaches and appeared to make them more attuned and receptive to feedback. They both acknowledged that the feedback from the teacher helped them improve their English and cited the Culmination element of the projects, and the subsequent feedback from the Teacher in this step as one of the most important dimensions of the projects. Kevin (PBL-Group) mentions how his group members’ feedback on the projects helped him become more familiar with the lexical items and grammatical constructions that were part of each project’s requirements. In the TB-curriculum, Lily and Kellan (TB-Group) likewise mention how the Teacher’s corrective feedback improved their speaking skill. Lily also remarks that listening to the Teacher repeat new phrases helped her think more about them and remember them better. However, both Lily and Kellan had difficulty staying in English throughout the entire class period because, as Lily mentioned, this was not a typical requirement or point of emphasis in her usual EFL classes, either in public school or at this academy.

Nonetheless, students in both curricula seemed to recognize how using new language and new modes of learning help them acquire knowledge and a better understanding of the material. Julie (PBL-Group), who had never tried painting before, expressed that she was motivated by the novel learning experience (Interview, 12 September 2015):

Researcher: When you’re thinking of ideas do you feel you’re being creative?
Julie: Yeah, I think so. At first, I wanted to do well in this project, because it was my first time to make a collage so I wanted to be perfect and I gave our team a lot of ideas and also this theme, this collage theme is birthday party, and this idea I suggested, so I was happy.

Jane (PBL-Group) also commented on how making projects gave her unique opportunities to be creative and this motivated her to engage in more new experiences. She also believed this acquainted her with different ways to learn that she would not have encountered otherwise and felt that these new learning strategies helped her remember newly acquired concepts better than studying for tests. Kevin (PBL-Group) gave a similar account. When asked if being creative helped him learn English, he explained (Interview, 18 April 2015):

Kevin: First project, I don’t have any ideas or often I have an idea, but now I can make many ideas.

Researcher: Do you think coming up with more ideas has helped you learn English? Do you think being more creative has helped you learn English?

Kevin: I don’t know but learning creative can be more effective and minded . . . don’t forget, helps me remember.

Although Lily and Ann (TB-Group) did not create projects, they asserted that communicative activities allowed them the opportunity to showcase their creativity as it relates to language through language play (Carter, 2015), spontaneous topical discussions with other students and the Teacher, language-oriented activities such as revising the textbook dialogues (although Ann would often only change a word or two), and games that included writing or drawing on the board.

Regardless of the type of activity, participants in both groups frequently mentioned the importance of interacting with classmates and the Teacher and how they learned through working with others. As explained in Chapter 2, Csikszentmihalyi’s (2014d) Systems Model of Creativity emphasizes the social aspect of creativity, and students in this study consistently highlighted working with others and sharing ideas when acknowledging creativity in the classroom. Jane (PBL-Group) felt that the very act of sharing ideas with others helped her become more creative. Likewise, Julie (PBL-Group) insisted that one of the most rewarding aspects of the PBL Curriculum, in terms of creativity, was hearing the ideas and views of others and learning new language and expressions from them. Group work in the PBL Curriculum encouraged the iterative development of language through conversations that required negotiation and repetition as students continuously adjusted their language to express their ideas more clearly and accurately —learner language is inherently creative in this way (Ellis, 2015a).

However, this learning condition certainly did not suit all. Several students in the PBL-Group did not see the rationale behind Project-based learning, particularly the emphasis on communicative interaction, and made the decision to quit early in the study. In the TB-Group, the sense that this course was analogous to their normal EFL circumstances had almost the opposite effect, causing those who expected something different to be disappointed, although it may be said that the familiarity with the context offered a certain level of comfort for others.
5.6 Participants’ Perspectives on Creative and Language-Use Affordances

Affordance refers to the relationship between the way in which individuals relate what is happening in their environment to their expectations and needs (Peng, 2011). Students seemed to recognize the importance of creative affordances to experiment with new words, expressions, ideas, and activities. Indeed, Lily (TB-Group) defined creativity as finding new words (and/or meaning) beyond what the teacher gave her and engaging in new activities and games. Ann (TB-Group) believed brainstorming in English was a form of creativity and a means to enhance it. Jane (PBL-Group) also underlined the creative value of engaging in new activities, such as painting and performing a drama. She also attested to the importance of hearing the ideas of others as a way to develop creativity. Julie and Kevin (PBL-Curriculum) also highlighted listening to the ideas of others as vital to augmenting their creative capacities. For example, Kevin (PBL-Group) felt that communicating with people from other countries can enhance creativity because it required using English naturally (Interview, 18 April, 2015):

Researcher: Do you think creativity is important for learning English?
Kevin: For exam, no. But talking to foreign people, creativity can be important for talking to foreign people because, I don’t know. I really didn’t think about it.
Researcher: Let me rephrase the question a little, do you think that being creative will help you learn English?
Kevin: Yes.
Researcher: Why?
Kevin: Because creativity make a sentence or make a story by English it can be helpful in learning English.
Researcher: What kind of story?
Kevin: Just, um, just talking about it.

Julie (PBL-Group) also calls attention to new learning experiences, but rather than mentioning future possibilities such as talking to people from other countries, she directly references what they have done in this class (Interview, 23 May, 2015).

Julie: I like this class because I haven’t done this kind of work, usually just sit down and study about grammar in Korean, although it’s in English. But this kind of class I can use English all the time and I can do something with English like make a play, make a story, make a brochure, like that. So, it’s a good program, but sometimes we don’t have many students so I can’t see many ideas and some of them are absent so it’s, um, I just hope that more people can join this class.

Julie expressed an openness to new learning experiences and new mediums of learning, and Jane (PBL-Group) acknowledged that she became less shy and more willing to share her ideas and opinions through working with other students — something she had little opportunity to experience in her regular school. Kevin (PBL-Group) oscillated between periods of shyness and increased sociability, but attested that the curriculum helped him engage more and, like Jane, he recognised the value in learning from peers.
In the TB-Group, Lily also felt that working with others was highly beneficial to her learning, both in terms of motivation and in helping her improve her English, asserting that she enjoyed collaborative work, “Because it’s more fun and it raises society” (see above, Interview 16 January 2015). Similarly, Ann reported that she “loved” working with her classmates (Interview, 30 October 2015, see above).

The Teacher also mentions the positive affect she believes students have on each other in group work; when asked about how she believed the PBL-Group were reacting to the mixed-level grouping in the beginning of the study, she replied (Interview, 29 November 2014):

*T*: I think it depends on who the high level person is because some people can be really encouraging and they’re, they’re enthusiasm can be kind of like infectious and even for low level people they can be like, “oh okay”; they can get excited about it too. I think it depends on the charisma of that person.

The Teacher believed active involvement in communicative activities demonstrated a positive attitude and learning potential in the TB-Group as well. When asked which students she believed were performing best, she asserted (Interview, 29 January 2015):

*T*: Okay. I just feel like Lily and Stella are just more, um, they’re more comfortable with the grammar structures because they’re in an advanced class in our academy so they’re doing more complex grammar in their normal class so this is just like easy breezy for them. They’re doing, for the most part they’re doing all their homework. They’re participating in all the class discussions. I don’t get any guff from them. Um, they, they follow my instructions really well and do the work.

In the TB-Group, the Teacher saw Lily, Stella, and Ann as highly proficient students that were willing to participate in class activities, but called into question Lily’s overall commitment to the class. Further, although, the Teacher became agitated by Kellan’s poor behaviour, she was determined to find ways to keep him engaged and, at times, appeared to succeed. For the PBL-Group, the Teacher felt Jane was a capable leader, believed Kevin was reserved but offered many creative ideas for the projects (as Jane and Julie also stated), and asserted that Julie was especially skilled at getting all group members involved through her strong communication skills that enhanced group discussions. In an interview with the Teacher on 24 March 2015, she offered praise for all three of the Cases in the PBL-Group:

*T*: I feel that all three, Julie, Jane, and Kevin, they’re not only are they smart, they’re driven. Like, they’re motivated, they have the will power to try something new that’s, even if it’s scary they want to try it. They want to get better. They enjoy it. They like the idea of the class not being so teacher-centred. They want it to be that way. They want to be there.

The Teacher’s sentiment that the students were enjoying the learning experience, “are smart,” “motivated,” and “have the will power to try something new…” is an allusion to affordances —it refers to their readiness to interact with opportunities present within the environment (J. J. Gibson, 2014; van Lier, 2000). Julie (PBL-Group) acknowledged how such affordances to engage in new experiences and work intensely with peers fostered at least the potential for creative development, and made her appreciate the chance to discuss and share ideas with others (Interview. 23 May 2015):

*Researcher*: From the first project to the last project you did, do you find in easier to come up with ideas?
Julie: Yes, I think. I don’t know well, but it’s easier to think of something and make something more easier . . .

Researcher: Then from the start of the class?

Julie: Yeah.

Researcher: Let me ask a different question. Do you think you are creative in the Korean language?

Julie: No, not really. I always think typically. I think not really creative because some students, some friends, are really creative, and then I think oh mine is too typical and not really creative. It’s like, if they hear my story then they say, oh, I think I heard that before; I have heard that before, like that. So, I think I’m not really creative in Korean or generally.

Researcher: So, just to clarify when you speak Korean you’re not that creative, but when speaking in this class you think you’re getting more creative, at least in English.

Julie: I hope so, but I’m not sure.

Researcher: Do you like working in a group?

Julie: Oh yeah, more than just by myself.

Researcher: Why do you like working in groups better?

Julie: We can share something, like we can hear more ideas and we can share our works with others. Like, some of them research something and some of them write something, like this. So, the works are more than one person.

Julie asserted that she enjoys working with others and shared her feeling that group interaction in this study was a major contributing factor to both her creative and linguistic development. The Teacher also believes she witnessed progress in Julie’s resilience in trying new things over the course of the study. When asked in the final interview who she felt had performed the best in the PBL-Group, the Teacher stated (30 December 2015):

T: In the PBL curriculum, I think maybe, maybe Julie because even though she was always consistently, like, skill-wise she was always very good but I think her attitude changed a little bit. Like, in the beginning she was kind of like, um, like she beat herself up a lot if she didn’t do as well as she thought she would and I kept having a lot of conversations with her, like, it’s not a big deal, like, you can do better next time and like, she just seems more laid back and I don’t know if that’s because of me or it’s her own personality.

The Teacher posited that her encouragement in the PBL-Group prompted students to speak more and to strive to come up with increasingly more creative ideas. Kevin (PBL-Group) confirmed the Teacher’s supposition, stating he believed he was developing his creative capacities based on the positive feedback he received from the Teacher and his group members. Julie (PBL-Group) also acknowledged that she felt more motivated when the Teacher would commend their work.

In contrast, early in the study the Teacher felt that students in the TB-Group did not show much interest in the class, but as the study progressed, she moved from placing responsibility for this from the textbook to the students. In an interview on 29 January 2015, when asked which class she felt was learning more, the Teacher had this to say about the TB-driven Group:

T: I feel that the Textbook Group is not going to go up or down, it’s just going to stay the same, like it’s just, I don’t know. I feel the students who are already good are just going to continue at that level and, in the textbook class, and then the lower level students I think they’re just going to be lazy and stay at their level too.

Researcher: Is it because of the curriculum or just the students?
T: I think it’s the disposition of the students. I think it has to do with their will power and discipline. Personal... what do you say? Self, self-discipline.

As previously mentioned, the Teacher felt that she was using the textbook the way it had been designed and teaching the way she had previously learned and practiced, and seems to put the impetus on the students to complete the textbook exercises and engage in class activities. This demonstrates that while the learners’ need to be aware of affordances, the teachers’ perspectives and beliefs are also instrumental in shaping the learning practices in the classroom environment. The Teacher’s impression is that the textbook presents and facilitates the key language and means of learning, rather than seeing affordances as a relationship between a context and individuals (Greeno, 1994). Interestingly she held steadfast to the difference in affordances between the TB-driven and PBL Curricula until the end of the study. In an interview on 15 November 2015, she mentioned the need for “leadership” in the PBL-Group, and when asked what she meant by classroom leadership in this context, she replied:

T: I think it’s, it’s knowing how to manage the classroom. Not only, like, in an organized way but managing the different personalities of students. Making sure they’re on task. Um, making sure that everyone’s understanding the concepts really well and that’s kind of like random, not really organized. I’m just thinking about it right now. But, I think, you know, because a lot of the leadership that I’m experienced with, like textbook-based curriculums is mostly discipline and, uh, keeping students, uh, on task, and focused. But I think in the PBL curriculum you need to know how to communicate with them because it’s daunting and also it’s a different way of learning so communication style has to change a lot. You’re not an authority figure anymore.

How she conceptualised the differences in her role and the role of the students between the two curricula offers insight into how she recognized, supported, and provided affordances for language use in classroom interaction. Students in the TB-driven Group also seemed to recognize the effects of the textbook on communicative affordances. The following exchange occurred with Kellan in an interview near the end of the study (Interview, 20 November 2015)

**Researcher:** How do you feel during this class? Like, during this class what’s your feeling.

**Kellan:** It’s a little long.

**Researcher:** Ninety minutes doesn’t seem like a long time for playing computer games or playing soccer with your friends, so why do you think it feels like a long time in this class?

**Kellan:** Study is no funny.

**Researcher:** What about this class, is it fun.

**Kellan:** A little not fun.

**Researcher:** Why is it not fun?

**Kellan:** Because we learn, we only learn the book. It is much time.

**Researcher:** So, what are some things you do in this class that are fun?

**Kellan:** Games.

**Researcher:** Do you like talking in English while you’re playing games?

**Kellan:** Yes.
Kellan stated that he felt his English had improved some, but again, expressed his belief that the class was at times monotonous and cites the adherence to the textbook as an underlying cause for the class being “boring.” Likewise, in the final Focus Group Session with the TB-driven Group three weeks later (11 December 2015), Ann and Lily expressed their feelings to the Administrator that, although they liked the textbook and learned many things in the class, they wanted to play more games and do more speaking activities.

When the Administrator inquired if the TB-Group students felt they had improved their creativity, Lily’s asked a critical question in response, “I don’t know yet. How will we know? By the tests?” While participants in this study share their experiences in the curriculum and perspectives on creativity and language learning, they do not distinctly articulate what they believe constitutes creativity. Likewise, members of the PBL-Group mention their creative experiences in several interviews, yet they do not offer any specific explanation of what characteristics they believe comprise creativity in actual classroom practice. This essential question is the focus of the next, and final, Findings chapter.

5.7 Summary of Main Findings

Cases in both groups support the claim that the recognition and exploitation of affordances in the activities/projects, and in the learning atmosphere more generally, played a critical role in how students interacted in English and how they demonstrated their creative capacities. Cases in the PBL Curriculum believed there to be more affordances for peer interaction and exploratory language use, not only because of the reduced teacher talk time, but because of a greater awareness of their responsibility to produce language to complete the projects. Moreover, Cases in the PBL curriculum remarked that the classroom climate created an atmosphere which prioritised student engagement, particularly in speaking English; students attuned to this and took advantage of the open-ended opportunities to use language in a unique way. This took a period of adjustment and resulted in early attrition, but students who remained in the PBL-Group (i.e. the Cases) affirmed that they felt the curriculum allowed for more iteration in the process, enabling them to revisit language points and parts of the project they did not understand well. This iteration also placed greater emphasis on collaboration and assisted with building camaraderie in the classroom. Even Kevin (PBL-Group), who struggled with the communicative nature of the curriculum throughout the study, and whom disclosed in interviews that he had “no friends here,” believed the collaborative aspect of the projects to be a significant factor for language learning and creativity development.

In contrast, all Cases in the TB-driven curriculum felt that there were not enough language-use affordances granted in group activities and stated that more speaking opportunities would have been
preferred. All Cases in the TB-Group declared that this study, other than having a native-speaking English teacher and using a textbook that was written in English, was similar to their typical learning environment. Perhaps because of this perceived parallel, and because English was seen as the “object” of learning, the Cases in the TB-driven Group routinely spoke Korean during class. This factor is mentioned by the Teacher in half of her interviews and apparently played a significant role in forming her attitude towards the curriculum and the students.

Indeed, the Teacher's perception and attitude, while not the focus of the study, unquestionably impacted the classroom environment. She was stricter with the TB-Group, reprimanding them for negative behaviour and corrected their English more, making them repeat words and phrases and rewrite answers in the textbook when done improperly. This was a rarity in the PBL-Group and, as most of what they produced did not have one correct answer, it was largely unnecessary. This difference had important consequences on students’ perception of how creativity was valued in the classroom.

The attitude towards creativity by Cases in the PBL-Group was, for the most part, affirmatory. All Cases believed that endeavouring to be creative through the process of project-making and sharing their ideas with others improved their confidence to use English. All Cases stated that they learned many words and phrases from each other, enjoyed hearing and expanding on each other's ideas, discovered new skills they were unaware of, and generally enjoyed the process of making and presenting the projects. All Cases also confirmed in the Focus Group session that they believed they improved both their English and creativity. With the exception of Kevin’s minimal decline on the TTCT, the assessments of creativity and language proficiency support their perception of gradual development in these two capacities. From the etic view, I agree with the Cases’ suppositions, and noticed gradual development over the course of the year. Kevin oscillated depending on contextual factors, most evidently with who was in his group. Jane demonstrated excellent leadership abilities by continuously asking questions and actively engaging in all stages of the projects. Julie was especially energetic during the projects, and showed leadership by ensuring all group members were involved in the process. As the study progressed, she gained increasing confidence in her English-speaking ability, her creativity, and her willingness to engage in novel experiences.

Cases in the TB-Group also showed general improvement during the study, although it is less evident in the data collection instruments, including the assessments of creativity and language proficiency, the observational data, the Teacher’s perceptions, and even their own attestations. Kellan’s creativity and language proficiency scores were erratic, but from pre-test to post-test his creativity improved only minimally, and his language proficiency score decreased. Ann remained level on the TOEFL Jr from pre-test to post-test, but did increase her TTCT score a respectable 12-percentile points. Lily scored impressively high on both assessments at the outset of the study, and was able to increase both slightly.
However, the Teacher repeatedly suggested that she did not think there would be much improvement in these scores from students in the TB-Group. She felt they were not engaged in class, even during class activities that held affordances for creativity and exploratory language-use. Observational data generally supports the Teacher’s view, finding that the class’s over-adherence to the textbook may have been responsible for students’ less-than-enthusiastic behaviour. Nonetheless, there are examples when each Case, Lily in particular, exhibited creativity and extended their language-use during activities. This said, students in the TB-Group were candid about their opinions regarding the class and what they felt was a lack of collaborative and creative engagement.

This chapter was dedicated to honouring the perspectives, attitudes, and personalities of the participants and aimed to paint a clearer picture of their views of creativity, second language learning, the curriculum and their experiences in this research study. The interviews provided invaluable insights into their perceptions and feelings about their own learning and the learning of English more generally. To better understand how their personal qualities and views of learning affected their performance and development over the course of the year, the study now turns to the extensive empirical data of classroom interaction to help draw out a constructive exemplification of how the Cases actuated the characteristics of creativity (from Chapter 4) through the affordances available in the learning environment.
CHAPTER 6: FINDINGS 3: EXPLORING THE FIVE CHARACTERISTICS OF CREATIVITY THROUGH THE MODIFIED SYSTEMS MODEL OF CREATIVITY FOR THE L2 CLASSROOM FRAMEWORK

“We must remember that there is a dynamic movement between thought, language, and reality that, if well understood, results in a greater creative capacity. The more we experience the dynamics of such movement, the more we become critical subjects concerning the process of knowing, teaching, learning, reading, writing, and studying.”

-Paulo Freire

This chapter responds to the third and final Research Question:

How are the characteristics of creativity manifest in the empirical data and how can they be analysed through the lens of the Modified Systems Model of Creativity for the L2 Classroom to explain the longitudinal development of creativity and L2 development in the six Case Studies?

The chapter aims to describe the differences between the Textbook-driven and Project-based Learning curricula in facilitating affordances for the five key characteristic of creativity through the Modified Systems Model of Creativity for the L2 Classroom. The comparative examples from each curriculum are based on two criteria: 1) corresponding segments at the beginning (classes 3~4), middle (classes 16~17), and end of the study (classes 27~28); and 2) the involvement of the selected Case Studies. The dates, class number (the total number of times the class had been held), the units/lessons being covered, and the tasks/projects and materials that were used during the lesson are tabulated for each group.

6.1 The Textbook Driven-Curriculum: Classroom Analysis

The chapter focuses on comparing language use affordances and activation of the characteristics of creativity in the two curricula through the Modified Systems Model of Creativity for the L2 Classroom, therefore the illustration of the model is given again here for reference. Although the focus is on the selected Cases, other students are included in the transcript for coherence. In addition, the Teacher’s actions in the classroom and perspectives expressed in
interviews are discussed at relevant points as they have an important influence on how students engage with the curriculum, as well as with each other, and provide insight into her attitude towards the students’ development and challenges faced in both curricula. Table 6.1 provides the details of the classes presented for analysis, including: the number of times the class had met, dates, the unit(s) being covered, the duration of the class period, and the Cases that are represented in the selected extracts.

Table 6.1: Textbook-driven Curriculum, Details of Classes 3-4, 16-17, & 27-28

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Textbook-driven Curriculum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Beginning</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Class Number</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Middle</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>End</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.1.1 Textbook-Driven Curriculum: The Beginning

In the early stages of teaching the TB-driven Curriculum, the Teacher used the lesson plans provided by the textbook publisher and was concerned primarily with explaining the language points of the unit and completing the exercises in the textbook. Although she claimed to be more comfortable teaching this class due to her past teaching experiences, she acknowledged in the second interview (29 November 2014) that she felt students were not completely engaged:

**Researcher:** So, what problems, or maybe challenges, with student engagement or anything, any kind of challenge, any kind of obstacles you’ve seen?

**T:** I think with the textbook class, I saw some problems with engagement. Like, they weren’t excited to be in the lesson, they weren’t into it, they weren’t excited to pay attention.

**Researcher:** All of them?

**T:** Yeah, I think that on a certain level, yeah. It just didn’t seem to stimulate them very much. Which was disappointing because I like the book.

Although her interpretation regarding the cause of the students’ disinterest is somewhat ambiguous in the extract above, in subsequent interviews, as well as personal conversations, she expressed that students (except for Lily) did not like the textbook in part because it was all in English and because they had simply expected something different from this class; this is why she states, “Which was disappointing because I like the book.” Hence, viewing the Teacher’s perspective through the Modified Systems Model of Creativity for the L2 Classroom, she seems to place the lack of student engagement directly on the materials (Domain), understanding it as the consequence of what the textbook fails to offer. Perhaps because of her previous teaching experience or her interpretation of the curricular approach, she does not make mention of how she did or did not create affordances as the teacher (Field), nor does she comment directly on what the students (Persons) are or are not doing in the textbook exercises (Domain). She perceived the textbook as providing affordances rather than seeing affordances as language-use being enacted through the classroom activities. However, this appears to change in her third interview, which was conducted two months later on 29 January 2015:

**Researcher:** Which class do you think is learning more and why?

**T:** Ugh. My gut reaction is to say the textbook because I’ve felt like we spent so much time on it and they’ve done, they’ve been practicing the material again and again. Like, first time I discuss it, then they do the exercises in the book, then it’s reinforced with homework. So, I feel like maybe they’re getting more . . . but I don’t if they’re retai . . . I mean, like when you say learning, you mean like absorbing it and retaining it, right?

**Researcher:** Yes.

**T:** I don’t know about the retention (laughs). I feel like that’s not, not going to last. For the PBL class, I feel like they’re, they’re practicing things mostly that they already know but I feel like they’re gaining more confidence at this time to be speaking English. And obviously, there has been some, like, improvement in the vocabulary because they have had to use the dictionary so often when they’re having conversation and stuff, so I think it will snowball like as, as time goes by, like, they’ll be learning more and more in the PBL group because they’ll be speaking more and having to practice more, um, English structures and vocabulary so [. . .]
**Researcher:** Is it because of the curriculum or just the students?

**T:** I think it’s the disposition of the students. I think it has to do with their will power and discipline. Personal... what do you say... self, self-discipline.

The Teacher begins to account for the interdependence between the learning environment and the abilities and willingness of the learners to engage (Greeno, 1994), and connects their “self-discipline” to the ultimate success of the learning environment. As another point of interest, she commented on how students in the PBL-Group used their phones to look up new words, while mentioning nothing about how the textbook stimulated learner-initiated learning practices in the TB-Group. To examine how the textbook influenced the curricular process, it is helpful to look at an example. In the following extract from Class #3 (28 November 2014), the Teacher asks students to guess the woman’s occupation on page 11 (Figure 6.1.1):

**Kellan:** Yoga teacher.

**T:** She could be a yoga teacher! That’s a good idea. I like that. They could be stretching, or whatever you want. Use your imagination. She could be an aerobics teacher, a yoga instructor, she could be a jazz teacher, any kind of, she could be a teacher or she could just be a dancer. It depends on what you think. […] Alright, so now, look at the map. Where is she from?

**Lily:** She is from France.

**T:** She is from Paris in France. So, what would be her nationality?

**Lily:** French.

**T:** French. Okay, so we know her country, France, and her nationality, French. Her job? You guess. Okay. But, you don’t have to think about the age. What I want you to do is to write here (pointing to the lines under the globe on p. 11). Just very short; this style (points to the other examples from pages 10 and 11). For example, okay, um, oh, what’s her name? How do you say that?

**Lily:** Angeline

**T:** Angeline. Angeline. Okay? So, Angeline is a blah, blah, blah. She is French and she is from Paris. Then you have to put a quote; something she is saying about her job. Okay?

**Michelle:** So, imagine?

**T:** Whatever you want. So, everybody, page 11 on your own. So, how do you make the structure? Again, “Angeline is a blank. You put there what job you think she has, okay. She is French and she is from Paris. Then, put a quote; something she said. Okay, do that on your own.

**Lily:** Teacher, how do you spell ballet?

**T:** Like this (the Teacher then writes the word “ballet” on the board). If you need any help, please ask me. Do you know what we’re doing, Danny? We are going to write like these articles.

**Kellan:** So, how to spell ballerina?

**T:** B-A-L-L-E-R-I-N-A. Okay, ballerina. Okay. You don’t have to write ballerina. Do you think Angeline is a ballerina?
Stella: Yeah.

T: Look at the picture. You think ballerina, too?

Danny: Yes.

T: Okay, so let’s not all write ballerina first. Where’s your... do you have an eraser?

Danny: No, I don’t have an eraser.

T: (Teacher hands Danny an eraser) Okay, so how do we start out. I said earlier. See this style (points to examples on pp 10~11)? Angeline. Angeline is a ballerina. Ballerina. Period. She is French. Please make a capital F. She is French. Make sure the nationality is also capitalised. She is French, comma, and she is from Paris. Now here. Look at this kind of thing. This kind of sentence where they are talking about their job. Now, you have to write a sentence she is saying. Think of a sentence she is saying, please. What are you doing, Kellan? What are you doing, Kellan? Are you trying to guess where the camera is pointing? Okay, let’s look at yours. Are you finished?

Kellan: Yes.

T: Okay. You already... okay, you wrote, She is French. She is from Paris in France. Her job is ballerina. Now, what is she saying? You have to make a sentence where they’re talking. A quote from them. Okay? Whatever you want. (Speaking to the whole class) I’m sorry. I didn’t tell you, the quote, the sentence they are saying, you have to put a descriptive adjective. “My job is difficult; my job is easy; I like the pay; my salary is good; I’m happy/unhappy; bored/interesting.” These kinds, you must put it. And remember, if you put a sentence they’re talking, you have to put a quote at the end too. (Speaking to Ann). Good, but we only put “an” with a word that starts with a vowel.

Ann: She is from Paris, France. She says, “A dancer’s life is hard, but interesting.”

T: Perfect. High five. Let’s see yours (to Emma). See, ooh, here, you put Paris, but how about we do like this style (pointing to examples on page 10)? Don’t say she is France, you say she is French, that’s her nationality; she is French and she is from Paris. Okay, good. And this one, French, “E”, French has an “E” in it. Okay? (To Stella). Okay, good. But put a quote. She says, (reading Stella’s writing) “I like dance, to teach students too.” Okay. Let’s say I like dance, and here, what do you want to say, it’s interesting, it’s exciting, it’s dangerous, what? What do you want her to say?

For approximately seven minutes, the Teacher walked around and checked the responses of individual students, providing feedback on their writing and making corrections to grammar and spelling.

T: Ah, Okay. Okay, she says, “It is difficult,” comma, “but I love yoga.” Okay. Good. High Five (Michelle gives Teacher high five). What kind of high five was that? You’re kidding. Come on, high five (they high five again). Okay, let’s see yours (to Stella). Hey, speak English (speaking to the whole class). “My job is interesting. I want to do it forever.” Nice job. High five (Stella and T give each other a high five). Let’s see yours (to Max). At the end, you have to put, oh, good. High five (they high five). (Reading Max’s writing) “Angeline is French...” Everybody, speak English. Okay, “Angeline is French. She is from Paris. Her job is ballerina.” Remember, we don’t say “she’s job,” we say “her job.” Okay. “Ballet looks very boring...” This has to be her talking though, right? So, if she’s talking, we have to put the quotes. Okay? High five (Max gives her a high five). (Walks over to Lily) “She says, I look good and I am flexible. My job is interesting.” Alright, nice job. High five (Lily gives teacher a high five). (Walks to Danny) Let’s see yours, Danny. Danny! You didn’t write anything Danny. Please write a sentence. She’s saying about her job, you have to use one of these descriptive adjectives (turns Danny’s book to page 8). (Walks to Holly) Finished. “I’m sexy” (the whole class laughs). Okay, that’s a descriptive adjective if ever I saw one. Alright, high five (Holly gives Teacher a high five). Good job. (Goes back to Danny) No. She says, here, she says. Make a capital letter. She says... What does she say about her job? What does she say about her job? Lily, can you help Danny. Don’t tell him in Korean though, tell him in English. Good job, everybody.

Despite the textbook encouraging open-ended responses regarding Angeline’s job, all students wrote that she was a ballerina until the Teacher directly requested they not all write the same answer. Students demonstrated some variety in their choice of adjectives (Lily: “I look good and am flexible”; Holly: “I’m sexy”), but five of the eight students wrote down one of the adjectives that the Teacher
provided as examples (difficult, bored, and interesting). As the Teacher circled the classroom to help individual students, others spoke in Korean and she reminded them several times to speak in English. The activity took over 14 minutes in total. As can be seen in the extract, the Teacher dominated the speaking time in this task, arguably limiting students’ affordances for engagement. However, she did provide grammar correction and offers positive reinforcement by commending the students on their written responses.

In the last 10 minutes of class, the Teacher decided to play a game for review. The game, which was not from the textbook but one she often played in her regular classes, required students to say a word in which the first letter of the word was the last letter of the word given by the previous student. For example, if the word was “Spain,” the next student’s word should begin with the letter “N” (Netherlands, for example). Students were limited to saying only countries, nationalities, occupations, or descriptive adjectives, the foci of the unit. The Teacher explained the game and the rules, which included the order they would go (Emma-first, Ann-second, etc.) and that they had only five seconds to respond.

T: Emma, go.
Emma: Unhappy (from p. 8).
T: Something that starts with a “Y.”
Ann: Yoga teacher (from p. 11, see extract above).
T: Okay. Um, rich (Teacher decided to include herself in the game).
Stella: Happy (from p. 8).
Danny: Yoga Teacher? (Not his turn; he was asking about what Ann said)
T: Also, don’t repeat any words others have said. You can’t do it again. One time only.
Kellan: Young!
Danny: What is young?
T: The opposite of old. (To Max) Okay, G. You can do a country name. We learned a country that started with G today. Or you can do a descriptive adjective or an occupation. [long pause] Five, four, three . . .
Max: Go.
T: No, that’s a verb.
Max: Give! Give!
T: That’s a verb. It has to be an adjective.
Max: Germany!
T: Very good. Country! Okay Y.
Lily: (Responds immediately) Yummy!
T: Okay, Y!
Holly: Yellow (after looking at a poster with colour words that was on the classroom wall).
T: Okay, yellow, that’s a descriptive adjective. Next, W.
Emma: Worried.
Ann: Different.
Students continued with the cycle of single word responses with several students unable to reply and thus exiting the game. When his turn came back around, Kellan offered the word *red* (again, looking at the colour chart on the wall). Lily responded with the word *dynamic*, which does not appear in the textbook (nor on the classroom wall). The game continued for a few more minutes, with students giving answers directly from the book, before the Teacher ended class.

During the game, some *original* words (words not appearing in the textbook or from the lesson) were used and would be considered *appropriate* in the context of the game, but the question is whether such single-word responses constitute “meaningfully expressing oneself” as mentioned in Chapter 2. Gladwell (2008) describes *Meaningful Work* as the feeling that one’s efforts are recognised and/or rewarded; perhaps it is through games that Kellan felt the possibility of his achievement (winning the game) being acknowledged by the Teacher. It is also possible that he just enjoyed competition and, indeed, he often focused intensely during games and became excited when he won. Although his responses were not particularly original (*young* does not appear in the book but is a relatively basic word, *engineer* appears on page 9, and *red* was on the wall poster), just participating in the game was meaningful for him as he expressed in interviews that playing games made the class more enjoyable. Intense purpose and interest are instrumental in language learning (Kharkhurin, 2012), therefore, if a learner finds games to be a useful strategy and feels their efforts are recognised then this would constitute *Meaningful Work*.

Well-designed games in the L2 classroom, in which responses are not confined to one correct answer, provide more freedom in responses and this can be taken as a means of input into the “materials” (Domain). Applying the *Modified Systems Model of Creativity for the L2 Classroom* to the game played above, the materials did not dictate responses, rather students’ responses created the flow of production, allowing for a greater range of language-use affordances. However, games and activities which require single-word responses or simple phrases may also relate to why Ann and Lily perceived creativity as “brainstorming” and “imagining words” rather than with the communicative or creative process of sustained engagement. Brainstorming is typically considered the beginning of the creative process, but since this game (and others played during the study in the TB-driven Curriculum) did not require any exploration or elaboration beyond an initial response, it is understandable that students would not see the creative enterprise as ‘committed and continuous engagement with a problem,’ as it is defined in Chapter 2 (Ghiselin, 1985). In other words, when the process is limited to single-word
responses, students may have the opportunity to use their own language resources, but the type of affordance limits the perceived opportunities for engagement (Greeno, 1994).

To create more affordances for creativity, the Teacher could have used additional constraints that would require more original and exploratory language use (Tin, 2011, 2012). For example, the Teacher could have required that they use only words that are a certain number of letters, or that after giving a word they must respond to a question given by the Teacher using their answer in order to construct meaning unknown to self or interlocutors (Tin, 2012). For instance, to Emma’s response “worried,” the Teacher might have asked Emma what she thought Ann was most worried about, and then Ann could have confirmed if she was right or wrong. Again, one of the main criteria for openness is that it prompts students to ask and answer open-ended questions (Berger, 2014; Walsh, 2011). The students’ questions from the two extracts above include:

- Michelle: So, imagine?
- Lily: Teacher, how do you spell ballet?
- Kellan: So, how to spell ballerina?
- Danny: Yoga Teacher?
- Danny: What is young?

These include one question for clarification of instructions, two for spelling, and two questions regarding definitions of words used in the game. None of these resemble the “more beautiful questions” proposed by Berger (2014) and most can be answered in just a few words (or letters, in the case of spelling). Moreover, most questions asked by the Teacher in this game were reformulations of the textbook prompts:

- T: Where is she from?
- T: So, what would be her nationality?
- T: Her job?

And a few elaboration questions, although they are essentially instructional questions:

- T: Do you think Angeline is a ballerina?
- T: You think ballerina, too?
- T: What do you want her to say?

Openness to Experience is also defined as a willingness to take risks, try new things, and engage in new experiences (Goldberg, 2006). It might be argued that Lily demonstrated a risk-taking quality by using her own vocabulary knowledge, choosing the words yummy and dynamic rather than recycling words from the unit (or source materials around the classroom). Likewise, Ann, needing a word starting with “D,” used the adjective “different” rather than dangerous (which appears on p. 8) or difficult (p. 9).
However, the game only required knowing the first letter of the word, and while their responses showed a capacity to take risks, the activity itself did not engage the more integral aspects of openness which occur during interaction, such as sharing opinions and gathering the ideas of others (K. Sawyer, 2007). As K. McDonough et al. (2015) found in their corpus-based study, asking questions in speaking tasks is one of the few linguistic forms that positively correlated with creativity scores on the TTCT. An effective variation on this game might be to have students ask questions (using full sentences) and the next student in line would need to formulate an answer that begins with the last letter in the question, followed by a question of their own; for example:

Student 1: “Do you feel worried today.”

Student 2: “Yes, I do because I have a test. When do you have your next test?”

Student 3: “The next test at my school is Wednesday. Do you want to study together?”

Student 4: “Really? That is a great idea.”

Student 5: “Awesome. Are you free on Friday?”

Student 6: “Yes, I am. Can you meet at 2 o’clock?”

Another shortcoming of the game is that it did not require a process-orientation beyond waiting for the next turn. In other words, the game, while engaging and possibly meaningful for some students (Kellan), did not provide the type of affordances that would provoke creative engagement or more extensive language use, nor did it offer the teacher affordances for genuine feedback (other than whether the answer was appropriate).

After commenting on how the PBL Curriculum has the potential to engage students, the Teacher laments on the general lack of interaction facilitated by the TB-driven Curriculum in comparison (Interview, Teacher, 29 January 2015):

T: Like, even when [students in the PBL-Group] were not into it, it’s still, like, on, especially on the day where like it’s like the third phase where they’re actually creating the project, they seem to really have fun with it, even though they weren’t really, like the lower level group who wasn’t putting that much into it, they were still having fun, ya know, just making something. The textbook class, I don’t know, there’s not a lot of opportunities for them to do stuff like that.

Again, the Teacher alluded to the curriculum (Domain) as the delimiting factor of the learning environment. In the next class, the students listened to a video about a woman who has learned English for her job as a tour guide in Korea and how it has helped in her life. After the video, the Teacher asked students to complete the exercise “After You Watch” on page 13 (Figure 6.1.1B). When they finished, she asked them to read their answers:

T: Okay, Lily. How can English speaking help you?

Lily: English speaking can help me when conversing with foreigners.
T: Do you think that is important?
Lily: Yes.
T: How is it important?
Lily: When I go abroad.
T: Good. It can help you with traveling abroad. How about you Kellan?
Kellan: English speaking help me in my social-ity.
T: It can help you in your society?
Kellan: Yes.
T: How does it help you in . . . in Korean society?
Kellan: No!
T: Which society? School society? With your friends? What kind of society do you mean?
Kellan: World society.
T: World society? Why? Do you plan on going to different countries?
Kellan: Yes.
T: Okay, cool, so it can help with the worldwide society, traveling, okay. How about you Ann?
Ann: English speaking can help me in my social life and I can speak to foreigners.
T: Okay, why? In your social life do you speak English?

Again, the Teacher followed the textbook instructions and students responded with short answers (Kellan: 12 words total, 3 of which are ‘yes’ or ‘no’; Lily: 14 words; and Ann: 20 words). The Teacher offered more affordances by asking for clarification, but the students responded in brief. The Teacher could have persisted with more open-ended questions, such as, why do you want to travel abroad; what are the different ways you might use English when you travel abroad; or are there any other languages that might be good to learn and why? The lack of opportunities for engagement, that is, occasions where affordances were possible but for whatever reason not offered, refers to what Glăveanu (2012) called uninvented affordances in his sociocultural model for an affordance theory of creativity. In addition, unexploited affordances, which posit that affordances exist and are on offer in the environment, yet cultural, contextual, or situation factors results in them not being exploited by the actors, may have also been a factor because the Teacher seems intent on preceding expediently through the textbook lesson. Through the lens of the Modified System Model of Creativity for the L2 Classroom, the lack of language-use affordances narrows both student responses and the Teachers’ opportunity for feedback because students (and perhaps the Teacher as well) understand completing the activity as the primary goal of the lesson.

Next, students did a group task which required them to compile a list of jobs women do well and jobs men do well and then to compare their list with their group members. Ann did not submit any answers.
that would be deemed *original* and Kellan mostly copied answers from Ann, yet did include the word *designer*.

Before analysing the interaction further, the discussion in Lily’s group is provided below:

- **Lily**: I think jobs that women do well are school teacher, stewardess, designer, housewife, and nurse.
- **T**: Danny, read your list.
- **Danny**: I think women do well is singer, firefighter, housewife, school teacher.
- **Holly**: I think also housewife, dancer, nurse, teacher.
- **Lily**: I think that men do well are pilot, policeman, firefighter . . .
- **T**: Wait, wait! Don’t talk about men yet. You are only talking about women now, right. Do you all have the same lists?
- **Lily**: Yes.
- **T**: No, it’s not exactly the same; they’re different. Do any of you say firefighter for women? Why does Danny have a different one? Danny why did you choose firefighter? Tell them.
- **Danny**: I chose firefighter for women because . . .
- **T**: Why? Why are women good at being firefighters?
- **Danny**: Women can do very strong.
- **T**: Okay. Do you guys agree?
- **Holly**: No.
- **T**: Why not?
- **Lily**: I am weak.
- **T**: You are weak so you think all women are weak? They can’t be firefighters? So, compare what is same and what different?

At this point, the Teacher walked away to assist other groups. In the three minutes that she was speaking with the other two groups, Lily, Holly, and Danny did not continue to discuss the topic, but instead spoke off-topic in Korean and, upon seeing this, the Teacher promptly ended the task.

The only word not directly from the textbook in Lily’s group discussion above was *housewife*. This word seems to be known by other group members (Holly also included it on her list, as did students in another group), so this word, despite not appearing in the textbook, would not be considered *Original* as it is defined in this study.

Again, the activity requires simple responses and the comparison with other group members does not lead to a discussion beyond reading their lists to each other, despite the Teacher’s insistence that they discuss the reasons for the differences. It is difficult to see any of the five characteristics in the activities/transcripts listed above, and seems particularly lacking in *Openness to Experience* or *Meaningful Work*. The Teacher comments on this in an interview on 29 January 2015; when asked if she sees different qualities in students in the different curricula, she responded:
T: The textbook class doesn’t nearly require as much curiosity and self-motivation. I think for the PBL class, I think they definitely need more self-initiative and like curiosity as far as like learning more in the class because the Coaching Stage is very short, I’m just very briefly outlining what they need to learn. So, for them to really retain it and use it well in the project they have to do it themselves. But for the textbook class, no, you just have to do the work and that’s it. So, the qualities are different but so far the students who are doing the best have similar qualities.

When discussing the TB-Group, she appears to be citing what the materials (Domain) fail to offer rather than what the students (Persons) are or are not doing or what she (Field) was doing to engage the students, although she does reference personality traits that she feels make some students more amenable learners. When asked which qualities she was referring to in her last sentence (above), she repeated self-motivation, self-initiative, and curiosity, however, she could not elaborate on how students in each group whom she felt possessed these qualities were enacting them. However, from her statement that the Coaching element in the PBL curriculum, which is the only teacher-centred phase, was “very short,” she appeared to be implying that the subsequent work they performed relied on these characteristics. Therefore, not only is the Domain perceived differently from early on (despite covering the same units from the textbook), but how the Field (the Teacher) regulates the Domain is also in contrast. The two-way flow between what the students recognise as the lesson objective and how they contribute to it is more evident in the PBL Curriculum as students produce the materials, based on the lesson and the project requirements and, as there are no “correct” answers per se, the teacher also naturally permitted more novelty to enter the Domain than she did in the TB-driven Curriculum.

From early on, it appeared that the curriculum changed the Teacher’s and students’ conception of the type of language-use affordances, fundamentally altering their perspective of both the Domain and the expectation of the Field. In the TB-driven Curriculum, the Domain is the ‘object’ language in the textbook and they are employing this language as the means of communication by answering the questions provided (which generally have only one correct answer). In contrast, in the PBL Curriculum, the emphasis of the Domain is the interaction between students to discuss and create the project with the key language integrated into the language-use affordances; that is, they are communicating in English about how to use the key language in their project rather than just using the key language to communicate to complete a task. This different orientation occurs because in the PBL-Group the Teacher (Field) is not assessing language-use by accuracy, but as development throughout the process—this means comprehension is viewed as progress (as in a sociocultural perspective) rather than correctness, which was the Teacher appears to emphasise in the TB-Group.

6.1.2 Textbook-Driven Curriculum: The Middle

In an interview on 24 March 2015, the Teacher again expressed difficulty in keeping the textbook class engaged because she felt they were moving through the book too slowly and students were beginning
to get bored. At this point, she began to play more games hoping it would pique their interests, but believed that it had proven ineffective:

T: Even though I’ve started to incorporate games and different activities into it now more so than the first few units, one of the students complained that she felt that the class is too easy. And so, I have to, I feel like, I have to challenge the higher level students while still being able to have the lower level students follow. So, I’m just apprehensive about keeping them interested and keeping them coming because I don’t want to have attendance issues with that class too.

In the last sentence above, she was referring to the attrition problem occurring in the PBL-Curriculum around this time. After articulating her struggles with both groups, I was curious about her general attitude towards the two curricula (Interview, 24 March 2015):

Researcher: So, at this point which class do you feel more comfortable teaching?

T: Comfortable? Well, neither because I’m feeling pretty apprehensive at the moment about the status of both. But, if you mean confidence wise, do you mean confidence wise?

Researcher: Yeah.

T: I guess the textbook class because I’ve been doing that for a long time but I’m not as interested in it.

Researcher: What do you mean?

T: Ah. It’s really boring to teach that class. It’s really really boring. Like, even coming up with the games and stuff... Like, it’s a small victory for me to see that they’re having fun with that. Like, any small victory that I would have in the PBL class would be a really big deal to me. Like, to see somebody have a breakthrough or just to see them producing something that would be more fulfilling for me.

It is possible that her perception of students’ attitude towards the curriculum is a projection of her own as she repeatedly expressed how bored she was with teaching the TB-driven Curriculum. It also seems likely that her negative opinion directly impacted the classroom climate as the teacher’s classroom demeanour has a significant effect on the learning environment. When she says, “Like, any small victory that I would have in the PBL class would be a really big deal to me,” she means to say that even the small successes she has had in the PBL Curriculum would be magnified if she could get students in the TB-driven Curriculum to do the same. She went on to explain that she feels some students who had initially struggled in the PBL-Group were showing signs of better engagement, but she had yet to see such improvement in the TB-Group (Interview, 24 March 2015).

Researcher: You haven’t explained sort of that, that breakthrough or that, that, uh, joy of watching somebody breakthrough in the textbook class . . .

T: No. Because they, there’s, they, they haven’t grown that much. There haven’t been those moments. Ya know, and especially in the textbook class, I’m mostly focused on keeping order and discipline and just, just wanting them to be on the same page with me, literally.

Researcher: Do you think it, that’s because of the curriculum or the students. You know, we have some trouble-making boys in that class, uh, do you think it’s because of them or because of the textbook . . .

T: I think both things contribute to it a lot; both, definitely.
Researcher: Okay. Um, so what can you say about the students’ performance in the textbook class, just generally about their performance? And you can be specific, you can use specific names here if you want to talk about a student that’s doing well, or this student did this well, or . . .

T: I’m struggling to find any particular examples where somebody has grown or gained new skills. I feel like that they’re at the same level that they were at before. Perhaps, they’ve acquired a lot of new vocabulary but that’s going to happen any time that you’re covering some materials for any amount of time. It would be ridiculous not to expect to have some new vocabulary.

Researcher: Right.

T: But like, even, no matter how simple the grammar structures are in the book, they don’t get it. Like the people who would have gotten at the beginning they still get it now, but the ones who I would want to have been able to be like, ah, okay I can better speak the sentences in this grammar style because we’re studying simple present or whatever, they don’t answer like that. They don’t answer using the examples that we’ve just studied. Like when we’re doing the role plays and stuff, they don’t even make sentences. They’re just like, “you show me bag.” Like, they’re not even speaking in full . . . like, there was the airport security with the dog, the detector dog role play. They were supposed to have fun with it and use the sentences that we’ve studied. They did that fill in the blanks; they listened to the CD repetitively. They know how that conversation is supposed to go, but when it’s time to come in front of the class, they were just drawing blanks; they had no idea what they were supposed to do. It’s just really disappointing because it’s the same format every unit. We do it several times before they’re expected to produce anything, and yet they cannot. Even the, even the smarter kids in the class we’re not producing sentences as I would have wanted them to. So, I don’t feel like I’m being really effective.

The Teacher had a growing recognition of the reciprocal relationship between the learners and the learning environment, but did not seem entirely aware of how the learning materials and teaching methods shaped students’ impressions about what was expected of them. She blames herself for being ineffective but rather than articulating what she is or is not doing in the classroom that had evoked this feeling, she based her evaluation merely on her perception that students were not engaged with the materials. Moreover, she commented on how students go through a series of textbook-directed activities in each unit, but cannot use the language more naturally in speaking or communicative-oriented activities —at the same time, several students in the TB-Group stated in interviews that they did not see much difference between this class and their regular learning context. In other words, the teacher followed the textbook lesson plan through several exercises of repetition and then asked students to demonstrate novelty in role plays or other more open-ended, communicative-type activities; however, students did not seem to understand that novelty and creativity were the desired goal of the exercise or conversation nor did they realise that the affordance-type had shifted towards more original and flexible language use because this had not been previously established in the learning process, and indeed was quite different from previous affordances available in the environment.

Furthermore, if students believe that the Teacher’s expectation is correctness, which it seems from their replication-like responses and the Teacher’s comment about having them do it until they do it right, their willingness to try something new is further inhibited; there is no real incentive to use exploratory language if risk-taking is not seen as being valued in the learning environment. When students perceive affordances as contingent upon specific expectations of the teacher (Field), they are unlikely to contribute anything new to the Domain (Csikszentmihalyi & Wolfe, 2014). In addition, the Teacher
explains that a main concern for her in the TB-Group is “keeping order and discipline and just wanting them to be on the same page…” While this was expressed within the context of growing frustration over student performance, such a conception from the Field does not fare well for creativity in the Domain or Persons.

The Teacher’s dissatisfaction with the TB-Group by the middle months of the study was the accumulation of her struggle to keep students on task and her feeling that the materials were largely responsible for keeping them engaged, particularly given that students were accustomed to changing textbooks frequently. In an interview on 24 March 2015, I asked her what her expectations were going forward; she answered:

T: What I . . . what I think’s going to happen with the textbook group is that they’re just going to keep getting more and more bored and I don’t know what I’m going to do to keep them engaged. That’s why I said I was really apprehensive. […] So, I suspect that they’re going to keep getting more and more bored and it’s gonna be harder and harder for me to engage them as time goes by. It’s not really like that with my other classes, my normal teaching job, because I’m always changing materials. And it’s not like the book’s not fun; it’s just when they see the same thing in their hand, they’re just like oh, this isn’t new. You know. So, I feel like I’m gonna have to work harder to engage them in the future.

Again, the Teacher placed responsibility for disengagement on the materials seeing it as what operationalised the lessons in the TB-driven Curriculum (Sheldon, 1987); however, she appeared to recognise the importance of the two-way flow between what the materials offered and what she could do to augment the curriculum (Domain) when she stated, “So, I feel like I’m gonna have to work harder to engage them in the future.” Indeed, in class on 27 March 2015 (just three days after the interview), she made an attempt to encourage more natural communicative-type interaction in a textbook speaking activity by asking them to engage in conversation and to ask questions beyond the activity’s prompts:

T: Okay, let’s look at Goal 4 (p. 47), discuss unusual and favourite foods. (Reading the prompt) Tell a partner about your experiences eating unusual and favourite foods. So, first you could ask them have you ever had any unusual food before and they can be like, oh yeah, I’ve eaten boiled crickets, frog legs, not normal food. Not normal food. It can even be luxury food if you want. Okay, after everybody has talked . . . no Kellan, wrong page. Wrong page. After; no, Kellan! (Lily turns his book to the correct page). After everyone has talked about their unusual food experiences than you should be like, what’s your favourite food? This is my favourite food. I like it because of this. What about yours? Go back and forth. Okay? Ask your partner. Partners (points to Holly and Danny), partners (points to Max and Ann), group (points to Lily, Emma, and Kellan who are arranged with their desks facing each other). Alright. So, let’s start talking now. Go!

Kellan began by rereading the prompt to his group members.

Lily: (Explains to her group members in Korea what to do). Let’s talk favourite food first, okay? What’s your favourite food? (She asks Kellan first).

Kellan: (Looks up a word on his phone). Chocolate (inaudible).

Lily: What?

Kellan: (Shows the word on his phone to his group members). Chocolate (inaudible).

Lily: Where is it from?

Kellan: Huh?
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Lily: Where is it from? Where did you eat it?
Emma: How does it taste?
Kellan: Cool.
Lily: Ask me, ask me.
Emma: What is your favourite food?
Lily: My favourite food is chicken.
Kellan: Me too.
Emma: You prefer chicken to pizza?
Lily: (To Kellan) What brand of chicken do you like?
Kellan: (Shows his phone to Lily and Emma) This.
Lily: What is that? Naver? (Naver is a Korean search engine – similar to Google).
Kellan: I don’t know the name, but I know what it looks like.
Emma: Draw a picture.
Lily: (Kellan shows his phone again) Ah yes, I know it. It’s (inaudible).

They spoke in Korean while the Teacher’s back was turned, but Lily quickly stopped this and asked Kellan (in English):

Lily: Have you ever eaten unusual food?
Kellan said a word that was not understood by his group members.

Lily: Caramel?
Kellan: No, not caramel. (Again, he looks the word up on his phone)

The group began to whisper, and the Teacher quickly turned her attention to them.

T: Are you guys speaking English?
Lily: Yes, yes.

Kellan looked something up on his phone and showed the picture to his group members.

Lily: Is it expensive?
Kellan: This, this, um, um.
Lily: How much is it?
Emma: it’s, ah, it’s, um, yummy?
Lily: Hey, is it expensive?
Kellan: I don’t know.
Lily: Okay, ask me.
Emma: Do you eat unusual food?
Lily: I don’t, I didn’t eat any unusual food.
Ann and Max worked as a pair in the same activity, but did not speak for the first minute until the teacher came over to help them. As the Teacher approached, Ann and Max began speaking:

**Ann:** Come on. What do you like?

**Max:** I like honey.

**Ann:** You are (inaudible)

**Max:** I am not caveman. Don’t laugh at me.

Ann said something, but it was incomprehensible.

**Max:** You can’t say that sentence, sentence. Okay, I’m handsome. You are ugly. I’m handsome and you are ugly. (To the teacher) Finished.

**T:** You talked about favourite food already?

**Max:** Yes.

**T:** No, you didn’t. (Looking at Ann) What is your favourite food?

**Ann:** Dumpling.

**T:** How does it taste?

**Ann:** It is delicious.

**T:** Okay, what is your favourite food?

**Max:** My favourite food is curry?

**T:** Curry? How does it taste? Where did you eat it? Why do you like it? You guys have to have a conversation.

**Max:** Uh, because curry is delicious.

**T:** Yes, but how does it taste? (To Lily, Kellan, and Emma) Are you guys speaking English?

**Max:** Taste spicy, a little spicy.

**T:** It tastes a little spicy. How do you eat curry?

**Max:** I don’t know.

**T:** What do you mean you don’t know, you ate it?

**Max:** Oh, how?

**T:** Yes, how? You put it on rice right and eat it in a bowl, right?

**Max:** Yes, yes.

**T:** Now, what’s the unusual food you ate? Your unusual food that you ate?

**Max:** Huh?

**T:** Unusual. Not normal. Weird food you ate?

**Max:** Ah. Insect (which is the example in the textbook).
T: I ate insect.

Max: (Repeating after the teacher) I ate insect.


Ann: How does it taste?

The Teacher appeared frustrated at this point and implored Max and Ann to talk and work cooperatively. She addressed the whole class, asking them to “have a conversation; just talk about your strange and favourite foods.”

Examining the characteristics of creativity in the extracts above, it is challenging to find much that would constitute Originality, Process-(but not step-by-step)-Oriented, or Collaboration (despite working in groups). There appears to be virtually no original language-use enacted in this activity as students either followed the language in the textbook or repeated after the Teacher. However, Kellan tried to explain one particular food, despite not knowing what it was called, but eventually gave up and showed a picture. There is no real process in either conversation as they simply took turns answering the textbook prompts; however, Lily demonstrated an effort to stimulate a process-orientation that could be considered “spontaneous, unpredictable, iterative, and non-linear (Ghiselin, 1985) when she asked the group to invert the prompts and discuss favourite foods first. She also asked a series of follow-up questions, including:

- Where is it from?
- Where is it from? Where did you eat it?
- What brand of chicken do you like? (to Kellan)
- What is that? Naver?
- Caramel?
- Is it expensive?
- How much is it?
- Hey, is it expensive?

Unfortunately, her group members’ brief responses short-circuited the “process” despite her individual efforts, which demonstrates the importance of a genuine collaborative effort in creative engagement (Thompson, 2013). As mentioned in Chapter 2, effective collaboration requires sharing, debating, negotiating, and fusing individual contributions (Rojas-Drummond et al., 2008), which Lily seemed to be attempting to activate, although she received little assistance from her group members in this regard. Emma contributed by asking follow-up questions, but shared very little information with the group, and, indeed, did not appear to answer a question during the activity.

Lily, despite Emma and Kellan’s terse responses, appeared engaged and interested in the topic. Emma and Kellan’s behaviour in this activity embodies what Carter (2007, p. 604) called “utilitarian and transactional,” as they asked and responded to the prompts with relatively short responses based on the
language they believed they were expected to produce; but Lily is relatively unaffected and requests her group members (twice) to ask her the questions. Unfortunately, when asked, her responses were not particularly extensive, and perhaps her request to be asked was also more utilitarian in purpose—to complete the task. An argument could be made that she showed an *Openness to Experience*, defined by asking questions out of genuine curiosity and she employs some of the “more beautiful questions” proposed by (Berger, 2014), including *what kind* (“What brand of chicken do you like?”), and *process-oriented* (“Let’s talk favourite food first, okay?”). Nonetheless, other question types such as probing, higher-order, divergent thinking, challenge, and affective are not used by either group, although there are certainly affordances to do so within the parameters of the given activity. Max and Ann’s conversation is even more formulaic than Lily’s group; it essentially followed the textbook dialogues found earlier in the unit, and the Teacher’s direct attempt to get them to engage in a more open-ended, natural conversation was unsuccessful.

Analysing the lack of creative engagement through the Modified Systems Model of Creativity, it appears affordances for creativity, exploratory language use, and open-ended dialogue were available in the context of the activity and in the learning environment, yet most students were not well prepared, or willing, to take full advantage of them. Again, this may be because of how they perceived their relationship with the curriculum and materials. Students appear to understand the language as the “object” of the discussion rather than the vehicle, and hence mostly produce the language being targeted. Further, when the Teacher took control of the conversation between Max and Ann, the students were more inclined to see language as product rather than process and to use repetition of the target language (or more specifically, the target language the Teacher provided) to complete the task. Both the materials and the affordances were unidirectional with students playing recipient to the demands of the activity.

In the next lesson (Class 17) 3 April 2015, the Teacher began her explanation by reading the exercise prompt on page 60 (Figure 6.1.2)
T: So, look at “Before you Watch,” A, which of these unusual sports would you like to try and why? First, it’s octopush. This is underwater sport where you have to use the little things and you try to hit the, it’s like playing hockey underwater. It’s like water-hockey, but it’s underwater. You have to have goggles on and you play under the water. The puck is on the floor. Then there is sumo wrestling. I think you guys know that, you guys, Korea has its own kind of wrestling sport. What’s it called?

Lily: Ssireum.

T: Yes, it’s like that only this is the Japanese one. They have big guys. Next, we have sepak takraw. Sepak takraw. This is like volleyball, but you don’t use your hands, you only use your feet. Serving spiking, everything using your feet.

Max: Jok-gu.

T: I don’t think so because it has a net. It’s like volleyball, only you use your feet.

Kellan: Jok-gu. Teacher, you don’t know jok-gu?

T: No. Sorry. Next, we have cheese rolling (students laugh). This is a huge wheel of cheese which is thrown down a mountain. . .

Max: Terrible sport.

T: It’s not that terrible, it’s quite fun. And these teams all run down to catch the cheese.

Kellan: Where are these sports from? Netherlands?

T: The cheese rolling, I think it is a UK sport. I think it’s British. Ah, yeah, here, look at the map, here. It’s from the UK, England, Brockworth, England, UK. It’s an English sport, it’s surprisingly, but it seems very British to me just throwing cheese down a hill and running to catch it.

Michelle: My mother says don’t throw food with eating, when eating things (Michelle laughs).

T: Your mother says don’t play with food.

Michelle: Yes, yes.
T: I think all parents tell their children that. Okay, Max, which one of these unusual sports would you like to try? Not play all the time, just try, and why?

The Teacher had a short conversation with Max in a question and answer format, asking a series of questions and Max providing short responses. The Teacher next asked Kellan and Ann the textbook prompt:

T: How about you Kellan, which of these unusual sports do you want to try?

Kellan: I want to try cheese rolling.

T: Try to answer completely. Because . . .

Kellan: Because, um, winner has a prize.

T: The cheese?

Kellan: Yes.

T: (laughs) How about you Ann, which sport do you want to try.

Ann: I want to try octopush.

T: Because?

Ann: Because I like water and it looks very interesting.

T: How about you Lily, what do you want to try?

Lily: I want to try octopush because I like to do difficult things, and this looks hard.

T: It looks difficult?

Lily: It is hard to in the water . . .

T: It is hard to stay under the water?

Lily: Yes.

T: Okay. Very good. I like that answer. Good job. So today we didn’t just say, “It looks fun,” that’s good.

Although the Teacher is pleased that students gave more complete answers as the exercise progressed, the interaction still followed an IRF style, with the Teacher typically giving feedback immediately after the students’ responses. The Teacher’s intentions are to ensure students learn to express themselves accurately in complete sentences, but students may have interpreted her follow-up questions as a means to demonstrate language proficiency rather than to communicate their ideas. So far in the TB-driven Curriculum, follow-up questions have not been particularly effective in providing open-ended dialogue or exploratory language use; this could be because the Teacher has focused more on the corrective feedback aspect of the two-way flow between language use affordances and herself (Field) and less so on evaluating and promoting opportunities for novelty. In an interview on 24 March 2015, the Teacher, after explaining her feeling that the PBL-Group needed more time with direct instruction, expressed her opinion that the TB-Group was not learning what had been taught, despite her continual feedback and emphasis on language points in the textbook:
Researcher: It’s interesting because you’re saying, like, you’re not giving [the PBL-Group], you feel like you’re not giving them enough of a foundation, enough information in the coaching stage. and in the TB-group you’re saying even though you do it repetitively they still don’t get it and still don’t do it properly, so what do you think is better. to just go ahead and let them do it and then, and then, as they’re producing language try to correct them or go through it several times, try to get it exactly right and then have them . . . fail (laughs)

T: Exactly.

Researcher: Or try, you know, try to do it correctly.

T: Well, that’s the thing. I don’t know what’s really effective, really. Because when I’m teaching the textbook class, their eyes are glazing over, they’re not even paying attention. Like, even when they’re filling in the blanks, they’re still answering wrong and they’re just waiting for me to correct it and to give them the correct answer that they can plug in; they’re not even trying to do it when we’re doing it repetitively.

Here, it is unclear whether the Teacher is putting the lack of engagement on the students or on the curriculum. In an interview on 7 August 2015, I posed this question directly:

Researcher: Do you think the reaction in the Textbook class is, um, they don’t really want to do the book or are kind of bored, do you think it’s because of the personality of the students in the class or is it because of the curriculum itself.

T: I think it’s definitely because of the curriculum because there are some kids with really positive attitudes in that class who I’ve done other stuff with them and they’ve had a totally different opinion about what I was going to do with them. Like, uh, usually it has to do with doing stuff besides what is in the textbook. Like, even when I have other classes with them.

In this interview, the Teacher is confident that the curricular approach is the major factor negatively affecting student motivation and engagement, and inhibiting language use in the TB-driven Curriculum. Although earlier in the interview she discussed how the games that she plays in the classroom encouraged them to be more active, she places responsibility for creative development on the affordances in the textbook and feels that games would not necessarily help in this regard (Interview, 7 August 2015):

T: The Textbook class, I think maybe their language will stay the same and their creativity may go up or down, I don’t know. The book is supposed to have some creative elements to it so maybe it helped them. I don’t really see how the games could be helping them be that more creative so I don’t, I don’t know. Maybe everything will be the same or get worse.

Therefore, by the middle of the study, the Teacher did not believe the TB-Group had improved their creativity or language development and did not specifically reference any of the students exhibiting the characteristics of creativity. She saw the process dictated by the textbook in a fairly rigid step-by-step process and did not feel the students were producing Meaningful Work or Originality through the affordances offered by the curriculum (Domain) or even by her (Field). While they did demonstrate some Openness to Experience in the extracts above (Kellan made a joke about the rolling cheese being the prize and Lily chose the sport of octopush because she “likes to try difficult things”), the Teacher did not take these affordances beyond a single response in which she essentially provided them the answer (“Your mother says don’t play with food”; “The Cheese?”). Finally, although the Teacher often
had them work in small groups, genuine **Collaboration** rarely occurred in part because she frequently interjected to ensure they were on-task and reproducing the language accurately. This seems to coincide with the criticism of textbook-driven courses that they dictate uniformity and constrain authentic language use and a teacher’s sense of empowerment (Chou, 2010; Hutchinson & Torres, 1994). Students became cognisant of this demand for accuracy and used formulaic language to answer the prompts or, as the Teacher points out, students are, “. . . just waiting for [her] to correct it and to give them the correct answer that they can plug in; they’re not even trying to do it when [they’re] doing it repetitively.”

Looking at the Cases through the *Modified Systems Model of Creativity for the L2 Classroom*, Lily seems to have made the most progress in terms of both creative and language proficiency development. From a quantitative perspective, she improved only two points on the TOEFL Jr Test, and increased her TTCT score by just 4-percentile markings, from the 93rd to the 97th percentile in Korea, but these scores do not reflect the advances denoted in the observational data. In my field notes on 3 April 2015, I remarked:

* Lily doesn’t always seem completely engaged in an activity, but when it is her turn she comes to life and does her best. She uses complete sentences and tries to use new words. She sometimes even asks questions to the teacher. In group work, she takes the leadership role and tries to get group members to talk more.

Further, Lily expressed on multiple occasions how much she enjoyed and valued working in groups and demonstrated her penchant for collaboration by frequently asking open-ended questions to her group mates. She also demonstrated a concerted effort to use her own linguistic resources rather than simply extracting formulaic language and dialogues from the textbook. Despite her contention that she is not a creative person because she “keeps rules,” there are numerous instances where she displayed a willingness to do something different than instructed and to “try out” new language. It is both my contention and the Teacher’s that Lily had made significant creative strides by the middle of the program and was improving her capacity to speak more readily and openly, yet this is not reflected in her language proficiency assessment score, which likely relates to the conclusions of Albert (2006) and Carroll (1990) that creativity is not necessarily reflected in the type of items found on standardized second language tests.

Ann, who increased her TOEFL Jr score by 6 points and climbed 14-percentile marks on the TTCT, also made progress in creative engagement in the classroom towards the middle of the study. While she does not appear especially active in the extracts above. She was beginning to speak more, and she acknowledged her growing confidence in an interview on 15 May 2015 (see Chapter 5), but she generally adhered closely with the language in the textbook and gave short answers to the Teacher’s and group members’ questions. Nonetheless, if there is one characteristic of creativity that she
improved over the first half of the program, it would be *Collaboration*, and while it depended greatly on who was in her group, she at times demonstrated the capacity to engage in a shared, concerted, and interactive process towards completing the goal of the activity (Robinson, 2011).

Kellan, as discussed in Chapter 6, increased his score on the TOEFL Jr by just one point, but his TTCT score went from the 13th to 79th percentile on the pre and mid tests, respectively. His TOEFL Jr score seemed to reflect the Teacher’s hypothesis that most students would not improve their score much (and maybe even go down), but the astounding leap in his TTCT score did not reflect his in-class performance, which again, could possibly relate to the fact that items on the language proficiency test do not match creative-type abilities (Albert, 2006; Carroll, 1990) and/or that motivational factors greatly affect text/retest reliability (E. P. Torrance, 1974). Kellan maintained a great sense of humour in class and on occasions, especially games, displayed genuine interest in the activities; however, there are few examples in which he exemplified any of the five characteristics of creativity in the first half of the program. The Teacher’s increased use of games could have had some positive effect on his creativity score, but the degree of improvement, 66 percentile points, is more likely an inconsistency in the objective-scoring of the test.

6.1.3 Textbook-Driven Curriculum: The End

As the end of the program neared, the Teacher’s perspective of the two curricula was well established and had important consequences on how the class was conducted and the type of affordances allotted, resulting in the conspicuous difference in the learning atmosphere. It is helpful to preface this subsection with pointed comments made by the Teacher in two separate interviews in the later months of the study. In an interview on 15 October 2015, I asked what she saw as the major difference between the two curricula:

T: The textbook-based curriculum is mostly discipline and, uh, keeping students, uh, on task, and focused. But I think in the PBL curriculum you need to know how to communicate with them because it’s daunting and also it’s a different way of learning so communication style has to change a lot. You’re not an authority figure anymore.

She took substantially different approaches in her role as the Field in the two curricula. In the TB-driven curriculum, she saw herself, and in many ways acted, as an authority figure, not only in terms of discipline but also as a ‘language authority,’ as she frequently corrected student responses and demanded that they stay in English. In the PBL-Curriculum, she perceived her role as encouraging communicative performance, was less inclined to correct errors, was more empathetic to their struggles (“because the curriculum is a different way of learning”), and was more willing to recognise students’ contributions, both in discussion and in their projects, as creative.
She also perceived the work that they did outside of class as being different; in an interview on 15 November 2015 (almost exactly one year of the study started), I asked whether she believed the textbook homework or the creative homework was easier:

**T:** Definitely the textbook one because they just have to read, it’s, the reason I like them doing it is just to review because there was so little retention so I think if they thought about what we did in class at least one more time [at home], it would, like, it would give them a better chance of memorizing what we studied. And anyways, to really remember you have to do it repetitively, but as far the PBL curriculum, all of it was like very open-ended questions, coming up with ideas, thinking, thinking, thinking, thinking, so it wasn’t a lot but it just made them use their brains more.

Not only did she perceive her role in the classroom differently, but she also saw student work as not only functionally different, but as requiring disparate cognitive abilities (“memorising” in the TB Curriculum verse “coming up with ideas, thinking, thinking, thinking, thinking,” in the PBL Curriculum). However, it seems that towards the end of the study, she tried to get away from repetition in the TB-driven Curriculum and encouraged more communicative and collaborative activities, yet she still tended to over-rely on the question and answer format.

The following extract is taken from 23 October 2015 as students undertook Unit 9 and completed page 103 (Figure 6.1.3). The activity was to brainstorm the advantages and disadvantages of online shopping versus shopping in the store; after explaining the meaning of the terms, the Teacher asked students to come to the board, handed each a board marker, and provided instructions for the next activity:

**T:** Okay, so now we’re going to talk about the good things about shopping online and the disadvantages, the uncomfortable, bad things about shopping online first, okay. Emma, tell me one good thing about shopping online.

**Emma:** Easy.

**T:** Good. Say, it’s easy, or write in on the board like this, use a little circle here. Don’t forget to put an apostrophe on “it’s.” Okay. Lily, give me another advantage of shopping online.

**Lily:** We don’t have to go out.

**T:** Outside? Write it. We don’t have to go outside.

**Lily:** Don’t have to . . .

**T:** Don’t have to go outside. We can just put phrases. We don’t have to put super complete sentences. Ann, do another one.

Ann looked at the board for approximately 20 seconds and then shrugged her shoulders.

**T:** Just think of one more thing.

**Ann:** There are no more.

**T:** There are no more advantages? Come on. Do you ever do online shopping, like G-Market or 11th Street? You have to have, right. It’s online shopping. Think of another advantage, Ann. Don’t speak Korean you guys. Do you need to use your phone?

**Ann:** I don’t have any ideas.
T: Emma’s trying to help you.

Ann spoke Korean to tell Emma just to write her idea on the board rather than explain it to her.

T: Speak in English, Ann!

Lily: In the store, on the thing, it’s not everything, maybe not have, but the internet has many kinds, everything.

T: Write it down Ann. There are many . . . Do you see how I’m asking you? (Lily and Emma turn around to whisper in Korean) Wait, come here. Pay attention. How did the teacher ask you to write your ideas? I said, write what you think, right? Do you have another idea? Hey, pay attention because you guys are going to make your own list for shopping in the store and I’m not going to help you. Now anybody, can you think of more advantages? I can think of one.

Lily: What?

T: I compare the prices. For me, shopping online is always cheaper. Right? Write it down. Cheaper prices. Lily, can you think of more advantages? Let’s think of as many as we can.

Lily: I don’t have any more ideas.

T: Emma, think of an advantage. A good thing about shopping online. Come on, Emma. No more? Okay. Let’s think of disadvantages. Emma what are some bad things about shopping online.

Emma: Can I check the book?

T: Yes, you can.

Lily: You can’t check the size.

T: You mean you can’t wear it?

Lily: Yes.

T: Say, I cannot try on the clothes.

Lily: I cannot try on the clothes.

T: I think everyone agrees that’s the worst. Write it down.

Ann: Me, oh me. (wanting to be called on by the teacher)

T: Yes, Ann.

Ann: It is not easy to find my size.

T: Write it down.

Lily: I have one more.

T: Wait, let Emma do one. Are you ready, Emma?

Emma: No.

T: Okay. Lily?

Lily: It’s the internet so dangerous for personal information.

T: You mean, like hackers?

Lily: Yeah,
T: Okay, so write: People can hack my information. What about you Emma, what do you want to say?

Emma looked through her phone for more than 30 seconds. Ann sighed and sat down on the floor.

T: Do you got one Emma?

Emma: No.

T: Okay, do you have another one, Ann?

Ann: Yeah, quality, um, worst quality.

T: Okay, you can write, items are bad quality.

Emma: Oh, pictures are, are . . .

Lily: Pictures are a lie.

T: (Laughs) The pictures are a lie, right. It always looks good in the pictures, right? You can write, pictures are not true. Do you agree with that?

Lily: Yes, and it’s slow. If you get in the store you can just take.

T: Okay, how can you say that in a sentence, Lily?

Lily: (thinks for approximately 10 seconds) It takes a long time online.

T: You mean delivery takes too long.

Lily: Yes.

T: Good. Write it down.
It might first be noted that none of the ideas are taken from the textbook as the pictures, vocabulary items, and sample sentences do not directly relate to the discussion prompts at the top of the page; most of their ideas and dialogue are from their own linguistic resources and this provides a good example of an open-ended, communicative activity afforded by the textbook. However, the dialogue that ensued was not particularly communicative in nature, but instead, as in the beginning and middle of the study,
the Teacher controlled the conversation which took on the familiar IRF format. In my field notes, I remarked:

*The goal is to have students discuss the advantages and disadvantages with each other but they wait for the teacher to indicate whose turn it is and the teacher asks questions to help them with ideas. The discussion was quite minimal as students looked in their book or waited for each other to write something.*

There are some examples of students deliberately contributing to the materials, and although they looked at the textbook, it is not clear how this helped as their responses were not from the unit. What is of note in this extract is that Ann and Emma informed the Teacher that they had no more ideas, but Lily, despite relaying the same sentiment, persisted in trying to think of answers and attempted to help Ann and Emma. She was successful in this regard as Ann became re-animated and supplied two additional disadvantages after saying she could not think of any more. Also notable is that while the Teacher had planned for the students to ‘brainstorm’ amongst themselves through discussion, she continued to provide error feedback and fairly precise instructions on what to write on the board.

The students’ level of interest in online shopping cannot be deduced from this extract, but based on their ‘conversation,’ this would not seem to constitute *Meaningful Work.* Again, the flow of conversation was mostly dictated by the Teacher and they are essentially adding to a list rather than mixing their ideas in any purposeful way, thus it would also not be considered *Collaboration,* but rather as what Robinson (2011) designated as “cooperation,” or a synchronised effort to complete a goal. As previously mentioned, Lily and Ann’s persistence with the activity might be loosely interpreted as *Openness to Experience* as they demonstrated a willingness to try new things and showed some adeptness in terms of divergent thinking (McCrae, 1987). However, students do not ask each other higher-order questions (Berger, 2014) and the conversation does not result in longer more complex interaction (Walsh, 2011). There also does not appear to be any *Process-orientation,* as the goal is simply to write a list on the board for advantages and disadvantages. Nonetheless, the students’ do demonstrate *Appropriate* language use for the task (although they were supposed to have a conversation amongst themselves as they drafted the list), and do use some *Originality* as they look up information on their phones and articulate their ideas in English to the teacher.

In looking at their interaction through the *Modified Systems Model of Creativity for the L2 Classroom* framework, some amendments to the activity would have better facilitated the five characteristics of creativity. In this activity, students were contributing to the materials, yet they were still following the textbook prompts. The teacher remained more focused on accuracy than novelty, and while encouraging them to share their ideas, she primarily attended to the specific task (writing a list) and on ensuring they wrote their responses correctly on the board. The affordances for student production were relatively open-ended in this task and they contributed some thoughtful ideas, but making a list, while
perhaps helpful for developing divergent thinking skills (again, it is essentially a brainstorming activity), could have been augmented to generate greater opportunities for creative engagement. If the Teacher had given more consideration to the characteristic of Process-(but not step-by-step)-Oriented, the list could have been employed for a series of follow-up activities. However, after the students created the list, they simply continued with the next page of the textbook.

In terms of preserving the two-way flow between the curriculum and language-use affordances, making a list can have the inverse effect because students are likely to see affordances as decreasing (and hence the activity drawing closer to an end) as more ideas are added to the list. Further, during moments of silence when they were thinking, the Teacher appears to push them slightly to give answers, something she had become conscious of not doing in the PBL Curriculum. However, when I asked the Teacher about her consideration to time-management in terms of pedagogical decisions based on what she believed was expected of her in this study, she responded (Interview, 15 October 2015):

T: Yes. I think, like, for the textbook curriculum, because, let’s say in my previous experience, I didn’t really think about it because I was always under a time constraint. It was always like, you have to finish this material in this many weeks so, like, rather than worrying about if the kids have got it or if I was doing the lesson well enough, I was just pushing through. But, now, even if I have like, like, even if we say, oh, let’s finish this because we have other things to do, I still felt like there was less pressure on me to just push through the material in the textbook class. And, as far as the PBL curriculum because it was totally new, there’s definitely a big expectation from me to understand it and to teach it well, especially because it was just so new for everybody, I guess.

Despite feeling there was less time constraint in this program, she continued to proceed through the book rather expeditiously in the TB-driven curriculum, likely due to her previous experiences with teaching textbook-driven classes; however this conception did not seem to carry over to the PBL-Curriculum, where she seemed more concerned with helping students understand the materials and adapt to the novel learning environment.

As in the above extract, by the end of the study, Lily could be seen, in almost every classroom activity, trying to use her own language resources, to engage fully in group activities, and to ask questions to both the Teacher and her peers. She frequently requested to do group work or play games and, like above, would persist in activities when others would try to bring them to a close. On the quantitative assessments, her creativity score remained in the 97th percentile, and her TOEFL Jr score increased by 22 points. In an interview in May 2015, Lily reported her feeling that the class had not helped her become more creative, however, four months later, in September 2015, she felt her creativity had improved “a little” because she had learned more English words. In the end-of-program Focus Group session, she was the only student in the TB-Group that believed the course had helped improve creativity (although she did not offer any reasons or clarification for this perception). By the end of the study, Lily’s attitude and behaviour differed from other students in the TB-driven Curriculum in that
she was actively and consistently seeking out language-use affordances in the learning environment and trying to create her own as well.

In contrast, Kellan’s TTCT score dropped to the 34th–percentile (down from the mid-test ranking in the 79th percentile) on the post-test and Ann’s TTCT score declined slightly from the 89th to the 87th–percentile. Likewise, Kellan’s TOEFL Jr score decreased 7 points to a total score of 40, and Ann returned to her pre-test score of 57, falling 6 points from her mid-test mark. Despite reporting that he had learned more words (as Lily had also mentioned) and improved his English, in a May 2015 interview, Kellan’s classroom observational data and insights conveyed through interviews did not reflect much activation of the five characteristics of creativity outside of sporadic bursts of engagement in games, and he appeared either not to perceive or to consciously leave unexploited the affordances for creative engagement and language use in classroom activities. Ann, remarkably absent from the Teacher’s interviews and reflections on classroom interaction, as well from my own observational field notes, appears to have participated well in classroom activities, yet it is difficult to see how she was interacting with the material other than completing the textbook activities. While taking advantage of language-use affordances in terms of activating the language she had learned, she did not create her own affordances to engage in communicative practice (other than short conversations with friends after she has completed a textbook exercise) despite reporting in interviews that she enjoyed talking and learning English with others. Although some students did improve their ability to take advantage of creativity and language-use affordance as the study progressed, there are distinct differences from beginning to end with the way in which students in the PBL-Group interacted in class, as well as in the resultant classroom dynamic.

6.2 Project-based Learning Curriculum: Classroom Analysis

As in the TB-driven curriculum examples, other students than the Cases occasionally appear in the extracts and the Teacher’s perspectives are added to provide greater depth to the observational analysis. Below, Table 6.2 provides the details of the classes. It might be noted that classes 16~17 and 27~28 fall one week later in the PBL Curriculum due a class cancellation in February 2015.
Table 6.2: Project-based Learning Curriculum, Details of Classes 3-4, 16-17, & 27-28

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Textbook-driven Curriculum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Beginning</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Class Number</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Middle</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>End</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.2.1 Project-based Learning Curriculum: The Beginning

At the beginning of the study, the Teacher was apprehensive about teaching the PBL curriculum because of her lack of experience with student-centred approaches, yet expressed excitement as well. In our first interview on 11 November 2014, which immediately followed a 2-hour training session on how to instruct the elements of the 10Cs of Project-based TESOL Curriculum, I asked for her opinion of the PBL curriculum; she answered:

T: Because I haven’t done something like this before, and I only know about it in the sort of theoretical sense, um, I guess it seems a little bit risky to me, but at the same time it’s exciting because it’s risky and also because I just like creative things and I think even non-creative people, like, even when they don’t like doing creative tasks, I think by the time their finished they’ve had at least a little bit of fun.

In an interview three weeks later, I asked how she was adapting to her new role in the PBL-Curriculum (Interview, 29 November 2014):

Researcher: So, in what ways is this like, you know, uh, a different role? So, there’s that, nobody’s speaking but you, you have to give pattern sentences (she mentioned this earlier in the interview), but, as you’re watching this (I played a short section of video form the PBL Curriculum for her to watch), you know, what other ways do you think it’s different from what you’re used to?

T: It’s not teacher-centred, so it’s not like everyone’s got their eyes on me. So, I feel like I’m just a presence in the class and not the centre of attention.
**Researcher:** How do you feel about that?

T: I don’t mind it. I guess, it’s just new to me, I don’t have negative or positive feelings associated with it, it’s just new.

**Researcher:** So, when you’re just standing here, and you can see your watching, and they’re working, most of them, but do you feel that you’re not teaching or have any negative feelings like that? Do you feel distant from what’s going on in the classroom or not?

T: Yeah, I guess I feel like I’m not very…the word you use is distant. I guess that’s a little bit how I feel. But I don’t think that’s necessarily like a bad thing. I feel like in this position, I’m there when they need me. I’m just worried that they won’t come to me when they need me.

**Researcher:** Ah.

T: That they’ll just sit there and not say something and they won’t think to be like, teacher, da da da da da.

This was a legitimate concern as some students had expressed to the school administrator that they did not understand what they were doing in the class and attrition had begun in week eight of the program, shortly after the first project. This, as previously mentioned, was in part due to the learning environment being radically different from that which they were accustomed, specifically with the Teacher not providing explicit language instruction and the students needing to produce oral output to communicate about the project.

The following extract from the PBL Curriculum took place on 29 November 2014; unlike in the Textbook-driven Curriculum, the Teacher’s input is noticeably minimal in the more than 4-minute conversation:

**Julie:** Um, you two, can you think about the titles, how we'll organise it? We'll have the titles, then we'll have 6 pages, and we should fill this paper. Let's think about that. Where's, um, first, let's put the table of contents on this page. Do you know what is content?

**Ailee:** Yes.

**Julie:** Okay, and second, what do you want?

**Ailee:** A simple page. Okay?

**Julie:** Ah, you mean introduction?

**Ailee:** This message (she points to computer screen).

**Julie:** Okay. Next?

**Ailee:** Other students.

**Kevin:** Interview?

**Julie:** Interview? What about a picture or your maze? Or another picture maybe. Is it okay, the maze picture? How many pictures?

**Ailee:** Only one picture?

**Julie:** (To Kevin) How many pictures? Only one maze?

**Kevin:** Yeah.
Julie: Okay. Only one maze and next page?

Ailee: Interview the kids.

Julie: Okay. And the next page. How about, how to . . .

Kevin: Come?

Julie: Yes, come, also, like how we learn, like this, in the school, um. . .

Ailee: Ah, the study system.

Julie: Yes, right. Good. The study system. And after, final, what do you want Kevin, last page?

Kevin: Thank you (meaning a “Thank you” page).

Julie: Thank you, okay. Or, how about we put any problem.

Ailee: Okay.

Julie: Like this then. Is it okay?

Kevin: No.

Julie: No? Okay we can put this somewhere . . .

T: (To the whole class) Does anybody need to use the internet? This computer has internet.

Julie: Oh, we need it. Okay, so like this, with a belt, the belt is good. Can you make it more thicker and . . .?

Kevin: This size?

Julie: Huh?

Kevin: This size?

Julie: Yes. We need it to do this (demonstrates wrapping a thin piece of paper around their pamphlet). Not now, after we finish okay? Okay, then the A4 [paper]?

Ailee: Teacher, we need A4?

T: A4 paper? How many pieces?

Julie: Just two.

T: How many?

Julie: Just two pieces. (To her group members) What about this? We just, um, fold it and cut it like this and glue it together and use staples. It's bigger, it's more bigger and more comfortable to write. This (indicating one of the A4 papers the teacher just handed them) is just extra. Okay, will you write the interview?

Ailee: Yes.

Although many of their sentences were short, they communicated authentically about their project and asked each other questions about the project design. They also debated elements of the design as when Kevin replied “No,” about the page arrangement of their pamphlet (although he does not offer an alternative). Additionally, he expressed his displeasure with the large size they had originally decided
upon and said, “This size,” to indicate that he preferred that the pages be smaller, approximately the size of A4 paper.

Not only does the activity allow them to continuously add to and adapt the learning materials (their project design) (Domain), but the constant renegotiation and supplementation of ideas provided substantially more authentic language use affordances without the need for the IRF format consistently present in the TB-driven Curriculum. The Teacher, while noticing some communication difficulties and the group’s dependence on Julie to keep the conversation going, did not intervene to clarify or correct, allowing students to dictate the language-use affordances and to have substantial freedom in the production of their pamphlets. This permitted a great deal of open-endedness from the students’ perspective, making them more reliant on collaboration through communication to produce the materials (Domain) and encouraging them to introduce Meaningful Work into their projects (Affordances). Their understanding of project-making as a process came to the forefront in the next class as they nervously prepared for the Culmination, in which they had to present their brochure to the class.

On 20 December 2014, the fourth class of the research study, Julie, Ailee, and Kevin had finished most of their pamphlet and were discussing how they would present it:

**Julie:** (To Kevin) When we present, please do like detective because 2S School is a detective school and you should like, act like a detective.

**Ailee:** What? How?

**Julie:** You should say, “If you want to be a great detective like Sherlock Holmes, then come to our school, you can learn criminal science.” Okay, Kevin, you should do like criminal. Like, put your hands behind your head (Kevin performs the action). Good. Yes, like that. Okay, psychology is your mind and how to handle a crisis, please, handle it like Sherlock.

T: Everyone, I’m going to give you a break now. It’s your time to drink water and go to the bathroom. You can go now. Go drink water or go the bathroom.

**Julie:** Kevin, you like runaway and she has to like catch you (Ailee groans). Please do it you guys, because you (to Ailee) are a detective and you (to Kevin) are a criminal, okay? Can you do that (Ailee groans, again)?

**Kevin:** Ah, she’ll catch the criminal?

**Julie:** Yes, can you do that? Just catch, catch him. You are a detective, a police officer, and he is a criminal.

**Kevin:** I’m a Japanese criminal.

**Julie:** Okay, catch him. Just do like this (acts out grabbing Kevin from behind) and catch him. Okay, so I’ll say, how to handle the crisis and how to solve the mysteries and this part you should do like, um, you are thinking, like hmmm (once again, Ailee groans this time more loudly, but Julie just smiles). You can be the detective, the best detective. Please do like that. Please, please, please. And this part (points to brochure) I will do. You (to Kevin) should do all the majors and the lessons, then I will do this part. And then, beside him, I will be the police officer.

**Kevin:** I’ll be criminal.

**Julie:** You guys, please do like that, okay. Please. Second, you catch him, and third, you should think, okay? Think, like solving mysteries, okay? Please do that (gestures a thinking motion with hand on the chin and head turned downward). And interview, just we should talk to each other but very fluently and confidently. Okay.
Julie dominated this conversation as she had a clear vision for the presentation and appeared to be excited about it. Ailee’s attitude was less enthusiastic and she sighed each time Julie gave a direction. During the actual presentation, Ailee only did a couple of the actions that Julie requested, and only after Julie paused the presentation in order for her to do them. It might be noted that Ailee dropped out of the course shortly after the first presentation. Kevin was seemingly enthusiastic about the Detective School brochure they had made as it was his idea, but was hesitant about the presentation and, as far as preparation for it, he mostly followed Julie’s lead—once the presentation began he demonstrated positive energy and performed most of the actions Julie had requested.

From the very beginning of the program, Julie had a terrific attitude about discussing the project design, constructing it, and presenting it. She used enthusiasm and a positive mindset to encourage her group members and because of her support, Kevin began to engage more readily. Although he did not speak much in the extract above, he did well throughout most of the project cycle, and, as mentioned earlier, this project possessed a strong element of Meaningful Work for him as he desired to be a detective when he is older. He played a big part in creating the brochure cover and contributed to the maze design of the school, the interview stories, and the curriculum design. He looked up numerous words in his phone and actively sought out new ways to express his ideas in the story. However, in verbal interaction with group members, his sentences remained short and Julie constantly asked him to elaborate. Kevin found learning through the projects useful for vocabulary, speaking development, and for remembering new words and phrases, and showed improvement from the first weeks of the study in his willingness to share and build upon his ideas in conjunction with his group members, but struggled to communicate authentically and, as he acknowledged, was hesitant to share his ideas.

Jane does not appear in the transcript data above (she was in the classroom, but in a different group), but, as mentioned earlier, she exhibited tremendous industry, had a positive attitude toward the projects from the beginning and believed they were a practical means to development English speaking skills; she also enjoyed partaking in new experiences and demonstrated leadership abilities in ensuring her group stayed on-task throughout the process. Of the three Cases in the PBL-Group, she had the lowest score on the TOEFL Jr test at all three phases (despite increasing her score 15 points from pre-test to post-test), however she had the highest TTCT score on the pre-test (although all Cases in the PBL-Group were approximately the same: Kevin - 79; Julie – 80; Jane – 82). While the results of a single case cannot be used for statistical generalisation, it calls into question the results of correlation studies that found a significant relationship between these two capacities (Albert & Kormos, 2004; Ghonsooly & Showqi, 2012; Landry, 1973; Ottó, 1998), and highlights that contextual and individual factors must
be given adequate consideration (K. McDonough et al., 2015; Tin, 2012), especially when considering both creativity and language development as dynamic rather than static qualities.

Jane expressed through her pre-study motivation self-report, in interviews, and demonstrated through classroom interaction, a strong desire to improve her creativity. Kevin also acknowledged a (MEDIUM) desire to improve his creativity and certainly displayed this capacity at times, however, he continued to focus on grammar and lexical development, was overly conscious about accuracy, and was tentative about conveying his ideas to others.

From the view of the Modified Systems Model of Creativity for the L2 Classroom, all students seemed to understand the reciprocal relationship between their verbal and conceptual contributions and the development of the artefacts of the curriculum (which were the projects they created). The absence of the Teacher in the dialogues above also indicates that she recognised a greater need to allow student-initiated affordances in the production of the classroom materials (Domain) and saw the unit contents as foundational, but not restrictive. Further, she does not appear to allow the project requirements to dictate oral production (Affordances) as evidenced by the fact that all groups failed to fulfil the listed requirements in the first project; however, the teacher overlooked this as she focused on encouraging student interaction and collaboration instead.

This also provided greater affordances in language-use and allowed students to use a significant amount of original language in their projects. Students recognised these affordances as well, both in terms of the project creation and the language they used to communicate while constructing it. Therefore, the cyclical flow between language-use affordances and the language that emerged through the course materials (Domain) was being continuously expanded, unlike in the TB-Curriculum where the language used by the participants was mostly dictated by the unit’s lexical and grammatical objectives. Thus, from the beginning, it is clear how the participants in the two curricula perceived language-use affordances differently. Further, it is evident how the Teacher (Field) permitted greater affordances in verbal production and played less of a gatekeeper role in the language that was produced, both in terms of language expansion (using language outside of the unit objectives) and controlling for accuracy from early in the study. The Teacher calls attention to this, although she perceived it as being initiated by what students were doing rather than by what she empowered through affordances: (Interview 29 November 2014 (right after the class):

T: For the project-based class, I’m really happy with Group 2, I mean they took the idea of a theme and they really ran with it. […] They were really taking the project and doing their own thing with it.

Through the Modified Systems Model of Creativity for the L2 Classroom Framework, how the Teacher (Field) accepts novelty and innovation to enter the curriculum (Domain) played an important role in
how the students (Persons) perceive opportunities to demonstrate creativity and expand their language use (Affordances). Indeed, in their re-conceptualisation of the Systems Model of Creativity for investigating creativity in the classroom, Csikszentmihalyi and Wolfe (2014, p. 179) comment that teachers are ultimately the judges of students ideas and products in the classroom and assert that, “It follows that if one wishes to increase the frequency of creativity, it may be more advantageous to work at the level of fields than at the level of individuals.” Whether intentionally or ancillary to the curricular approach, it was established early in the PBL Curriculum that the students intellectual and linguistic resources would be called upon to facilitate the flow of the curriculum and that the Teacher would permit, and perhaps even embolden, student-led interaction. Unfortunately, for some students, this proved too challenging and attrition proliferated.

6.2.2 Project-based Learning Curriculum: The Middle

After the initial wave of student attrition, the Teacher briefly returned to a more teacher-centred pedagogical approach, feeling that this might prevent other students from dropping. However, after several personal discussions with me in which I told her not to worry about the attrition and to simply continue with the curriculum as planned, she made a conscious effort to interject less during group discussions and to act more as a guide. This allowed students to again take control of the flow of conversation and to generate their own language-use affordances. However, she gave more attention to ensuring that the projects’ thematic and language-related requirements were being achieved and, while continuing to give space for creative and language-use affordances, she provided more feedback throughout the process and implemented ‘practice sessions’ at the end of each class so that students could show what they had produced thus far, granting her more opportunities to offer guidance as they proceeded.

Julie recognised the value in this new ‘step’ and took advantage of the iterative opportunities to make changes after subsequent practices. She also continued to improve her skill of being open to experience and trying out new ideas as she engaged in meaningful work by empowering herself and others to make decisions about the projects (Gladwell, 2008). In addition, she became progressively more adept at effective collaboration, consistently asking group members, especially Kevin, for input and ideas (Thompson, 2013). Kevin continued to struggle, perhaps even more than early on. The Teacher calls attention to both Julie’s improvement and Kevin’s “regression” when I asked which students’ she felt had made progress (Interview, 18 September 2015):

**T:** I would say definitely Julie and Jane, um, out of the two, Julie’s definitely gotten much better. I mean, her sentences are much longer now. When I first was talking to her in the early months, I felt that she stuttered a bit and not because of a speech impediment, just like she was trying to find the right words in her head and there was a lot of ums and ahs, a lot of hesitation in her speech and now it’s straight forward, she doesn’t really do that
anymore. So, that’s a big thing that I noticed. Also, her confidence in talking to me, I don’t know if it’s because of the familiarity or just the general process, but she seems a lot more confident in talking with me so definitely she’s gotten better. Jane, I feel that her absences have affected her negatively. If she had come as consecutively as Julie did, they would probably be at the same level. And then Kevin, I feel like he’s regressed a little bit, because in the beginning, he had somebody in the class that he really like talking to, Matt. And now that he with girls, he’s a little bit awkward with them. He doesn’t, I feel like he doesn’t feel like his ideas jive with them. Like, when he had his friend who was his partner or in a group that at least had another guy or at least had a few other people, he was, he seemed more talkative especially when he was talking about his ideas and what he wanted to contribute. But, the last two project cycles, he’s been very quiet. So, I don’t want to say he got worse, but as far has his, the amount of time he spends speaking in class is definitely been reduced so that’s definitely a negative progression. That’s not progression, that’s getting worse – losing your confidence, not talking anymore, that’s a kind of regression, so, you know, um, I don’t know what to do with him because like I’ve talked to him a few times on the side, like, “what’s up with you, you know, like, why don’t . . . is it because of girls,” and he’s like, “yeah, I’m a little uncomfortable.”

However, Kevin acknowledged that it is more than just working with female classmates, he also had insecurities regarding his language ability (Interview with the Teacher, 18 September 2015):

**Researcher:** So, he acknowledged it wasn’t the curriculum itself. It’s some other extraneous factor?

**T:** Yeah, he said it’s a social, like, anxiety that he has. Like, he’s, like he said he felt and he said they’re really good at speaking so, I’m shy to share my ideas. And I’m like, “okay, well just don’t even think about it like that. You guys have been friends for a long time, you know. You can feel comfortable with them. And then like on the last project, we kept talking about how, uh, he eventually let out what he thought on their painting, that the colours were too girly, for example. And that was something he noticed from the beginning and yet he was hesitant to share it. So, I don’t think, I don’t think it’s necessarily that he’s regressed as far as his language ability, but I can’t really gauge that because he’s not talking.

Kevin had also recognised his reticence when communicating with Jane and Julie, and had mentioned it in several interviews. This may have had something to do with his lack of conversational engagement at times, but it is unclear whether it affected his creative development as both Jane and Julie acknowledged his creative contributions on several occasions. From a quantitative perspective, he improved his TTCT score only 5 percentile points over the course of the study, however, he believed that he could think of more ideas than before and that he had improved his communication skills in English. In my field notes on 4 April 2015, approximately 15 minutes into the class, I remarked:

*Kevin seems really nervous and awkward when working with girls. T showing amazing constraint in not jumping in as Kevin struggles to respond to the Qs. Ss struggle a bit to communicate but continuously worked to negotiate comprehension The teacher allows this to happen without rescuing them. Julie tries to carry the conversation – her fluency isn’t great – I think she is either concerned with Kevin’s level of comprehension or she is just annoyed.*

Some parts of the project cycle are dependent on group interaction and collaboration and it became clear on several occasions how much one group member’s lack of participation can affect group cohesion, and indeed the learning atmosphere. Kevin seemed to be aware of this and tried to contribute more as the class progressed (as it was only he and Julie present); approximately an hour after my notation above, I recorded in my field notes:

*Students (Julie and Kevin) communicating fairly well at this point about their ideas for the project with some long gaps of silence as they look over their idea – overall, students do a pretty good job of discussing their ideas and they draft an outline and create the character’s roles.*
Although Julie appeared frustrated at times, she continued to be encouraging and Kevin eventually shared his ideas more willingly. *Meaningful Work* played an important role in Kevin’s increased engagement as the more interested he was in the topic and the more he felt that his contribution was valued, the more immersed he became in group discussions and projects. For Kevin, the *Process-(but not step-by-step)-Orientation* was especially important because he often did not voice his opinions in the initial stages, but understood that he would have opportunities to share his thoughts at various points along the path and seemed to wait until the project developed before making suggestions. It is my belief that had the curriculum been based around single-class tasks, rather than extended projects, he would not have been able to deliberately improve his ability to become more involved in ideation and group discussion because, as he mentioned, he needed to think carefully about his ideas before sharing them.

Jane (again, not present in the class above) continued to show leadership and share her thoughts for the projects, however, her attendance was sporadic during the middle months of the study due to her school mid-term exam (and an overseas family trip in May 2015) and she did not attend the class from which the below extract was taken, nor the class before. In the following extract, only Kevin and Julie were present (11 April 2015):

Julie: What about this? Each person does something. For example, father drives a car and he has a car accident, and the mother loses her suitcase, and the son lost his passport, and daughter just disappeared. Finally, they meet together and go to Spain, but there, they lose something again.

Kevin: Many problems.

Julie: Yes.

Kevin: So, that’s good.

Julie: Yeah, I like this. Do you have some other ideas?

Kevin: Not yet.

T: Did you guys choose what you want? Do you have a good idea? Now you need to outline it. Don’t make a detailed story, you don’t have enough time [today]. You can do that next time with your group, just make an outline of the story you’re gonna make when you know how many characters there are. What kind of costumes do you need? What kind of props do you want to make? If you want to make a background, it is up to you because if you have an outline then you can make a plan for each person to do what you need them to do . . .

Julie: Think about the background we need. Somewhere we go, winter, spring, autumn.

Kevin: When is the Tomato Festival?

Julie: Let’s search about that (Julie picks up her phone and searches for the date of the Tomato Festival in Spain; Kevin looks on). It’s in August.

Kevin: August. Okay.

T: You should think about what props you need and what background you want to make.

Julie: Do we need to think of props and background now?
T: You should be able to because you have to bring it. You should just think about what you have to bring. If you don’t know right now then don’t worry because you still have next week, but just think about props so it will help you next week.

Julie: Okay, I think we should wear summer clothes. And you have two roles, right?

Kevin: What is roles?

Julie: You are son and airport officer.

Kevin: Oh, right. And we need passport.

Julie: Right, do you have a passport?

Kevin: No.

Julie: I have a play one I can bring you. Will we use PPT to show the background?

Kevin: Yeah.

Julie: Okay.

Kevin: What background?

Julie: What we will show on the PPT.

Kevin: Oh, okay.

Affordances were provided for a process-orientation by allowing them to discuss various options and develop their ideas iteratively, but it also promoted Originality by permitting them to choose their own festival and learn more about it while also requiring Appropriateness as students turn their attention to the thematic requirements of the projects, which included props, costumes, and creating backgrounds. Most of this extract involves students discussing the technical aspects of performing the play, and this facilitated dialogue that was quite different from normal language learning tasks as it required them to communicate beyond practicing specific grammatical or lexical points. Jane, who attended the next class (see below) and helped expand the acting directions for the play, shared her thoughts on how the Drama project helped improve her English (Interview, 12 September 2015):

Researcher: What do you think was better for improving your English, the drama or the collage Project?

Jane: I think both the project helped me, but the drama project was more helpful for speaking English because we had to think of a lot of ideas for the play.

For all three students, this was the first time that they had written, directed, and performed in a play in English and they displayed both their Collaboration skills and Openness to Experience as they debated elements of the dialogue, stage directions and costumes, and the backgrounds they would use. All three Cases appeared to be engaged in the project and to enjoy the process.

As mentioned above, the Teacher began to implement in-class rehearsals at the end of each class (especially during the Drama Project). This addition to the process-orientation provided students greater confidence when performing/presenting. This is represented in the extract below, taken from 11 April 2015, near the end of the class period. All students that remained in the PBL-Group, including Matt, were present on this day, and after spending nearly the entire class developing and refining their
script, the Teacher asks them to practice what they had so far so that she could offer feedback to help them with the final script. She allowed them to read directly from their scripts for this rehearsal, however, most students did their best to act it out with some enthusiasm in their voice (except for Matt who was monotone in his delivery):

**Julie:** We need background sound, so when we make the PPT we’ll have just some picture.

T: If you want to play the PPT do you want to use that monitor?

**Julie:** Yes. (To group members) What about TV sound? (To teacher) Can you do TV sound?

**Jane:** Just short.

T: Wait, wait, wait. American TV sound?

**Julie:** Yeah.

T: Wait.

**Julie:** Like just a commercial.

T: Okay, I just googled TV sound. How about this?

**Jane:** Yeah.

**Julie:** (Starting to act out the drama) That’s fine. Okay. Look, we went there last year.

**Kevin:** Oh, I remember, it was a very important day, wasn’t it?

**Matt:** It was a terrible day. I don’t want to go there again.

**Jane:** But, it was a good day to remember?

**Julie:** I agree, I can’t forget that vacation.

**Matt:** Let’s just not talk about that day.

**Kevin:** It was bad even from the morning. We woke up late and I didn’t take the suitcase.

**Jane:** Right, I was really busy that morning.

**Julie:** (To the Teacher) Stop (meaning stop the background music).

At this point, the story shifted to a flashback scene.

**Matt:** Today is a big day, hurry up. We have to get there by 9AM.

**Kevin:** Dad, did you buy our airline tickets?

**Matt:** Yeah.

**Jane:** Did you pack your bags, guys?

**Kevin:** No, not yet. Where is my passport, Mom?

**Julie:** Mom, where is my hat?

**Jane:** I told you finish that yesterday! Kevin, your passport is on your desk and Julie, your hat is in the suitcase.

**Matt:** There’s no time. We have to go now, take a taxi.

**Julie:** I’m almost done. Just wait for a second, Dad.

**Jane:** Okay, we need Taxi driver (Teacher had agreed to play this part in their drama).

T: Oh, are we to the taxi scene now. Okay, let’s put these three chairs on front of each other.
Julie: You can . . .

T: Or, how about this, three people can be in the back. You’re the passengers and I’m the driver here.

Julie: Matt, you will be here (motioning to the front seat of the arranged chairs). Teacher, you can look . . .

T: Oh, thanks (takes the script from Julie)

Jane: We should memorise this script.

Julie: Do we have to memorise it?

T: Oh yeah. Do you think we’re just going to do the play holding this (Teacher shakes the script paper)? Would you pay to see a play where everybody was holding their script? Okay. (Now saying the lines on the script) Where do you want to go?

Jane: Matt, did you bring credit cards and traveller’s checks?

Matt: No, I forgot.

Julie: Oh, don’t worry, I brought them.

Kevin: This taxi is too slow. Isn’t it strange?

Julie: I think so. Dad, this taxi goes too slowly and the route is a little different. We may arrive late.

Matt: (to the Teacher/Taxi Driver) Hey, go fast (everybody laughs).

T: Okay, sir (pretends to put her foot on the accelerator and jerk the steering wheel). Okay, I just turned so everybody . . . (she means everybody act like the car just took a sharp turn, which the students all do, and then laugh).

Kevin: The taxi driver is going the wrong way.

T: No, this is the fastest way to the airport.

Julie: You’re lying. I know this way. I use this way to go to school.

T: You are still young, so you don’t know well, don’t care about my driving.

Jane: I don’t know about the way, exactly, but please go faster.

T: (with a sarcastic voice) Okay, ma’am.

Jane: (Reading the narration): And the taxi driver stops the car at the airport.

T: Okay, I’m going to turn hard.

Julie: Now we have to stand up.


The students pretended to get out of the cab and then Jane announced that they were now at the airport and were going to check in for their flight, but they don’t have the tickets. Julie then informed the Teacher that the rest of the story was not finished. The Teacher commended them on their use of the language from the projects requirements, their development of the characters through the dialogue, their creative and humorous ideas, and the amount of work they had achieved during the class period. She offered them a few corrections on the dialogue and made suggestions on how to proceed with the next scene. The students seemed receptive to her ideas and Jane asked if they would have another chance to rehearse before the performance to which the Teacher confirmed they would.
The written extract cannot adequately convey the students’ positive energy as they practiced their lines, laughed, and listened intently to the Teacher’s suggestions. In my field notes I remarked:

*Students finally seemed relaxed and are enjoying the project. Even Matt laughs and smiles during the rehearsal. I can see how much work they have put into the script and I can’t wait to see them perform it.*

The students were also more conscious of the requirements for this project (appropriateness). Table 6.2.2 demonstrates the completed requirements.

Despite giving more attention to the language requirements, their own ideas and personalities were well infused into the script and they used a significant amount of original language (language not from the textbook or Teacher’s examples), both in the script and while exchanging their ideas about it. Through the *Modified Systems Model Framework for the L2 Classroom*, the Teacher (Field), while moderating more for the language requirements (Domain), continued to allow a great deal of novelty in the projects and the students (Persons) became more aware that they could include most anything as long as the basic requirements were met (Domain). This produced affordances for novelty and extended language-use, allowing the five characteristics of creativity to surface in the projects and in the classroom interaction. The Teacher was consciously aware of these activities and how she was responsible for creating them through the materials and the learning environment. In an interview on 7 August 2015, she shared her thoughts on her responsibility for creating fundamentally different affordances in the PBL Curriculum:

**Researcher:** Okay, which class, the textbook curriculum or the PBL curriculum, have you found more professionally rewarding, like has kind of developed you professionally?

**T:** Definitely the PBL class. The Textbook class is just the status quo for me. There’s nothing really new for me to do in there. I mean, definitely, it’s challenged me as far as finding activities and games, I mean I really haven’t, I mean, I have a lot of games in my, that I’ve done in my past, but like now, in the PBL class, I feel more challenged to come up with more creative ways to incorporate the stuff from the book into activities.

While the Teacher acknowledged the significant contributions of the students in the PBL-Group for positively affecting the classroom climate, she continued to see the materials, and how she incorporated them into the learning environment, as the primary vehicle for nurturing creativity. What is perhaps most compelling is the pedagogical paradox this seems to manifest between the two curricula: in the Textbook-driven curriculum, she perceived the materials as dictating student production and the resultant environment as restricting for students; in contrast, she understood the PBL curriculum as the students “creating” the materials and essentially the curriculum as well —from the Teacher’s viewpoint, the open-endedness of the Domain and the reciprocal flow between the students (Persons) and the materials (Domain) in the PBL curriculum were the key elements in fomenting creative engagement and thinking.
Table 6.2.2: Project #3: Drama Project (Units 3+6) Requirements Checklist:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>From the Script</th>
<th>Unit / Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preparing for Travel</td>
<td>• “take a taxi,”</td>
<td>Unit 3 / Pg. 28 (Figure 6.2.2A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• “pack your bags”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel Documents</td>
<td>• “passport,”</td>
<td>Unit 3 / Pg. 32 (Figure 6.2.2B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• “credit cards,”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• “traveller’s checks”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possessive Adjectives</td>
<td>• “Dad, did you buy our airline tickets?”</td>
<td>Unit 3 / Pg. 29 (Figure 6.2.2.C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• “Did you pack your bags, guys?”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• “Where is my passport, Mom?”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• “Mom, where is my hat?”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• “Kevin, your passport is on your desk and Julie, your hat is in the suitcase.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simple Past Tense (using the negative)</td>
<td>• “Look, we went there last year.”</td>
<td>Unit 6 / Pg. 64 (Figure 6.2.2D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• “Oh, I remember, it was a very important day, wasn’t it?”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• “It was a terrible day. I don’t want to go there again.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• “But, it was a good day to remember?”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• “I agree, I can’t forget that vacation It was bad even from the morning. We woke up late and I didn’t take the suitcase.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• “I was really busy that morning.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.2.3 Project-based Learning Curriculum: The End

The Teacher decided to use Unit 9, entitled “Shopping” (and some key vocabulary items from Unit 10), for what would be the final project in the PBL Curriculum, which began on 30 October 2015. At this same time, the TB-Group were doing the same unit (23 October 2015, see subsection 6.1.3 above). The following extract is from the Coaching element of the 10Cs Curriculum and the Teacher had them do the same activity as she had done with the TB-Group on page 103, which was to write a list of the advantages and disadvantages of online shopping. She asked all of them to approach the whiteboard and first asked Kevin to write two categories on the board, “Online Shopping” and “Store Shopping.” She then asked Jane to divide each category into Advantages and Disadvantages:

T: Kevin, what is an advantage when we do online shopping?

Kevin: Can do it at home.
T: We can do it at home, right? Good, write it down. Jane, what is another advantage of online shopping?

Jane: It is cheaper than shopping in the store.

T: Perfect. Write it down. Julie?

Julie: Yes?

T: Can you think of another advantage of online shopping?

Julie: Um (Julie thinks for a moment), I don’t know, really.

T: Just think of one thing about shopping online. Have you ever shopped online before? What did you like about it?

Julie: Actually, I don’t buy my clothes online.

T: Have you ever seen someone shop online?

Julie: Yeah, my friends.

T: What did your friends say they liked about it?

Julie: Actually, they told me the disadvantages only.

T: Oh, okay, so you’ll have many for disadvantages. I’ll help you then. For me, you have many choices, many options, compared to when you shop in the store. Right? So you can write that down. There are many options. Especially if you want to buy pencil cases or something, you go to department store and they have one section, right? Online they have hundreds. Can you guys think of any more advantages of online shopping?

Jane: I can read others opinion.

T: Very good. They have reviews. Good idea. Write it down. How about you Kevin? Any more ideas about the advantages of online shopping?

Kevin: Easy to see.

T: What do you mean easy to see?

Kevin: Compare them.

T: Compare the products?

Kevin: Yeah.

T: Okay. Write it down. Easier to compare the products. Alright Julie, I won’t ask you, I’m expecting a lot from you for disadvantages, so let’s go to disadvantages . . .

Julie: It’s not exact.

T: Tell me more.

Julie: It looks different

T: Right. Good. You can write, looked better on the model. Jane, what’s another disadvantage of online shopping?

Jane: It can, I have to wait longer.

T: You mean for delivery time?

Jane: Yeah.

T: Good. I like how you guys are using comparatives. Kevin, what’s another disadvantage of online shopping?

Kevin: You have to pay the delivery money.

T: Delivery fee. Yeah, F-E-E. Write it down. You have to pay the delivery fee. Good. Nowadays, there are a lot of stores that do free ones, but usually the item is not that good anyways. Okay, Julie, another one.

Julie: Okay, um, the quality is not really good.

T: Take, another?
Thus far the activity took on the same dynamic as in the TB-driven Curriculum with the Teacher calling on each student by name, prompting responses, and offering corrective feedback as they thought of their ideas and recorded them on the board. The Teacher then decided to turn the conversation over to the students as she did with the TB-Group:

**T:** Now, I helped you a lot with asking questions about online shopping. Now, as quickly as you can, I want you guys to have your own discussion about shopping in a store. Go! Kevin, you ask first.

With only a brief hesitation, Kevin began:

**Kevin:** Shopping at stores, what can be the opposite of this (points to the list of disadvantages of shopping online)? These can be the advantages.

**Jane:** Yes, I think so too.

**Julie:** Huh?

**Jane:** Yeah, it’s really just like the opposite of this. I think the best way is we can try to think of other ideas first. (Jane writes “Can walk around with friends” on the board, then turns to her group members) Any other things?

**Julie:** It’s easier to refund or exchange. (After speaking, Julie writes this on the board).

**Jane:** How about you, Kevin?

**Kevin:** Deletion of delivery fee (Julie and Jane roll their eyes as they realise that Kevin is just going to put opposites from what is already on the board)

**Julie:** (After Kevin finishes writing) I think we can check the clothes so it’s more exact or, yeah, like that. (Writes her answer on the board).

**Jane:** We don’t have to wait for it (All students laugh because they realise that this answer is also the opposite from one the reasons written for the disadvantage of online shopping).

**Julie:** Any more?

**Jane:** I think that’s it.

**Julie:** Nah, I think there’s one more. Sometimes we can get a discount.

**Jane:** Ah, yeah.

**Researcher:** What do you mean?

**Julie:** In the store, we can barter when we buy a lot.

**Researcher:** Ah, right.

**Julie:** More?

**T:** More, there’s always more.

**Julie:** And, hmm, what are the disadvantages, Kevin? (Kevin pauses for approximately 30 seconds)

**T:** Think about it, Kevin. What is uncomfortable or inconvenient or bad about shopping in a store?

**Kevin:** You have to stand long.

**T:** Stand up for a long time? Okay.

**Julie:** That’s a good one. I really hate that when I shop with my mother.

**T:** Does she make you hold all the bags too?

**Julie:** Yes, yes, yes, right. All her bags. It’s really boring.

**Kevin:** (After writing his answer on the board) Another?
Julie: We have to spend more time than online shopping.

Jane: But I spend a lot of time when I use online shopping, and I can’t choose.

Julie: Sometimes they don’t have any size.

T: Yeah, you finally find the one you want and then you click on it, and it’s like, size out of stock, and you’re like, No!

Jane: (Laughs) Yeah.

T: Any more, Jane?

Jane: It is more expensive.

Julie: Especially books.

Jane: And I think when I shop in the store, I, the shop owner, they bother.

T: They keep following you and bothering you trying to get you to buy more stuff, right.

Jane: Yes.

Julie: Yeah, I don’t like it.

T: How about you, Kevin, what the thing you really don’t like about shopping in a store?

Kevin: There isn’t a clock.

T: Ah, yeah, there isn’t a clock in the store. Yeah, they do that on purpose, right.

Julie: Oh really?

T: Yeah, they want you to forget the time

The Teacher then ended the activity and moved to the next exercise in the textbook. What is most noticeable in the PBL extract compared to essentially the identical activity in the TB-driven Curriculum is that the Teacher, for the most part, effectively removed herself from the discussion after she turned the conversation over to the students (until the end when she reasserted herself to keep the discussion going). It appears that by the end of the study, the Teacher had developed confidence in the PBL-Group students to maintain a conversation without the need for the IRF format still prevalent in the TB-driven Curriculum, but she also had learned to better act as a guide and to help students when she felt it was needed. Reciprocally, Julie and Jane seemed to understand their responsibility in facilitating the conversation and prompted each other and, especially, Kevin; however, Kevin still struggled at times to communicate openly and, as can be seen at the end of the extract above, the Teacher (as well as Julie and Jane) still felt the need to provide him support at times.

Through the lens of the Modified Systems Model of Creativity for the L2 Classroom, the Teacher and students both appear to recognise the Domain, beyond the requirements of the project, as more of a space to be filled than as representing an existing body of knowledge (Csikszentmihalyi, 1999; Feldman et al., 1994). In the extracts above, students understood the need to create the language use affordances and attempted to initiate responses from each other. Even Kevin, who continued to rely on Julie and Jane to carry group conversations, asks “Another?,” to encourage more suggestions. A further development in the extract above is the Teacher, in hoping to sustain the conversation, does so in a
fundamentally different manner than she did in the TB-Group: while she did initiate requests of the students at points, for the most part, rather than asking pointed questions, she commented on students’ input to cue elaboration of ideas and comments on their responses in a conversational style instead of giving corrective feedback (despite the fact that she is at times essentially providing recasts – “They keep following you and bothering you trying to get you to buy more stuff, right.”).

The next class was the Confrontation Stage; as this was the fifth (and final project), the students were expected to produce 15 ideas each, however, all Cases were still struggling with the Concept Generation (divergent thinking) element. Kevin had produced only 9 ideas, which was the most he had come up with thus far, and Julie had devised 10 (Jane was absent from class but had emailed the teacher her list of 12 ideas). At the beginning of class, Kevin and Julie expressed some confusion with the project and the Teacher took about 10 minutes to explain the details again. The project was for them to create an online shopping website and to include video elements to sell their products. In the previous class, Julie, Jane, and Kevin had devised the idea of filming a fashion show for their shopping website (note: the website was not real). The Teacher commended them on this concept and premised their homework on further developing this idea; however, Kevin and Julie had interpreted it slightly different and so, after clarifying the theme and requirements, the Teacher asked them to come up with more ideas together —using both divergent thinking to generate more ideas and convergent thinking to combine their ideas:

T: Okay, so Kevin you came up with different collections that a designer can show, and you (gesturing to Julie) came up with different situations, right? So, let’s but collections and different design situations together. I will give you guys 10 minutes to make at least seven, or six more ideas, alright? So, together as a group, come up with six more ideas about your project now that you understand it better and you can talk to each other.

Without a moment of hesitation, Julie began this process:

**Julie:** You said Halloween, right?

**Kevin:** Yeah.

**Julie:** How about asking about Halloween costumes to people. Like, people walking around the street, we can say, what do you think about Halloween costumes and some people will say, it’s good or bad.

**T:** In English, right? Are you really going to interview people?

**Julie:** No.

**T:** Oh, just act? (Julie nods her head) Oh, okay.

**Julie:** Okay, next. You said Halloween and what? Something about sports?

**Kevin:** recycling clothes.

**Julie:** Okay, that’s good. So, we interview a designer who makes recycled clothes. So, we ask her or him why do they make recycled clothes and how? (Kevin nods in agreement). More? You had a lot of good ideas.

**T:** What else? You had like nine ideas, right?

**Kevin:** Yes.

**T:** That’s good. Halloween and recycled and . . .
Kevin: Unique.

Julie: What kind of unique?

Kevin: Very strange and colourful.

Julie: Okay, with unique clothes, how can we present?

Kevin: So, with . . . (inaudible)

Julie: Can you say again?

Kevin: With recycle clothes, we can do interview?

Julie: Yes. With unique clothes, I think, these days, when you see a fashion show, there are so many unique clothes, so ask the model, what do you think about these clothes and are you happy when you wear these clothes? Like that. How about this idea?

Kevin: How about we ask both designer and model?

Julie: Okay. What other things?

T: You don’t have to only come with ideas about the concept. You can come with some ideas about actually making the video. Right? You can also come up with those kinds of ideas. Like, where will you do it? How long will you make the interview? How should we show the clothes? Those are also ideas that are part of the process. Because, I feel like you have a lot of ideas about concepts. So, you can do more ideas about the concept or start thinking about the actual making? How about you Kevin?

Kevin: Yeah. Let’s think about the process.

Julie: I need more of your ideas.

Kevin: Okay. How can we combine these ideas?

Julie: I think it doesn’t have to be your idea and my idea, let’s just make other ideas for where do we film for our video, or . . .

T: You can think about ideas about how you will design the room when your filming and stuff. Stuff like that. Let’s take a five-minute break so you can have some tea, okay.

There is Originality in their ideas as the Unit does not mention Halloween costumes (although it was the week after Halloween), recycled clothes, or “strange and colourful” clothes. Further, they attempted to converge their ideas in novel ways while also paying attention to the appropriateness of the project requirements, including the need to perform an interview (real or scripted), and they followed the Teacher’s recommendation of considering where they would film. Kevin did not seem particularly interested in the fashion show concept, but was open to the experience of both filming a fashion show (which students did four weeks after this conversation), and making a shopping website. Julie gave particular attention to the Collaboration aspect of the project in the extract above, asking Kevin to share, clarify, and elaborate his ideas in a variety of ways, including:

- You said Halloween and what? Something about sports?
- More? You had a lot of good ideas.
- What kind of unique?
- Okay, with unique clothes, how can we present?
- Can you say again?
- How about this idea?
- Okay. What other things?
- I need more of your ideas.
- … let’s just make other ideas for where do we film for our video.
Again, these questions embody the “more beautiful questions” proposed by Berger (2014). Julie had been asking questions in this way, essentially playing the teacher role in group discussions, for several months, and noted in interviews that she enjoyed hearing the ideas of others. As shown in both extracts in this subsection, by the end of the study Kevin had also begun to ask his group members for their ideas more frequently and to directly elicit their opinions:

- With recycle clothes, we can do interview?
- How about we ask both designer and model?
- Okay. How can we combine these ideas?

Again, it might be pointed out that K. McDonough et al. (2015) found that in a group discussion, one of the few speech features that correlated to scores on the TTCT was question-posing, and this important aspect of collaborative interaction was far more prevalent in the PBL-Group in the later months of the research project. Given the vastness of the data set, it would be nearly impossible to enumerate the number of questions that each participant asked, but from observational data and my field notes, it is evident that Jane and Julie queried group members more during discussion and negotiation of project design, and this seems to be reflected in their improvement on the TTCT.

The Process-(but not step-by-step)-Orientation, while not expressly apparent in the extracts above, is embedded in the students’ discussion and interpretation of the project as in a continuous state of development. Unlike early in the PBL Curriculum, there was no sense that the project needed to be finished imminently, or that their ideas needed to be concretised by the end of the class period; Julie, Jane, and Kevin conceptualised the project as a work in progress with multiple opportunities for iteration and this inherently created more affordances for creative development in student-led discussions. The Teacher became better at allowing these affordances, even when students struggled, but admitted this was a challenge for her throughout the study. In the final interview on 30 December 2015, I asked the Teacher what she found to be her biggest challenge in the PBL Curriculum:

T: For the PBL curriculum, it was just fighting my instinct not to just fill the, the void with the sound of my voice because that’s what I’m, that’s what’s been ingrained in me since I started teaching, is like, you have to keep like talking, you have to keep the kids talking, and if they’re completely unwilling to talk you better like ask intrusive questions and like elicit answers from them as much as possible. That’s what I kept thinking about. But, I wish I would have held back more so the kids could have liked more had more talking time between themselves.

Researcher: Do you think you got better with that?

T: I think I got better with it, but then when the attrition happened a lot, like I think I felt like the room was just like really quiet and I was expecting, you know, groups to be happening. I was expecting to like having to be going back and forth between groups and like managing my time well, but when there was just one group left it was just like a lot of time and no talking so I felt really awkward about it and, yeah, so, I guess I got worse when that happened.

As mentioned above, the Teacher did take more control over student conversations and group interaction in the PBL Curriculum after the initial wave of attrition, but became more cognisant of this
in the later months of the study. It is my belief that the process-orientation was instrumental in helping her refrain from interjecting or over-managing the conversation, as she continued to do with the TB-Group, because she understood that she could offer guidance at various points during the project and waited to see when and how students might need help along the way. She also became more “efficient” when offering support in the PBL Curriculum; her explanations, instructions, and feedback are noticeably more concise compared to the TB-driven Curriculum, but this is largely a product of her expectations of students in the different curricula.

6.3 Summary of Main Findings

The cyclical relationship between language-use affordances and the curriculum (Domain) created more overall language production from the students in the PBL Curriculum because students understood the Domain as something that they contributed to and continuously developed instead of something that was disseminated or reproduced. The Teacher also saw the materials (Domain) as something generated and aggregated by the students and perceived the requirements as only the frame of knowledge that would be activated, with students cooperatively constructing the total substance of what was learned through the projects.

This is significantly different from the Teacher’s conceptualisation of the textbook (Domain), and how she taught it, in the TB-driven Curriculum, where her main objective was to inform and clarify the concepts through instruction and the activities in the book. In the TB-driven Curriculum, the emphasis for students was primarily on (re)producing answers, whereas in the PBL-Curriculum, students focused on generating ideas for discussion. The differences between the two curricula in actual and perceived affordances for the key characteristics of creativity are manifested by these critical distinctions in the Teacher’s attitude towards the classroom climate and her impression of curricular objectives, more in terms of interaction with the students than with the pedagogical approach. How the Teacher understood and engaged language-use and creative affordances had important consequences for the students’ perspectives of the learning material, the learning environment, and what was expected of them by the Teacher. This was pivotal in the way that the characteristics of creativity were perceived, permitted, valued, and actuated in the classroom dynamic.

Although students in both curricula had to bear in mind Appropriateness in learning the textbook unit’s key language goals and, in the case of the PBL-Group, fulfilling the project requirements, there was more opportunity for Originality and inventiveness in the PBL-Curriculum as the Domain was dependent on what students were willing to contribute to it, while in the TB-driven Curriculum, the Teacher relied more on students completing what the textbook had already produced, most of which was based on accurate reproduction of the language aims. In interviews, both students and the Teacher
called attention to the role of *Originality*, in terms of what they learned, how they learned, and their own capacity to develop more original ideas, as a critical aspect in creative development. In classroom interaction in the TB-driven Curriculum, Lily, and occasionally Kellan (during games), attempted to use original language or incorporate their own lexical knowledge in activities and this may be at least in part responsible for their increased score on the TTCT. Similarly, Jane and Julie both acknowledged in interviews and demonstrated in classroom interaction, their improved capacity for divergent thinking, and their penchant for discovering new ways to include humour and new vocabulary in projects, and this appears to be reflected in their steady improvement on the TTCT.

In terms of *Process-(but not step-by-step)-Orientation*, students in the TB-Group saw the learning process as following the Teacher’s instructions and completing the activities in the book, but the PBL-Group appeared to understand the process as an ever-developing substantiation of their ideas and as a tangible representation of what they accomplished and learned. Iteration was a critical aspect of project development and a means to develop their understanding of the language and project goals; this process was lacking in the TB-driven Curriculum as the focus was on completing the textbook activities and, occasionally, reviewing the language through controlled practice. However, it cannot be ignored that less proficient students in the PBL-Group struggled with the lack of clear ‘structure,’ and the Teacher also admittedly had difficulties preparing for and conducting the 10Cs Curriculum at the beginning of the study; in this regard, the organization, cohesion, and logical progression offered by a textbook could have helped both the teacher and students more clearly recognise learning as a process (Tomlinson, 2001b). However, none of the Cases in the TB-driven Curriculum advocate, or even mention, the textbook as providing support in this way, and, in fact, most acknowledged a need for more open-ended speaking and learning opportunities.

In the PBL Curriculum, the novel learning experiences empowered students to try out new language and new ideas, while students in the TB-driven Curriculum lamented during interviews that not much was different from their normal language learning circumstances and hence they tended to perform similarly, even using Korean in the classroom. The transcripts above show the progress of students in the PBL Curriculum in understanding the value of *Openness to Experience* during the projects, and in engaging in increasing longer discussions by contributing more detailed responses (with the possible exception of Kevin) and asking more questions. Indeed, the Cases in the PBL-Group tended to reference the textbook less in each subsequent project, yet they all (Julie, Jane, and Kevin) claimed to remember the key language and grammatical concepts better than in their regular learning context. In contrast, despite focusing almost entirely on the textbook, none of the students in the TB-Curriculum stated anything about how the book helped them remember, and the Teacher bemoaned their inability to recall or use anything they learned during the class. Although I have mostly (and intentionally)
avoided the deeply complex and multi-dimensional issue of motivation in explaining students’ attitudes or performance, it is difficult not to give it momentary mention when considering how new learning experiences contributed to student engagement — while the open-ended nature of the PBL-Curriculum appears advantageous for stimulating motivation, a lack of interest in participating in such a novel learning environment was also partially responsible for the early attrition as some students did not perceive creative learning as particularly relevant for their language learning needs. However, it is also partially responsible, according to the students and Teacher, for the at times disappointing commitment of students in the TB-Group.

For the students that remained in the PBL Curriculum, the open-ended language-use affordances offered greater opportunities for Meaningful Work as students infused the projects with their own personalities, ideas, and interests. There were certainly affordances for students to actuate these personal attributes in the TB-driven Curriculum, but they went largely unexploited as students and the Teacher did not see the work from the textbook as particularly challenging or rewarding (Amabile, 2001; Gladwell, 2008). In the PBL Curriculum, there was more affordances for students to choose and implement ideas and topics of their interest (Starko, 2013) and to use a variety of language resources. By the Cases own accounts in interviews, this played an important role in their creative and language development.

Another aspect of the PBL learning environment that students found meaningful, was sharing ideas and experiences with and learning from their classmates. While the fact that the PBL-Curriculum facilitated greater opportunities for Collaboration is unsurprising as most frameworks for Project-based Learning are largely premised on group work, it is important to attend to how collaborative engagement ameliorated the learning environment and dramatically affected the way in which students perceived affordances and used language in the classroom. As seen in the above transcripts, there is little idea-sharing, debating, or concerted effort in the TB-driven Curriculum, and when students did engage in group and pair work, their focus was primarily on repeating the key language and completing the activity. In the PBL-Curriculum, students were dependent on authentic discussion about the project to bring it to fruition, and hence the focus was on the project, rather than English, as the ‘product’ of learning. Moreover, interacting with peers allowed students to activate their curiosity, draw on the strengths of others, and build a community of learning (Robinson & Aronica, 2015), something that was expressed as a significant benefit by all Cases in the PBL Curriculum, and was also addressed as something regrettably lacking by Lily and Ann in the TB-driven Curriculum.

Through the lens of the Modified Systems Model of Creativity for the L2 Classroom, and supported by student and Teacher interviews, as well as by the quantitative assessments of creativity and language
proficiency, several significant differences between the PBL Curriculum and the TB-driven Curriculum emerged during the study. First, the greater language-use affordances for students in the PBL
CHAPTER 7: CONCLUSION

“The secret to change is to focus all of your energy not on fighting the old, but on building the new”

—Socrates

The conclusion chapter begins with a summary of the main findings of the study, then links these findings back to the existing research on creativity in language learning. Next, it outlines the major contributions this study makes to the field of applied linguistics. The limitations of the study are then examined, including limitations in the research context, participant sample, and the practical and methodological limitations. It also considers how other relevant areas of second language acquisition research, particularly those concerning learner variables, relate to the findings of the current study and proposes how their connection to creativity may offer fruitful lines for future inquiry. Finally, the thesis closes by delineating the implications this study has for future research on the relationship between creativity and second language learning and the impact it may have on language teaching and learning in Korea and beyond.

7.1 Main Findings of the Thesis

The qualitative, longitudinal nature of the study yielded extensive empirical classroom data for analysis of creativity in an L2 environment, allowing for a comprehensive inductive examination of what characteristics best define creativity in the EFL classroom. Further, it granted important insights into students’ and the Teacher’s perspectives and attitudes towards creativity in the EFL classroom and the critical role the curriculum plays in shaping these perceptions. Finally, it discusses how classroom interaction influenced language learning over time and how the new conceptual lens of the Modified Systems Model of Creativity for the L2 Classroom provided a greater understanding of the relationship between creativity and language learning.

7.1.1 Research Question 1: Main Findings

QUESTION 1: When viewed through the Modified Systems Model of Creativity for the L2 Classroom, what are the essential characteristics that define creativity in a language learning environment?

Based on the ethnographic analysis of the empirical data collected over the course of one year, this study offers a definition of creativity in the L2 classroom as five characteristics of creativity that are mutually dependent on the learner and learning environment. These characters are:
1. Originality and Appropriateness
2. Process-(but not step-by-step)-Oriented
3. Openness to Experience
4. Meaningful Work
5. Collaboration

These characteristics were first determined through inductive analysis of the extensive qualitative data that included student and teacher interviews and field notes taken during classroom observation. After the process of inductive analysis, a modified analytical framework of the Systems Model of Creativity (Csikszentmihalyi, 2014d; Feldman et al., 1994). was created. The following synopsis highlights the differences between the two curricula for each characteristic as viewed through the Modified Systems Model of Creativity for the L2 Classroom:

### Originality and Appropriateness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PBL Curriculum</th>
<th>TB-driven Curriculum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher understands students’ input as the materials/curriculum, with the project requirements as a guide, hence creating more affordances for originality; it terms of appropriateness, the teacher allows students to use their imagination and nearly everything is considered appropriate so long as the project requirements are met.</td>
<td>Teacher understands completing the textbook tasks as determining the materials/curriculum and lesson objectives, providing fewer affordances for originality; appropriateness is primarily seen as language accuracy and ‘correctness’ in learning tasks and exercises.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Process-(but not step-by-step)-Oriented

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PBL Curriculum</th>
<th>TB-driven Curriculum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cases recognised learning as a continuous, gradual, and iterative process that necessitated constant interaction with the teacher, peers, and the objects of learning (a sociocultural perspective). However, the perceived lack of structure made the learning context uncomfortable for some students.</td>
<td>The textbook provided more order, coherence, and familiarity for students, but limited affordances —it is argued that this limitation had largely to do with the lack of perceiving and acting upon affordances. The Teacher contributed to this as she understood the textbook material as something transmitted to students and saw completing the textbook activities as the learning goal.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Openness to Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PBL Curriculum</th>
<th>TB-driven Curriculum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Cases saw new learning experiences, working with new mediums of learning, communicating through project making, and exploratory language use as beneficial to the learning process and enjoyed the uniqueness of the curricular approach. The Teacher realised the importance of her role as the “Field” and encouraged novelty.</td>
<td>The Cases previous learning experiences with a textbook were not particularly “open,” and most saw the curriculum as analogous to their regular learning environment. This limited their perception of affordances in the environment. Moreover, the Teacher’s adherence to the textbook lessons, to some degree, limited actual affordances for student interaction and creativity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Meaningful Work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PBL Curriculum</th>
<th>TB-driven Curriculum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cases believed the curriculum to be challenging and rewarding and found using English as natural, purposeful, and enjoyable. Further, project-making enhanced their creative engagement by allowing them to include their own ideas, identities, and personal interests.</td>
<td>The Teacher’s over-reliance on the textbook’s exercises (and themes) and her focus on accuracy and having students complete exercise correctly inhibited the Cases’ affordances for introducing meaningful work into the materials; even group conversations were highly controlled by the teacher and/or materials.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Collaboration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PBL Curriculum</th>
<th>TB-driven Curriculum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Cases and the Teacher believed that group work can facilitate and emphasise creative interaction. Cases in the PBL Group exemplified “collaboration” which has been defined as sharing ideas, negotiating, and debating with others, with this interaction directly affecting the outcomes of the project or experience. The Teacher believed collaboration in the PBL group to be instrumental in creativity and language development.</td>
<td>All Cases expressed that group work, games, and communicative exercises helped improve their English and creativity. However, Cases in the PBL group exhibited mostly “cooperation,” or sharing necessary information to complete a task. The Teacher struggled to keep students on-task in pair/group work, having to monitor for use of their L1 and to ensure they were doing the work. She did not feel that group work was effective for enhancing creativity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This chapter aimed to show the importance of encouraging and cultivating these five characteristics to actuate students’ creative capacities in the second language classroom. A focus on developing these
characteristics with a consideration of the _Modified Systems Model of Creativity for the L2 Classroom_ can serve as a practical guide for students to plan their lessons, improve classroom communicative interaction, and create affordances for creative learning.

7.1.2 Research Question 2: Main Findings

**QUESTION 2: What are learners’ perspectives and attitudes towards creativity in language learning and how does the curriculum influence these perspectives and attitudes?**

The aim of this chapter was to better understand and to prioritise the learner’s perspectives of creativity in the EFL classroom in the Korea. There were clear differences in the way that learners perceived creative engagement and affordances for creativity between the two curricula with findings showing that Cases in the PBL Curriculum:

1. perceived there to be more affordances for exploratory language-use and creativity because of: a) significantly less teacher talk time (compared to their other English learning experiences; b) they understood that it was their responsibility to communicate through the process of project-making

2. prioritised student engagement and provided affordances for exploratory language use

3. took advantage of opportunities for iteration, allowing students to revisit and revise language points and project criteria with which they had difficulty; iteration also helped more reticent students (like Kevin) to communicate as they realised there would be multiple opportunities to articulate their opinions and ideas during the process

4. built a greater sense of camaraderie and cohesion amongst participants

5. required a period of adjustment; it was important that the teacher clearly explain the class processes and the reasons for them

6. felt more challenged by the curricular demands, resulting in some students leaving the study, while those who completed the course asserted the value of this challenge

7. expressed improved confidence in using English naturally, particularly in classroom interaction

8. claimed they learned many new words from their groupmates and enjoyed hearing the ideas and opinions of others

Findings demonstrate that Cases in the Textbook-driven Curriculum:

1. confirmed the class was analogous to their normal learning context, creating a certain level of familiarity and comfort
2. desired more affordances for communicative interaction through group/pair work, games and speaking activities

3. saw English as the ‘object’ of learning rather than the ‘vehicle’ of learning

4. understood tasks as something to complete

5. spoke significantly more Korean in class than the PBL-Group (the PBL-Group rarely spoke Korean during class time)

6. understood the goals of the curriculum better from the beginning due to a familiarity with using textbooks in previous English learning experiences

7. one student, Lily, improved both her language proficiency and creativity; she achieved the highest TOEFL Jr score and the second highest TTCT at the end of the study demonstrating that the characteristics of the learner may be as important as the curricular approach/learning environment

Findings also demonstrate important contrasts in the teacher’s attitude and perspectives of students’ behaviour and performance in the two curricula, with:

1. more disciplinary issues in the TB-Group (reprimanding students for negative classroom behaviour and speaking Korean) and expressed difficulty in keeping students engaged and interested in the material

2. more error correction and focus on language accuracy in the TB-driven Curriculum

3. more favourable characteristics for creativity and exploratory language use in the PBL-Group

4. better relationship with students in the PBL-Group over the course of the year

5. less confidence in undertaking the PBL Curriculum (both her and the students)

6. larger effect on learning outcomes on behalf of the students in the PBL-Group

7. greater improvement in creativity and language development in the PBL-Group

In summary, these findings represent the differences in students and the teacher’s perspectives of creativity in the language classroom. From the etic view of the ethnographer, I believe the empirical data supports these perspectives. Essentially, the analysis suggests that learner-centred approaches, such as PBL, may help students perceive creativity and language learning as something that is both their responsibility, but which also depends on the affordance embedded in the curriculum, the teacher’s capacity to create and empower students to create affordances, and the classroom climate.
7.1.3 Research Question 3: Main Findings

**QUESTION:** How are the characteristics of creativity manifest in the empirical data and how can they be analysed through the lens of the *Modified Systems Model of Creativity for the L2 Classroom* to explain the longitudinal development of creativity and L2 development in the six Case Studies?

The *Modified Systems Model of Creativity for the L2 Classroom* represents the two-way complementary interaction between the components of the system. This includes the relationship between:

1. the curriculum (Domain) and the teacher (Field) (i.e. what the textbook offers and what the teacher provides to change, supplement, and enhance it)
2. the students (Persons) and the curriculum (Domain) (i.e. what the textbook offers and what students contribute to the materials)
3. the language-use opportunities (Affordances) and the teacher (Field) (i.e. how the teacher provides opportunities for creativity and language-use not only through the materials, but the learning environment that is co-constructed with the students)
4. language-use opportunities (Affordances) and the students (Persons) (i.e. how students create and take advantage of language-use and creative affordances available in the learning environment)
5. the cyclical flow between the curriculum (Domain) and the Language-use affordances that creates the dynamic classroom climate (i.e. how the materials manifest and facilitate language-use in the classroom and how the type of affordances available and acted upon affect the students and teachers’ perception of and interaction with the materials).

This conceptualisation of the relationship between the classroom participants and the curriculum and materials can help transform how materials are used and create a path for more student-centred approaches. The model represents how teachers and students can conceive of the curriculum as something that is continuously and mutually shaped and reshaped through experience. Teachers can:

1. evaluate how their relationship with the Domain is affecting affordances for feedback and introducing novelty
2. better understand how their relationship with the Domain is influencing their capacity to recognise and act upon affordances.
3. focus more on helping students see the second language as a communication tool and a vehicle for the learning process rather than the ‘object’ of study.
4. understand language learning as an iterative process of development in which they must act as a guide, instead of overemphasising ‘correctness’

In turn, students can:
1. learn to recognise, adapt to, and create affordances for creativity and exploratory language use through classroom interaction and through interaction with the materials

2. activate the five characteristics of creativity that can engender the type of interaction that is conducive to creativity

3. focus more on using the second language as a communicative tool and a vehicle for the learning process rather than only as the ‘object’ of study

4. understand language learning as an iterative process of development and capitalise on affordances for exploratory language-use rather than for ‘one correct answer’ or being overly concerned with accuracy

In summary, the model can help illustrate the dynamic interaction between the elements of the classroom environment (Persons, Field, Domain, and Affordances); this can assist teachers and students in attuning to these inter-relationships and endeavouring to activate continuous and reciprocal interaction throughout the language learning process.

7.2 Links to Previous Research on the Relationship between Creativity and Language Learning

This study aimed to fill the gap in the literature on the relationship between creativity and language learning, which has hereto been dominated by correlation studies. In Chapter 2, I call attention to the confounding, and often conflicting outcomes and analysis of these studies and elaborated on the various methodological issues, yet the primary intent of this research undertaking was to offer a novel lens and approach to the study of creativity in the language learning environment rather than to resolve the matter of the methodological challenges of the existing research. Nonetheless, it is worth briefly considering how the methodological approach and results of this study may offer new insights into existing studies and future possibilities in research on the topic of creativity in L2 learning.

To begin with the foundational studies discussed in Section 2.3.1, Carroll (1990) believed that the type of questions found on discrete-point exams measuring language proficiency were not appropriate for an investigation of creativity, a point later reiterated by Albert (2006). The findings of this study suggest that they were likely accurate in this assessment as multiple-choice language proficiency tests are not well-designed for, and arguably antithetical to, the complex and situated nature of creativity. For this reason, the proficiency test taken in this study (the TOEFL Jr.) was not used for analysis in any definitive or concrete sense, but rather became an integrated component of each learner’s profile and analysed for additional insights into their behaviour, performance, and perspectives of the class.

This lack of applicability also holds true for the TTCT, which, despite studies supporting its internal and predicative validity, may not be the most accurate or suitable assessment of creativity in a language learning environment. Admittedly, in preparation for this study, I had high expectations for what the TTCT could reveal about creativity; however, it soon became apparent that no psychometric evaluation
could be used as a proxy for creativity in a classroom setting. Like myself, the previous studies that used the TTCT were looking for a valid, reliable, and well-established means by which to verify and “objectively” measure creativity, but the results of the current study suggest that new assessments specifically designed for evaluating creativity in a second language are needed because existing tests do not consider a range of factors and circumstances, which is evident in several of the correlation studies. The qualitative, empirical view taken in this study granted insights into what these studies lacked, which can be summed up as a better understanding how creativity is defined in the L2 classroom and how students do or do not enact their creative capacities in learning activities.

The study by Ottó (1998), in which students’ scores on a prototype of the TTCT were correlated with course grades, also does not explain creativity beyond the test’s criteria, which makes it difficult to understand how students’ creative abilities relate to the course aims and marking criteria, which were also not well defined. If creativity is to be linked to academic achievement or any educational endeavour in a meaningful way than it should be defined within a specific learning environment and sociocultural context and should make transparent the role the course and instructors play in developing or assessing students’ creativity and language proficiency. The correlation study by Kasaeian and Kasaeian (2010), which administered a standardized English proficiency test and a Iranian version of the TTCT, is similarly devoid of context, submitting creativity and language proficiency as assessment results rather than learning outcomes and positioning both as static rather than dynamic qualities. Although both studies report a statistically significant correlation between creativity and L2 proficiency, neither elucidate what creativity is in the language learning classroom and hence are not particularly helpful for teachers who wish to facilitate creativity in their practice. Again, the current study offers a clear definition of creative characteristics in the language learning classroom, and attends intensely to the learners, the situational and contextual factors, and the learners’ actions and interactions in the learning activities. In addition, the analysis of the empirical data (and to some extent the TTCT) does confirm the assertions of numerous scholars that creativity is a skills that can be developed (Beghetto & Kaufman, 2007; Edwards, 2010; Robinson, 2011).

The studies by Landry (1973) and Ghonsooly and Showqi (2012) also do not effectively demonstrate creativity as a beneficial individual characteristic in a language learning classroom because they use different population samples instead of analysing the development of the same learners over time. Accounting for numerous social, psychological, affective, and cognitive factors over a student’s learning trajectory, as this study attempted to do, is fundamental in helping actuate creativity in practice and in promoting the type of teaching behaviours that will cultivate creative learners. Indeed, a critical argument asserted in this thesis is that to determine the value of creativity in the process of language learning, it should be made clear what it is and how teachers can create the conditions that nurture it.
Two studies, Tin (2011) and K. McDonough et al. (2015), offer contextualized examples of creativity in classroom learning activities and provide details of the learning task, the language produced, and clear explanations and evidence of creativity within the observed interactions. However, both studies gave primary analytical emphasis to linguistic production rather than to the learning dynamic, learner behaviours and personalities, or the environment. As van Lier (2004) put it, “language does not exist in a vacuum,” and the personal qualities of the learners and situational dimensions of the learning context from which the language emanates are vital to how learners respond. Further, although they examined real language produced in a classroom activity, they were “one-off observations” which did not explore: (1) students’ improvement over time; (2) the learner’s or the teacher’s perspectives of or attitude towards creativity (or the learning task); or (3) how ‘affordances’ for creativity were or were not exploited or manifested as a result of the interaction and ongoing classroom dynamic. Through a Case Study, longitudinal analysis, this study focused on these aspects to better understand the concept of creativity through the participants’ voices and actions.

As this research approach was significantly different than the studies mentioned above, it is difficult to speculate on whether or how the findings concur with the previous research. Nonetheless, it can be said that students who demonstrated the key characteristics of creativity were able to better recognize, take advantage of, and create affordances for creativity in the classroom. Creativity in the use of English was exemplified through exploring new words and grammatical structures while also learning key concepts (originality and appropriateness); engaging in learning as an iterative process of development (process-(but not step-by-step)-oriented); taking risks with language by being willing to make mistakes and engage in new activities (openness to experience), investing one’s self in the learning activities by personalising the work and desiring constructive feedback (meaningful work), and improving with and through the other members of the class (collaboration). The previous studies make interesting contributions on how creativity corresponds to L2 proficiency, but this study aims to closely examine the process by which creativity and the L2 interact over time and is primarily concerned with how creativity and language learning develop symbiotically in a second language classroom.

7.3 Major Contributions of the Study

This study offers three major contributions to the field of applied linguistics. The first is that the ethnographic-qualitative approach grants a greater understanding of the learner/environmental characteristics that can define creativity in the L2 classroom. The second contribution is that defining and exemplifying creative engagement through empirical evidence can improve pedagogical practice by helping teachers implement creativity in their teaching and cultivate it in their students. The final contribution is the novel analytical framework of the Modified Systems Model of Creativity for the L2
Classroom which offers a new analytical lens for exploring and evaluating creativity in classroom interaction.

7.3.1 Creative Learning in the L2 Classroom

As previously mentioned, most existing studies on the relationship between creativity and language learning are correlation studies and provide little information about the individual participants, the learning context, or what constitutes creativity in L2 learning (Albert, 2006; Albert & Kormos, 2004; Carroll, 1990; Ghonsooly & Showqi, 2012; Kasaeian & Kasaeian, 2010; Landry, 1973; Ottó, 1998). A few studies evaluate creativity in peer interaction in a classroom context (K. McDonough et al., 2015; Tin, 2011), but beyond the investigation of a communicative task, they do not attend to how creativity and language learning mutually develop over time and, again, do not look at environmental factors or individual students and their perspectives of creative engagement. In the current study, the extensive data collected and analysed provided an in-depth evaluation on which to base a definition of creativity. Further, the observation data, along with assessments of creativity and language learning, provided a clearer picture of how these capacities interact in the L2 classroom. As Korea presently touts the importance of creativity in education (Center, 2017; O'Donnell & Micklethwaite, 1999), this timely study may have significant consequences for helping teachers and students recognise the value of creativity in language learning and better understand how they may implement it into classroom practice.

7.3.2 Considerations for Pedagogical Change in Korea

When making informed decisions about lesson goals, teachers should permit, encourage, and continuously give attention to the two-way reciprocal flow between the components of the system as illustrated in the Modified Systems Model of Creativity for the L2 Classroom. This means students are co-creating and building upon the textbook material rather than just “completing” it. It means the teacher must also actively engage with, supplement, and transform the curriculum and materials to provide the best learning opportunities. Teachers should also be aware of how they are providing affordances for novelty and feedback. They should also learn to see language learning as continuous “progress” rather than “correctness” and be more conscious of not constantly emphasising accuracy over exploration if they wish to develop the characteristics of creativity in learners. Moreover, teachers must help students develop the capacity to recognise and act upon affordances that may not be obvious, but are nonetheless available in the learning environment; as students learn to see affordances, they will in turn learn to create them. As more affordances are produced by the teacher and students, they will be reflected in the curriculum, which will change (“for good or for ill”) as the classroom climate changes.
This study has also shown that both teachers and students will need time to acclimate to new learning approaches that place on them new demands. The teacher will need adequate training to effectively carry out innovative, student-centred approaches like PBL and students will need a clear explanation of the processes, objectives, and rationale for this new paradigm of learning. Students are not tested on creativity in their regular learning context (and likely won’t be any time soon), and may not see it as important to their current educational situation, therefore teachers will need to help students realise the value of creative engagement and get them to buy into novel learning experiences that may at first be discomforting, confusing, and challenging.

7.3.3 A New Analytical Approach: The Modified Systems Model of Creativity for the L2 Classroom

A major contribution proposed by this study is the novel analytical lens of the Modified Systems Model of Creativity for the L2 Classroom. The model aims to provide a conceptual frame by which to analyse the dynamic interplay and reciprocal flow between the components of the system (students, teachers, the materials/curriculum, and the affordances for creativity and language-use), as well as the classroom climate that emerges as a result of these interactions.

The original model created by Csikszentmihalyi (Csikszentmihalyi, 1999; Feldman et al., 1994) aimed to demonstrate that creativity does not exist only in the minds of individuals (Persons), but is also a social construct that depends on those who set conventions and make judgements about creativity (the Field) and the symbol system and body of knowledge in which a discipline is embodied (the Domain). Whether something is recognised as creative and given status in the Domain largely depends on how receptive the Field is to change. Csikszentmihalyi’s model assumes that creative works are being submitted to the Domain because of the passions and interests of artists and innovators; however, teacher (Field) and student (Persons) input into the curriculum and materials in an educational context (Domain) cannot be considered inherent to ‘the system,’ thus the component of “affordances” (J. J. Gibson, 1977) is essentially incorporated into the model. The concept of affordances is intended to emphasise that the interaction between teachers, students, and the learning materials creates opportunities for creativity and language use and it is up to the classroom participants (students and teachers) to recognise and make use of these affordances. It is hoped that the conceptualisation of creativity and language-use in the L2 classroom proposed by this model can help make teachers and students understand the significance of reciprocal interaction between the system components and become more cognizant of their role in producing and acting upon the dynamic affordances in the learning environment.
7.4 Limitations of the Study

The limitations of the study are divided into four categories, limitations in the research context, limitations in participant sample, limitations in the methodological approach and theoretical lens, and limitations due to researcher bias.

7.4.1 Limitations in Research Context

One limitation of this study was that it was conducted with a limited number of students in one geographical area of Korea. In the city where it was undertaken, Andong, North Gyeongsan Province, most parents and students have a relatively relaxed attitude towards education compared to those in more metropolitan areas of Korea. As this was a free and voluntary class carried out for the purpose of research, it was not a priority for most students and there were no ramifications for poor performance, lack of homework compliance, disciplinary issues, nor were their consequences for absences or dropping the course entirely. Furthermore, any measures of accountability were difficult to enact as the school administrator did not wish me to pressure the students about this class.

Another limitation related to the context was that I did not have my choice of teacher. The Teacher in this study was the only full-time native-speaking teacher employed by the academy and was recommended by the administrator. Although I had no dissatisfaction with her during the study (or now), I may have selected a relatively more experienced educator had I the option.

A final limitation of the study was that I had only limited time options for when I could hold the class. The TB-Class was on Friday evenings, when students (and the Teacher) were occasionally tired from their busy week. The PBL class was held on Saturday mornings and students sometimes missed classes for family trips and were often late for a variety of reasons. At least one student in the PBL-Group reportedly dropped the study because she did not want to attend on Saturdays. Certainly, future studies in a variety of contexts (their regular school context, in particular) would be highly valuable in examining the relationship between creativity and language learning and how learner variables and contextual circumstances affect these capacities.

7.4.2 Limitations in the Participant Sample

The negative impact of attrition could have been minimised had a larger number of qualified students applied to be part of the study. Only 18 students met the baseline score requirement of the TOEFL Jr test, and several of them were at the low end of the spectrum. In addition, as a primary aim of this study was to see development of the same students over time, this study examined only 13–14-year-old students. Investigating the performance and perspectives of students that are younger (e.g. elementary)
and older (e.g. university students) would also be valuable. I chose middle-students because I believed they were less preoccupied with academics and exam preparation than high school students, but soon realised that middle-school students also had a significant amount of stress related to school-life. There were also two crucial challenges to collecting interview data: 1) students had busy lives and finding time when they could interview after class proved more difficult than anticipated; and 2) They were interviewed in English and thus could not articulate their ideas as they may have in Korean. A final limitation in the participant sample was that I did not have access to important demographic information, such as socioeconomic status and level of parent’s education or English proficiency. Due to the sensitivity of these issues in Korea, and because the participants were minors, I was instructed by the school administrator not to collect these data.

7.4.3 Limitations in Methodological Approach and Analytical Lens

The longitudinal design of this study was intended to fill the gap of previous studies that used either one-off tests to examine the relationship between second language proficiency and creativity and/or tested different population samples to determine the long-term effects of second language learning on students’ creativity, however, this approach was not without its own methodological and analytical challenges and shortcomings.

First, the integrity of the longitudinal aspect was dependent on student attendance and commitment for the entire year. Unfortunately, several students had sporadic attendance during the study (although adequate attendance was a criterion for the selection of the representative Case Studies), and attrition was an unavoidable risk of the design (due to the research site being a voluntary after-school program). Additionally, the longitudinal, qualitative aspect of the design created one of the most demanding challenges of the study: managing, evaluating, analysing, and adequately and accurately describing the vast amount of classroom and interview data collected over the course of the year. While I attempted to capture and articulate the most compelling phenomena, not all which transpired over the course of the year could make it into this thesis.

The most significant challenges and limitations in terms of the theoretical approach was its novelty; because the modified model was my own adaptation, there were no previous studies to serve as a model for its application or on which to justify its efficacy. Furthermore, while the model adapted for education by Csikszentmihalyi and Wolfe (2014) provides a base for analysis and application, no adaptation of Csikszentmihalyi’s original model (Feldman et al., 1994) has been applied to the second language learning classroom and thus its validity and reliability as a means to investigate creativity may be called into question. Additionally, the qualitative nature of the analysis makes it difficult to reproduce as each analyst’s interpretation will be unique (Creswell, 2012). This uniqueness carries an
inherent element of researcher bias. Although, every effort was made to demonstrate, thoroughly describe, and support all claims, it is ultimately my understanding and depiction of events and phenomena.

7.4.4 Researcher Bias

As this was ethnographic research, the understanding, interpretation, description and analysis is a subjective account of events (Fetterman, 2010; Kaplan-Weinger & Ullman, 2014; J. McDonough & McDonough, 2014) and it could be argued that research findings may be the researcher merely confirming a priori hypotheses and beliefs or using “selective” sampling of the data to support their assumptions and/or advance their research agenda. Although there is a presumed element of bias in naturalistic inquiry, like that of ethnographic research (P. Atkinson & Hammersley, 1994; Larsen-Freeman & Cameron, 2008a), care was taken to portray participants and events openly, fairly, and accurately and not to make broad generalisations based on the limited participant sample (Fetterman, 2010; Hammersley, 2006; Kaplan-Weinger & Ullman, 2014).

Further, while every attempt was made to take a non-judgemental orientation and to prioritise the point of view of the participants, it is acknowledged that my cultural and personal background may have played a role in the process of evaluating the data and coming to conclusions about the participants’ actions, behaviours, and input (Eisenhart, 2001; Fetterman, 2010). This was continuously monitored through “researcher reflexivity,” meaning I was fully aware of my role in the study, the impact that my presence had in the classroom, and that analysis of the data was ultimately my interpretation of what transpired (Creswell, 2012; Kaplan-Weinger & Ullman, 2014), yet, effort was taken to privilege and accurately represent the ideas and perspectives of the participants. (Kaplan-Weinger & Ullman, 2014).

In summary, researcher bias cannot be eliminated entirely from qualitative analytical approaches, but I remained cognizant of this during the data collection period and subsequent analysis, and ensured that interpretations were supported with samples from the empirical data using a cross-sectional design for longitudinal data analysis to minimise the potential for selective sampling.

7.5 Directions and Implications for Future Research

More qualitative longitudinal studies on the relationship between creativity and language learning are needed to uncover additional characteristics that define creativity or that propose alternative definitions and concepts. As creativity occurs in various forms and manifests differently according to a myriad of contextual factors, a typology of “creative behaviours” or “creative interactions” may help make it more comprehensible, observable, and easier to actuate in classroom practice.
In addition, a broader population sample could show important differences between the middle school students in this study compared to elementary, high school, tertiary, or adult language learning students. It would also be interesting to compare students from different parts of the world learning through a variety of educational paradigms. Further, gathering data from a variety of learners, different perspectives of the issue would also contribute to theory building about what constitutes creativity in the L2 classroom. For example, analysing the perspectives of teachers with different levels of professional experience, school administrators, language education policymakers, and parents would produce a more robust and diverse conceptualisation of creativity and provide insights into how it is valued in the educational process. Beyond investigating different characteristics, theories, and participant perspectives, there are a number of additional questions for qualitative inquiry that could be explored, for example:

- What language skills (reading, listening, speaking, writing) provide the best affordances for creativity in second language learning and how?
- Does creativity relate to long term success in second language acquisition (requiring an even longer longitudinal design with the same participants)?
- How do demographic factors (e.g. gender, age, socioeconomic status, and parent’s occupation) relate to students’ creative capacities in a language learning environment?
- How does Project-based Learning compare to other learner-centred approaches for facilitating creative behaviours and interaction?
- What are the strengths and weaknesses of the Modified Systems Model of Creativity for the L2 Classroom in analysing creativity in the second language classroom (from another researcher’s point of view)?

It is hoped that future qualitative studies will further test the analytical model used in this study through comprehensive, empirical data. Additional alterations to Csikszentmihalyi’s (2014d) model or entirely new theoretical frameworks and methods for exploring the relationship between creativity and language learning can contribute to a better understanding of the concomitant relationship between these abilities, advance the applicability and importance of creative engagement in the L2 classroom, and position creativity as its own learner variable. Pertinent to the last point, locating creativity as its own trait, another important area of inquiry will be exploring how creativity interacts with other learner variables, particularly those that have been more intensively researched in L2 acquisition. There are four learner variables that are especially relevant to the findings of this study: agency, autonomy, willingness to communicate, and motivation. In addition, one specific educational philosophy, Humanistic Language Teaching, is notably integrated into the learning approach and findings of this study. How these individual differences and educational philosophies connect to the findings and how
the relationship between them and creativity offer fruitful avenues for future research is briefly explained.

**Agency:** In essence, agency means that the initiative and self-regulation of the learner determines action (van Lier, 2008). Agency is described by Ahearn (2001) as “the sociocultural mediated capacity to act.” This suggests that agency is a social phenomenon and indeed is socially interpreted. In this study, the concept of affordances is necessarily integrated into the analytical framework because how students perceive opportunities for creativity and creative language, how they choose to act up available opportunities, and how they create their own have much to do with students’ agency, or their self-directed capacity to engage in the social dynamic of the classroom. How students initiate and generate learning opportunities for themselves and others in the classroom is shown to be essential for creativity to thrive in the learning environment. In brief, nurturing and developing a student’s sense of agency in classroom activities is an important dimension of nurturing and empowering opportunities for creativity. Future research might explore this connection further, particularly into how agency influences the ways in which students utilize and create affordances for creativity in various activities and curricular approaches.

**Autonomy:** Autonomy can be defined as the capacity to take control over and manage one’s learning (Benson, 2007). It also includes a person’s capacity to demonstrate responsibility within the social context (Kohonen, 1992), in this case, the classroom. Students who showed the ability to manage their learning, exhibited initiative in speaking activities, and possessed a sense of a social responsibility for the learning environment were more apt to demonstrate the characteristics of creativity and displayed more dynamism in their language learning efforts. In this study, the Teacher refers to certain students’ ability to the work without constant supervision and commends them on their “leadership” skill to complete the assigned tasks and get others involved. The Teacher uses expressions, such as “self-discipline,” “will power,” and “wants to be there,” to describe the students who strived to make the most out of the learning opportunities. Conversely, when discussing students who were not particularly committed, and those who dropped the course, she referred to them as lacking the ability to see the value in the learning approach and context, struggling to adapt to the unfamiliarity of the learner-centred paradigm, and, in some cases, disengaged from the activities. Future studies could evaluate the connection between self-regulated learning and the development of students’ creative competency in various learning contexts, with specific attention given to the effects of autonomy on creativity in student-centred, communicative-driven learning approaches.

**Willingness to Communicate:** There is an evident relationship between students’ creative proclivities in group discussions in this study and the concept of ‘willingness to communicate’ (WTC). WTC,
defined as, “the probably of speaking when free to do so,” can, like the five characteristics of creativity, be considered an individual factor and a product of the learning process and environment in L2 acquisition (MacIntyre, 2007). Encompassing a spectrum of cognitive and affective factors, WTC is one’s readiness, state of self-confidence, and desire to communicate in the target language, positing that one makes a conscious choice to participate in a given moment (MacIntyre, 2007). Research has shown that higher levels of WTC results in the student initiating interpersonal communication in classroom dialogue (Yashima, Zenuk-Nishide, & Shimizu, 2004). While creativity in L2 learning does not innately demand that a student be “outspoken,” there is a clear association between WTC, essentially the ability and alacrity to capitalize on affordances, and creative development. In many cases in this study, students’ enthusiasm to engage in the learning activities, especially activities that were novel, and their desire to express, discuss, and debate their ideas is in some ways synonymous with creative production. Although, I would argue that one’s “willingness to communicate” in the classroom is different from creativity, it is a vital element, perhaps even an antecedent, particularly as it pertains to creative output during group discussions. Future studies can explore the interrelationship between WTC and creativity, especially from the students’ perspectives, using a range of surveys and self-assessments of the two constructs.

Motivation: The link between intrinsic motivation, that is, motivation internal to the creator without any obvious external reward, and creativity has long been established, indeed, many scholars in the field of psychology see it as a core tenant of the creative person (Amabile, 1993; Hallman, 1963). In the field of Applied Linguistics, the research on motivation is expansive and eclectic with most studies submitting intrinsic motivation as a key component in language learning success (Crookes & Schmidt, 1991; Dörnyei, 1998; Dörnyei & Schmidt, 2001; Gardner & Smythe, 1975). But what is the link between intrinsic motivation to learn a foreign language and the motivation to be creative in the process of doing so? The logical answer is that the motivation to be creative in the L2 classroom has a lot to do with the learner, the teacher, the learning context, and the aims of learning outcomes. The focus here is solely on intrinsic motivation because in the case of extrinsic motivation, or motivation to achieve a particular goal or reward (often associated with passing a test in an educational context), it is less likely that students will be concerned with developing thinking skills like creativity. In fact, several students quit the PBL class because it did not fit their learning needs and/or expectations. Therefore, considering intrinsic motivation only, the findings give some evidence that students who were more motivated to learn English demonstrated more incidences of creative engagement. There are several allusions to motivation in this study by the Teacher and students (and appears occasionally in my field notes) as a factor in students’ persistence and dedication to the course. As my intention was to focus on creativity as its own learner variable, I did not elaborate significantly on this relationship, but it is certainly ripe for future research.
In exploring this relationship, a distinct line of inquiry might be investigating the directionality of the relationship—does creative engagement in the L2 classroom lead to learner motivation or vice versa? Another question might be whether a creative approach to language education alters students’ motivational trajectories over time. To minimize the negative effects that attrition would have in observing students with different attitudes and perspectives of creative engagement in the EFL/ESL classroom, it would be best to conduct such a study in a public-school setting. However, most teachers working in public schools do not have the time, training, or authority to implement a program with a targeted emphasis on creativity, and, as posited as a main finding of this study, affordances for creative interaction depend to a large degree on the learning environment. Thus, future investigations (or theoretical discussions) may focus on teachers’ motivation to develop students’ creativity and their corresponding educational philosophies and approaches. Focusing on teachers’ perceptions of creativity will produce valuable insights into the type of learning paradigms that nurture it. In this study, one specific approach, Humanistic Language Teaching, was naturally invoked in the practices and processes employed throughout the course of the study.

Humanistic Language Teaching (HLT): Humanistic Language Teaching emerged from humanistic psychology, which rose to prominence in the mid-twentieth century. It emphasises relationship-building, responsibility for one’s learning, and self-actualization through expressing one’s unique self genuinely in the process of learning with others (Moskowitz, 1978). In HLT, the learner is seen as a whole person with physical, emotional, social, and cognitive dimensions (therefore it is often referred to as a “holistic approach”) (Tanemura & Miura, 2011).

Many of the elements of HLT correspond with the five characteristics of creativity suggested in this study. First, HLT requires that a teacher find a balance between self-directed autonomy and some need for authoritative action. Indeed, Underhill (1989) posits that both autonomy and “authority” are important in a learning environment, with authority meaning that the teacher will take some command over what is studied, how it studied, and how students’ work will be evaluated and administered. Yet, to empower students as individuals, this structure must be balanced with learners’ autonomy and needs; this principal can be considered originality and appropriateness. The idea that learning is a process, one that is partly subconscious but also in need of direct attention, is also fundamental to humanistic philosophy. Feelings are also advocated as part of the subjective experience of learning and learners are asked to engage their affective domain. For their part, the teacher should develop awareness and skill in helping learners reduce their anxieties in order to become genuinely invested in the learning process and engage in meaningful work without the fear of judgement. This means that in the learning process, students are free to make mistakes and indeed understand risk-taking as an integral part of the learning process. The demand for correctness is not ignored, but mitigated with the assertion that errors are part
of learning discoveries; this openness to experience leads the learner to creative engagement by allowing them to develop new skills and strategies that will help them improve in the L2 in cooperation with a learning facilitator and other learners. The reduced emphasis on correctness and the idea of learning as perpetual development allows for greater trust, camaraderie, and collaboration amongst learners which helps develop social relations, a central tenet of humanism (Stevick, 1990).

Ultimately, the goal of humanistic education is the education of the whole person with an emphasis on personal growth, the growth of creativity, and nurturing students’ ability and willingness to undertake self-directed learning (Maple, 1979). To bring HLT ideals to fruition in classroom practice, teachers should respect and listen to both the language and the learner (Underhill, 1989), and attend to students’ creativity by nourishing affective and cognitive skills. The current study shows how humanistic values may be bolstered in the language learning classroom in Korea by drawing out creative characteristics that correspond with the principles of HLT and by describing how students, teachers, the learning materials, and the learning environment affect engagement and individual development.

7.6 Impact of the Study for Future Language Teaching Pedagogy in Korean and Beyond

At present, educational systems around the world are transforming their mission to help students develop the skills needed for the future – second language proficiency and creativity figure prominently into these policies.

In China, educational reform has been geared towards humanistic goals, with developing students critical thinking and creativity figuring prominently into curricular objectives (Gong & Holliday, 2013). In 1992, references to creativity and innovation appeared just 8 times in the report on educational strategies in Mainland China, but with dramatic changes to the curriculum over the next two decades, references to these key terms skyrocketed from 38 in 2001 to 126 in 2011 (Pang & Plucker, 2012). Yet, despite these ostensible changes to strategic goals, which included new textbooks and teaching methods advocating Task-based Language Teaching in EFL courses, implementing a humanistic approach and attention to creativity have thus far proven difficult (Gong & Holliday, 2013).

Education policy in Hong Kong also recognizes creativity as a main skill to be developed, and the curriculum provides general principles and strategies for developing it, however, like Mainland China and Korea, teachers face difficulties implementing an emphasis on creative learning in classroom interaction (V. M. Cheng, 2010). Chan and Yuen (2014) explored teachers’ perceptions about creativity and creative education and found that teachers had difficulty finding opportunities for creativity in mainstream classrooms as they felt compelled to attune primarily to content knowledge. The authors concluded that what is most needed to move forward with innovative initiatives is teacher professional
development to help them cultivate creativity in their students and, as the current study affirms, engender environments supportive of creativity.

In Korea, China, Hong Kong, Japan and much of Asia, there is a call for a greater emphasis on creativity in education, from elementary to tertiary levels, but a multitude of challenges and obstacles have thus far made it more an aspiration than an educational imperative. K. H. Kim (2005) suggests there may be a cultural explanation that hinges not necessarily on education philosophies in East Asia or Confucian values, but rather on how these elements relate to schooling practices —rote learning, competition, conformity, the devaluation of play, and a dichotomous conception of work and play are all detrimental to creativity. However, providing as evidence recent high marks on internationally benchmarked creative problem-solving tests, H. Park (2013) argues that the perception of Japanese and Korean students learning in systems that devalue creativity in favour of academic performance may be more stereotype and based on a Western definition of creativity in learning. Nonetheless, the author acknowledges that recent educational reforms in both countries may have contributed to success on the test. Indeed, despite difficulties, many East Asian countries have made great strides in revamping their curriculums and learning environments to promote more collaboration and creativity.

It is hoped that the Project-based learning curriculum and the characteristics of creativity offered in this study can help policymakers, administrators, and classroom teachers circumnavigate some of the challenges and demonstrate that creativity does not mean neglecting content knowledge, or language skills in the case of ELT, but instead is an essential element for educating the whole person and for preparing students for the future.

This study has shown that creativity is constructive in second language learning because it promotes exploratory language use, impels a willingness to undertake novel learning experiences, helps students understand English as the vehicle of learning rather than the ‘object’ of learning, and cultivates characteristics of creativity that are beneficial for language development. Given that the current methods in English language teaching and learning in Korea (and elsewhere) do not appear to give adequate attention to creativity (Anh, 2012; Woo, 2013), this study has aimed to explain how creativity and language learning interrelate in the learning process, how teachers and students’ perceptions of the concept contrast in different curricular approaches, and how teachers can cultivate learner/environmental characteristics that can enrich students’ creativity as well as their language learning experience. It is hoped that this study can provide a more discernible and practical depiction of what creativity entails in the L2 classroom so that teachers everywhere may more effectively animate students’ creativity and help them recognise its value in school, language learning and in life.
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APPENDICES

Appendix A1: Student Participation Sheet and Consent Form

PARTICIPANT INFORMATION SHEET FOR STUDENTS

Project title: Exploring the Relationship between Creative Development and Language Learning:

Researcher: Vincent Greenier

Introduction

My name is Vincent Greenier, and I am a PhD student in the Department of Applied Language Studies and Linguistics in the School of Cultures, Languages, and Linguistics at the University of Auckland. I am studying the relationship between creativity and second/foreign language learning and how the English as a Foreign Language (EFL) curriculum affects these two skills. This study looks at South Korean students studying EFL in South Korea and focuses on middle school (12-15) aged students. Therefore, if you are a middle school-aged, South Korean student interested in improving your English and creativity, I would like to invite you to participate in my research.

Procedures

Participation is strictly voluntary. If you agree to participate, you will be committing to one full year of English as a Foreign Language instruction taught by a qualified native-speaking English teacher. The class will meet for two hours per week for approximately 35 weeks of the year, for a total of approximately 70 hours of English instruction throughout the year. The focus of the class is on communicating in English and using your creativity to do group projects. You will be asked to take a creativity test and an English level test at the beginning and end of the course. You will be provided a textbook at the beginning of the course. You will also be given a textbook at the beginning of the course and will take the end-of-the-book final test at the beginning and end of the course. You may also be interviewed by the researcher. All classes and interviews will be recorded by audio-visual devices (video camera and digital audio recorder). You will also be asked to keep a journal of your learning experience throughout the course. At the end of the course, you will receive a certificate for your participation to show that you have take part in a class that has helped your English skills and creativity.

Your confidentiality is important to me, so the results of all test scores and writing assignments will be assigned a number and a pseudonym (fake name) and these will be the only identifiers that will be used in the research. You, your parent/guardian, my doctoral supervisors, and I will be the only people with access to these scores and assignments. Your classroom teacher will NOT have access to your creativity or language proficiency test scores at any time before, during or after the study. I will also typing out everything that is said in the classroom and I will use your fake name and your number on both the recordings and the transcript. Anything that might identify you as the speaker will be removed from the transcript. I’ll keep one original copy of the recordings as a backup, but I will be the only person with access to it, and the research itself will be conducted using only your fake name and number.

If you agree to participate, you are free to withdraw from the project at any time throughout the one year course. The data collected up to the point of withdrawal from the course will be used in the research. As this study observes/records and subsequently analyses/transcribes classroom interaction, spoken or written input, in whole or in parts, cannot be removed as the conversations/interaction would not make sense. Therefore, your participation up to the time that you withdraw will be used in the study. If you do not want what you say in class used in the research study, you will not be able to participate in the study as editing out your participation would make the transcript unclear and difficult to understand. Therefore, you are free to withdraw from the course at any time without prior notice, and if you choose not to allow your data to be used in the research, this will also be considered a voluntary withdraw from the class.

Use of the data

Your test scores on the creativity test, English proficiency test, and textbook quizzes and final test will be used for quantitative analysis to determine any connections between development in English proficiency and development in creativity. The interviews, recordings and student journals will be used to attempt to explain relationships between the results of all your tests. All data collected in this study will primarily be used for my doctoral thesis, and any data or
information that is used in my thesis or any associated publications or presentations will use only your fake name. I am the primary analyst for this project, but my supervisor and co-supervisor will also have access to all data.

Your data may be used in more than one project. This means that your recording may be shared with co-investigators in future research projects; if this is the case, these researchers will only have access to the versions of your data that use your fake name, and they will only know your pseudonym and some fairly basic demographic information about you (such as your age, your gender, and hometown). Your data will be kept indefinitely and potentially used in other projects and writings, and your confidentiality will always be maintained. Your data will be stored as digital files on an external hard drive, which will be encrypted, password-protected, and stored securely in a locked cabinet at all times.

If you request, at the conclusion of the study I can provide you with a free copy of all test scores (your scores only. In order to ensure confidentiality and to keep the recordings and transcription from being publically spread, only the researcher and the researcher’s supervisor will have access to the video and audio recordings and transcriptions for as long as the data is kept. If you would like to be updated regarding any publications that arise from the use of your data, please let me know at any point during the study and I will be more than happy to share these with you. Any address or contact information that you provide me will be used for the sole purpose of transmitting information to you, and will not be shared with anyone else.

Contact details

If you have any questions, comments, concerns or thoughts about the project as a whole, please don’t hesitate to contact me by e-mail or phone at:

Vincent Greenie (PhD Candidate)
tel: +64 022 388 1425
email: vgre876@aucklanduni.ac.nz or vtgreenier@yahoo.com

If you have any questions or concerns relating specifically to the collection or use of data as described in this document, you may contact any of the following members of the University of Auckland faculty:

Dr Tan Bee Tin (PhD Supervisor)
tel: +64 9 373 7599 ext 87078
email: tb.tin@auckland.ac.nz

Dr Lawrence Zhang (PhD Co-supervisor)
tel: +64 9 623 8899 ext 48750
email: lj.zhang@auckland.ac.nz

Dr Gary Barkhuizen (Head of School Cultures, Languages, Linguistics)
tel: 64 9 373 7599 ext 88197
email: g.barkhuizen@auckland.ac.nz

For queries regarding ethical concerns, you may contact:

The Chair, The University of Auckland Human Ethics Committee
The University of Auckland
Office of the Vice Chancellor
Private Bag 92019
Auckland 1142
tel: +64 9 373 7599 ext 83711

APPROVED BY THE UNIVERSITY OF AUCKLAND HUMAN PARTICIPANTS ETHICS COMMITTEE ON Apr-08-2014 for (3) years. REFERENCE NUMBER 011363
PARTICIPANT CONSENT FORM
THIS FORM WILL BE HELD FOR A PERIOD OF 6 YEARS

Project title: Exploring the Relationship between Creative Development and Language Learning

Researcher: Vincent Greenier

I have read the Participant Information Sheet and I understand the intent and nature of the research project. I understand that my participation is completely voluntary. I understand that I have the opportunity, at any point before, during, or after the research to ask questions and receive satisfactory answers about the research. I understand that I may choose to withdraw from the study at any time during the one year course. I understand that the data will be stored in a secure location for an indefinite period of time.

The following is a list of provisions required for participation in this study. Please read the following carefully. Your signature at the end of the form indicates that you consent to all components of the study.

- I agree to participate in this project as part of being enrolled in the course.
- I am aware that I may choose to withdraw from this course/research at any time, but that my data that has been collected up to the point of my withdrawal will be used in analysis for the research project.
- I am aware that I have the right to view the results of my own creativity tests, English proficiency tests at the conclusion of the study, and all quizzes and tests related to the textbook, and that these results will not be shared with other members of the class.
- I am aware that all classes will be recorded by a video recorder and digital audio recorder, and that these recording will be used in the study with my identity anonymized.
- I grant you permission to use all material collected in this research for any academic purposes relating to your doctoral research, such as discussions, publications, and presentations. I understand that all data will be anonymized, my confidentiality will be maintained at all times, and anything that can identify me as the speaker will be removed from the transcribed record.
- I understand that my data collected in this research may also be used in later publishing (other than the thesis). I understand that my confidentiality will be maintained at all times.
- I grant you permission to share anonymized versions of my recording and transcript with other co-investigators in future collaborative studies.
- In order to ensure confidentiality and to keep the recordings and transcription from being publically disseminated, I understand that only the researcher and the researcher’s supervisor will have access to the video and audio recordings and transcriptions for the lifetime of the archive.

__________________________________________________________
Name of participant (please print clearly)

__________________________________________________________
Signature of participant

__________________________________________________________
Signature of researcher

__________________________________________________________
Date

__________________________________________________________
Date
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REQUEST FOR FURTHER CONTACT

I would like to have the following information or documents sent to me:

- summaries of any research findings that stem from this project
- electronic copies of any journal papers and/or presentations that stem from this project
- the result of the TTCT and TOEFL ITP tests at the conclusion of the study

I would like the above to be sent to me at the following address(es):

name (for use in correspondence)

email address

postal address

APPROVED BY THE UNIVERSITY OF AUCKLAND HUMAN PARTICIPANTS ETHICS COMMITTEE ON ______ for (3) years. REFERENCE NUMBER 011363
PARTICIPANT INFORMATION SHEET FOR TEACHER

Project title: Exploring the Relationship between Creative Development and Language Learning

Researcher: Vincent Greenier

Introduction

My name is Vincent Greenier, and I am a PhD student in the Department of Applied Language Studies and Linguistics in the School of Cultures, Languages, and Linguistics at the University of Auckland. I am studying the relationship between creativity and second/foreign language learning and how the English as a Foreign Language (EFL) curriculum affects these two skills. This study looks at South Korean students studying EFL in South Korea and focuses on middle school (12-15) aged students.

Procedures

As the teacher you will be committing to one full year of teaching two EFL Language courses. The classes will meet for two hours per week for approximately 35 weeks of the year, for a total of approximately 70 hours of English instruction throughout the year. You will teach two different courses, an Arts-based curriculum and a textbook-driven curriculum, therefore you will instruct for 4 hours per week for a total of 140 hours over the course of one year. You will also be required to undergo 4-6 hours of training prior to the beginning of the course. There will be two vacation periods of approximately 3 weeks each during the school’s mid-term and final exam periods. The focus of the class is on communicating in English and collaborative, creative engagement. Participants will be asked to take a creativity assessment and a standardized English proficiency examination at the beginning and end of the course as well as the end-of-the-book final test at the beginning and end of the course and end-of-unit quizzes to determine how well they have learned the objectives of the textbook. As the teacher, you will NOT be permitted to see the scores on the creativity and standardized English tests, in order to prevent bias. However, you will read and assess their textbook tests and all work related to the course. You will be provided a textbook and teacher’s guide for the prescribed textbook at the beginning of the course. This will be provided by the researcher. You may also be interviewed by the researcher. The interview will focus on your perceptions of the curricula and of classroom interaction. As part of this research, you are asked not to discuss the other curriculum or participants with participants in the different curricula. All classes and interviews will be recorded by audio-visual devices (video camera and digital audio recorder). Participants will also be asked to keep a journal of their learning experience throughout the course; as the teacher you are asked to respond to these journals with a sufficient amount of feedback and not to share or discuss the journals with anyone other than the researcher and student who wrote the journal.

Your confidentiality is important to me, so, if you choose, you may use a pseudonym in the research. However, as this is an excellent opportunity for professional development and an experience you may wish to use on your resume in the future, you may also choose not to remain anonymous. As the classroom teacher, you will have access to and are required to assess and provide feedback on classwork and assignments, but you will NOT have access to the creativity tests or standardized English proficiency tests at any point during the study. I will also be transcribing the classroom interaction and then anonymizing both the recordings and the transcript (all students will be given a pseudonym). Again, if you prefer, anything that might identify you as the speaker will be removed from or anonymized on the transcript. I’ll keep one unaltered copy of the recordings as a backup, but I
will be the only person with access to it, and the research itself will be conducted using the anonymized versions.

You may withdraw from the research project at any time. The data collected up to the point of withdrawal from the course will be used in the research. As this study observes/records and subsequently analyses/transcribes classroom interaction, spoken or written input, in whole or in parts, cannot be removed as it would affect the overall coherency and flow of the interaction. For the same reason, a final stipulation is that being the teacher for this course is contingent upon consent to use your data.

**Use of the data**

Test scores on the creativity test, English proficiency test, and textbook quizzes and final test will be used for quantitative analysis to determine any correlations between development in English proficiency and development in creativity. The interviews, recordings and student journals will be used to attempt to explain relationships between test score results. All data collected in this study will primarily be used for my doctoral thesis, and any data or information that is used in my thesis or any associated presentations will be anonymized, and attributed only to your pseudonym, unless you choose otherwise. I am the primary analyst for this project, but my supervisor and co-supervisor will also have access to all data.

Participants’ data may be used in more than one project. This means that recordings may be shared with co-investigators in future research projects; if this is the case, these researchers will only have access to the anonymized versions of the data (unless you choose otherwise), and will only be given the participants’ pseudonyms and some fairly basic demographic information (such as students’ age, gender, and hometown). Participants’ data will be kept indefinitely and potentially used in other projects and writings, with all confidentiality precautions maintained for the lifetime of the archive. The data will be stored as digital files on an external hard drive, which will be encrypted, password-protected, and stored securely in a locked cabinet at all times.

In order to ensure confidentiality and to keep the recordings and transcription from being publically disseminated, only the researcher and the researcher’s supervisor will have access to the video and audio recordings and transcriptions for the lifetime of the archive. If you would like to be updated regarding any publications that arise from the use of the data, please let me know at any point during the study and I will be more than happy to share these with you. Any address or contact information that you provide me will be used for the sole purpose of transmitting information to you, and will not be shared with anyone else.

**Remuneration:**

While participation in this study provides an excellent opportunity for professional development and to take part in a unique curriculum that will help students enrich their creativity and experience with the arts, you will also be paid for your time and skill as a qualified English language teacher. The hourly wage will be discussed and agreed upon in conjunction with the researcher of this study and a separate contract for duties required and payment owed will be drafted prior to the start of the pre-course training sessions (about 4-6 hours prior to the beginning of the study).

**Contact details**

If you have any questions, comments, concerns or thoughts about the project as a whole, please don’t hesitate to get in touch with me:
Vincent Greenier (PhD Candidate)
tel: +64 022 388 1425
e-mail: vgre876@aucklanduni.ac.nz or vtgreenier@yahoo.com

If you have any questions or concerns relating specifically to the collection or use of data as described in this document, you may contact any of the following member of the University of Auckland faculty:

Dr Tan Bee Tin (PhD Supervisor)
tel: + 64 9 373 7599 ext 87078
e-mail: tb.tin@auckland.ac.nz

Dr Lawrence Zhang (PhD Co-supervisor)
tel: + 64 9 623 8899 ext 48750
e-mail: lj.zh@aubknd.ac.nz

Dr Gary Barkhuizen (Head of School Cultures, Languages, Linguistics)
tel: 64 9 373 7599 ext 88197
e-mail: g.barkhuizen@auckland.ac.nz

For queries regarding ethical concerns, you may contact:

The Chair, The University of Auckland Human Ethics Committee
The University of Auckland
Office of the Vice Chancellor
Private Bag 92019
Auckland 1142
tel: +64 9 373 7599 ext 83711

APPROVED BY THE UNIVERSITY OF AUCKLAND HUMAN PARTICIPANTS ETHICS COMMITTEE ON 08-Apr-2014 for (3) years. REFERENCE NUMBER 011363
TEACHER CONSENT FORM

THIS FORM WILL BE HELD FOR A PERIOD OF 6 YEARS

Project title: Exploring the Relationship between Creative Development and Language Learning

Researcher: Vincent Greenier

I have read the Participant Information Sheet and I understand the intent and nature of the research project. I understand that my participation in this research is completely voluntary. I understand that I have the opportunity, at any point before, during, and after the research to ask questions and receive satisfactory answers about the research. I understand that the data collected by the researcher will be stored in a secure location for an indefinite period of time.

Please read the following carefully. Your signature at the end of the form indicates that you consent to all components of the study.

- I agree to participate in this research as the teacher for both classes - the Arts-based curriculum and the textbook-driven curriculum. I understand that both classes will be one year long.
- I am aware that I may choose to withdraw from teaching the courses at any time, but data that has been collected up to the point of withdrawal will be used in analysis for the research project.
- I agree that as the teacher of the course I will demonstrate equity, fairness, impartiality, and professional integrity at all times and that I will not knowingly bias students, the curriculum, or this study in any way.
- As teacher of the course I will have access to the students’ real identities and personal information. I agree that I will not disseminate any information that may identify students in this research and that I must maintain the confidentiality of the students in spoken and written works by using their assigned numbers or pseudonyms in any and all correspondence related to this class/research.
- I am aware that I may NOT view the results of the creativity tests, or standardized English proficiency tests, and agree that I will not attempt to access this information during the study as it may bias my opinions about the student and/or the curriculum. However, I will view and assess all coursework, quizzes and tests related to the textbook, as well as the artefacts created by the students throughout the course of the study. I agree that these products and/or results will not be shared with other members of the same class, members of the other class, other parents/guardians (other than the parent/guardian of the child to which the test or work belongs), other teachers in the school, or anyone outside of the institution, and that any and all use of this data will be anonymized so that students enrolled in my class will not be identified in the research or any subsequent discussion, publications, or presentations.
- I am aware that all classes will be recorded by a video recorder and digital audio recorder, and that these recording will be used in the study with my identity and the identity of the students enrolled in my class anonymized.
- I grant you permission to use the interview material for any academic purposes relating to your doctoral research. I understand that confidentiality of myself and students enrolled in my class will be maintained at all times.
- I understand that data collected in this research may also be used in later publishing (other than the thesis). I understand that my confidentiality and the confidentiality of students enrolled in my class will be maintained at all times.
- I grant you permission to share anonymized versions of the recordings and transcripts with other co-investigators in future collaborative studies with the understanding that my identity will remain confidential at all times.
- I have had the opportunity to discuss remuneration with the researcher and have come to an agreed upon wage for the duration of the study.
• In order to ensure confidentiality and to keep the recordings and transcription from being publically disseminated, I understand that only the researcher and the researcher’s supervisor will have access to the video and audio recordings and transcriptions for the lifetime of the archive.

Name of Teacher

______________________________

Signature of Teacher

Signature of Researcher

______________________________

Date

Date

Please indicate below whether or not you would like to remain anonymous in this research study below. Please keep in mind that choosing to remain anonymous means that the researcher and all participants involved will not be permitted to identify you as the instructor of this course and you will therefore not be able to use participation in this study on your resume, curriculum vitae, or anything that would require public acknowledgement of your participation in the study.

☐ I would like to remain anonymous throughout this study and in any and all subsequent publications and presentation of the data. I would like my participation in this research project to remain confidential for the lifetime of the archive.

☐ I grant the researcher permission to identify me as the teacher of this course in publications, presentations and any subsequent public dissemination of the data related to this research project. I prefer to be acknowledged as an active participant in this study.

REQUEST FOR FURTHER CONTACT

I would like to have the following information or documents sent to me:

☐ summaries of any research findings that stem from this project
☐ electronic copies of any journal papers and/or presentations that stem from this project

I would like the above to be sent to me at the following address(es):

name (for use in correspondence)

______________________________
email address


postal address


APPROVED BY THE UNIVERSITY OF AUCKLAND HUMAN PARTICIPANTS ETHICS COMMITTEE ON _____ for (3) years. REFERENCE NUMBER 011363
PARTICIPANT INFORMATION SHEET FOR SCHOOL ADMINISTRATOR

Project title: Exploring the Relationship between Creative Development and Language Learning
Researcher: Vincent Greenier

Introduction

My name is Vincent Greenier, and I am a PhD student in the Department of Applied Language Studies and Linguistics in the School of Cultures, Languages, and Linguistics at the University of Auckland. I am studying the relationship between creativity and second/foreign language learning and how the English as a Foreign Language (EFL) curriculum affects these two skills. This study looks at South Korean students studying EFL in South Korea and focuses on middle school (12-15) aged students.

Procedures

Participation is strictly voluntary. Participants will be committing to one full year of English as a Foreign Language instruction taught by a qualified native-speaking English teacher. There will be two different classes. One group will complete an Arts-based EFL curriculum designed by the researcher and the other class will use a textbook-driven curriculum and follow the teacher’s guide for the prescribed textbook. The same teacher will teach both classes. Each class will meet for two hours per week for approximately 35 weeks of the year, for a total of approximately 70 hours of English instruction throughout the year. There will be two vacation periods of approximately 3 weeks each during the school’s mid-term and final exam periods. The focus of both classes is on communicating in English and collaborative, creative engagement. Participants will be asked to take a creativity assessment and a standardized English proficiency examination at the beginning and end of the course. Participants will be provided a textbook at the beginning of the course provided by the researcher. Participants will be asked to take the end-of-the-book final test at the beginning and end of the course and to take end-of-unit quizzes from the textbook to determine how well they have learned the objectives of the textbook. Participants may also be interviewed by the researcher. All classes and interviews will be recorded by audio-visual devices (video camera and digital audio recorder). Participants will also be asked to keep a journal of your learning experience throughout the course.

The confidentiality of all enrolled students at your school is important to me, so the results of all test scores and writing assignments will be assigned a number and a pseudonym and these will be the only identifiers that will be used in the research. The parent(s)/guardian(s) of the participants (their own child’s work), the participants (their own work), and the teacher will have access to student assignments and writings and to the textbook’s quizzes and final test, but NOT to the creativity tests or standardized English proficiency tests during the study. After the study, students will be permitted to view the results of their own creativity and English proficiency tests upon request, but during the study, this information will only be available to the researcher and the researcher’s supervisors. I will also be transcribing the classroom interaction and then anonymizing both the recordings and the transcript. Anything that might identify participants as the speakers or you (the administrator) will be removed from the transcript. I’ll keep one unaltered copy of the recordings as a backup, but I will be the only person with access to it, and the research itself will be conducted using the anonymized versions.

Students may withdraw from the course at any time. The data collected up to the point of withdrawal from the course will be used in the research. As this study observes/records and subsequently analyses/transcribes classroom interaction, spoken or written input, in whole or in parts, cannot be
removed as it would affect the overall coherency and flow of the interaction. For the same reason, a final stipulation is that participation in the course is contingent upon consent to use the participants’ data.

**Use of the data**

Test scores on the creativity test, English proficiency test, and textbook quizzes and final test will be used for quantitative analysis to determine any correlations between development in English proficiency and development in creativity. The interviews, audio and video recordings and student journals will be used to attempt to explain relationships between test score results. All data collected in this study will primarily be used for my doctoral thesis, and any data or information that is used in my thesis or any associated publications or presentations will be anonymized, and attributed only to the participants’ pseudonym. I am the primary analyst for this project, but my supervisor and co-supervisor will also have access to all data.

Participants’ data may be used in more than one project. This means that recordings may be shared with co-investigators in future research projects; if this is the case, these researchers will only have access to the anonymized versions of the data, and will only be given the participants’ pseudonyms and some fairly basic demographic information (such as students’ age, gender, and hometown). Participants’ data will be kept indefinitely and potentially used in other projects and writings, with all confidentiality precautions maintained for the lifetime of the archive. The data will be stored as digital files on an external hard drive, which will be encrypted, password-protected, and stored securely in a locked cabinet at all times.

In order to ensure confidentiality and to keep the recordings and transcription from being publically disseminated, only the researcher and the researcher’s supervisor will have access to the video and audio recordings and transcriptions for the lifetime of the archive. If you would like to be updated regarding any publications that arise from the use of the data, please let me know at any point during the study and I will be more than happy to share these with you. Any address or contact information that you provide me will be used for the sole purpose of transmitting information to you, and will not be shared with anyone else.

**Contact details**

If you have any questions, comments, concerns or thoughts about the project as a whole, please don’t hesitate to get in touch with me:

Vincent Greenier (PhD Candidate)
tel: +64 022 388 1425
e-mail: vgre876@aucklanduni.ac.nz or vgreenier@yahoo.com

If you have any questions or concerns relating specifically to the collection or use of data as described in this document, you may contact any of the following member of the University of Auckland faculty:

Dr Tan Bee Tin (PhD Supervisor)
tel: +64 9 373 7599 ext 87078
e-mail: tb.tin@auckland.ac.nz

Dr Lawrence Zhang (PhD Co-supervisor)
tel: +64 9 623 8899 ext 48750
e-mail: lj.zhang@auckland.ac.nz

283
Dr Gary Barkhuizen (Head of School Cultures, Languages, Linguistics)
tel: 64 9 373 7599 ext 88197
e-mail: g.barkhuizen@auckland.ac.nz

For queries regarding ethical concerns, you may contact:

The Chair, The University of Auckland Human Ethics Committee
The University of Auckland
Office of the Vice Chancellor
Private Bag 92019
Auckland 1142
tel: +64 9 373 7599 ext 83711

APPROVED BY THE UNIVERSITY OF AUCKLAND HUMAN PARTICIPANTS ETHICS COMMITTEE ON ______for (3) years. REFERENCE NUMBER 011363
**SCHOOL ADMINISTRATOR CONSENT FORM**

**THIS FORM WILL BE HELD FOR A PERIOD OF 6 YEARS**

**Project title:** Exploring the Relationship between Creative Development and Language Learning

**Researcher:** Vincent Greenier

I have read the Participant Information Sheet and I understand the intent and nature of the research project. I understand that participation by students enrolled in my school is completely voluntary. I have the opportunity, at any point before, during, and after the research to ask questions and receive satisfactory answers about the research. I understand that the data collected by the researcher will be stored in a secure location for an indefinite period of time.

Please read the following carefully. Your signature at the end of the form indicates that you consent to all components of the study.

- I agree to allow students enrolled in my school to participate in this research.
- I am aware that if a student chooses to withdraw from the course data that has been collected up to the point of withdrawal will be used in analysis for the research project.
- I am aware that I have the right to view the results of all quizzes and tests related to the textbook, that these results will not be shared with other members of the class or other teachers in the school, and that any and all use of this data will be anonymized so that students enrolled in my school will not be identified in the research or any subsequent publications or presentations.
- I am aware that all classes will be recorded by a video recorder and digital audio recorder, and that these recording will be used in the study with the identity of students enrolled in my school anonymized.
- I grant you permission to use all material collected in this research for any academic purposes relating to your doctoral research, such as discussions, publications, and presentations. I understand that the confidentiality of students enrolled in my school will be maintained at all times.
- I understand that data collected in this research may also be used in later publishing (other than the thesis). I understand that the confidentiality of students enrolled in my school will be maintained at all times.
- I grant you permission to share anonymized versions of the recording and transcript with other co-investigators in future collaborative studies.
- I understand that I may reproduce and use curriculum and course materials for subsequent classes with the express, written permission of the researcher, but that I may not reproduce or use data collected from this research project or use the real names of students who took part in this study for promotional or any other purposes.
- In order to ensure confidentiality and to keep the recordings and transcription from being publically disseminated, I understand that only the researcher and the researcher’s supervisor will have access to the video and audio recordings and transcriptions for the lifetime of the archive.

________________________________________

Name of School
REQUEST FOR FURTHER CONTACT

I would like to have the following information or documents sent to me:

☐ summaries of any research findings that stem from this project
☐ electronic copies of any journal papers and/or presentations that stem from this project

I would like the above to be sent to me at the following address(es):

name (for use in correspondence)

email address

postal address

APPROVED BY THE UNIVERSITY OF AUCKLAND HUMAN PARTICIPANTS ETHICS COMMITTEE ON ______for (3) years. REFERENCE NUMBER 011363
Appendix A4: Parent Participation Sheet and Consent Form

PARTICIPANT INFORMATION SHEET FOR PARENTS

Project title: Exploring the Relationship between Creative Development and Language Learning:

Researcher: Vincent Greenier

Introduction

My name is Vincent Greenier, and I am a PhD student in the Department of Applied Language Studies and Linguistics in the School of Cultures, Languages, and Linguistics at the University of Auckland. I am studying the relationship between creativity and second/foreign language learning and how the English as a Foreign Language (EFL) curriculum affects these two skills. This study looks at Korean students studying EFL in South Korea and focuses on middle school (12-15) aged students. If you are the parent or legal guardian of a middle school-aged, South Korean student and would like to enrol your child into a program aimed at improving both English proficiency and creativity, I would like to invite you to enrol your child in this research study.

Procedures

Participation is strictly voluntary. If you agree to allow your child to participate, you will be enrolling them in a program that requires one full year of English as a Foreign Language instruction taught by a qualified native-speaking English teacher. The class will meet for two hours per week for approximately 35 weeks of the year, for a total of approximately 70 hours of English instruction throughout the year. There will be two vacation periods of approximately 3 weeks each during the school’s mid-term and final exam periods. The focus of the class is on communicating in English and collaborative, creative engagement. Your child will take a creativity assessment and a standardized English proficiency examination at the beginning and end of the course. Your child will be provided a textbook at the beginning of the course at the researcher’s expense. Your child will be asked to take the end-of-the-book final test at the beginning and end of the course and to take end-of-unit quizzes to determine how well he/she has learned the objectives of the textbook. Your child may also be interviewed by the researcher. All classes and interviews will be recorded by audio-visual devices (video camera and digital audio recorder). Your child will also be asked to keep a journal of their learning experience throughout the course. Participants who successfully complete the course will receive a certificate for participation this course.

Your child’s confidentiality is important to me, so the results of all test scores and writing assignments will be assigned a number and a pseudonym and these will be the only identifiers that will be used in the research. You, your child, my doctoral supervisors, and I will be the only people with access to these scores and assignments. The classroom teacher will have access to classwork and assignments, but not to the creativity tests or standardized English proficiency tests. I will also be transcribing the classroom interaction and then anonymizing both the recordings and the transcript. Anything that might identify your child as the speaker will be removed from the transcript. I’ll keep one unaltered copy of the recordings as a backup, but I will be the only person with access to it, and the research itself will be conducted using the anonymized versions.

If you agree to allow your child to participate, you are free to withdraw him/her from the project at any time throughout the one year course. The data collected up to the point of withdrawal from the course will be used in the research. As this study observes/records and subsequently analyses/transcribes classroom interaction, spoken or written input, in whole or in parts, cannot be removed as it would affect the overall coherency and flow of the interaction. For the same reason, a final stipulation is that
participation in the course is contingent upon consent to use your child’s data collected throughout the course for the purpose of this research study.

Use of the data

Your child’s test scores on the creativity test, English proficiency test, and textbook quizzes and final test will be used for quantitative analysis to determine any correlations between development in English proficiency and development in creativity. The interviews, recordings and student journals will be used to attempt to explain relationships between test score results. All data collected in this study will primarily be used for my doctoral thesis, and any data or information that is used in my thesis or any associated publications and presentations will be anonymized, and attributed only to your child’s pseudonym. I am the primary analyst for this project, but my supervisor and co-supervisor will also have access to all data.

Your child’s data may be used in more than one project. This means that recording may be shared with co-investigators in future research projects; if this is the case, these researchers will only have access to the anonymized versions of your child’s data, and will only know your child’s pseudonym and basic demographic information about your child (such as age, gender, and hometown); all confidentiality precautions will be maintained for the lifetime of the archive. Your child’s data will be stored as digital files on an external hard drive, which will be encrypted, password-protected, and stored securely in a locked cabinet at all times.

If you request, I can provide you with a free copy of all of your child’s data, including the results of all test scores (your child’s scores only) at the conclusion of the study. In order to ensure confidentiality and to keep the recordings and transcription from being publically disseminated, only the researcher and the researcher’s supervisor will have access to the video and audio recordings and transcriptions for the lifetime of the archive. If you would like to be updated regarding any publications that arise from the use of your child’s data, please let me know at any point during the study and I will be more than happy to share these with you. Any address or contact information that you provide me will be used for the sole purpose of transmitting information to you, and will not be shared with anyone else.

Contact details

If you have any questions, comments, concerns or thoughts about the project as a whole, please don’t hesitate to contact me by e-mail or by phone:

Vincent Greenier (PhD Candidate)
tel: +64 022 388 1425
e-mail: vgre876@aucklanduni.ac.nz or vgreenier@yahoo.com

If you have any questions or concerns relating specifically to the collection or use of data as described in this document, you may contact any of the following member of the University of Auckland faculty:

Dr Tan Bee Tin (PhD Supervisor)
tel: + 64 9 373 7599 ext 87078
e-mail: tb.tin@auckland.ac.nz

Dr Lawrence Zhang (PhD Co-supervisor)
tel: + 64 9 623 8899 ext 48750
e-mail: lj.zhang@auckland.ac.nz

Dr Gary Barkhuizen (Head of School Cultures, Languages, Linguistics)
tel: 64 9 373 7599 ext 88197
email: g.barkhuizen@auckland.ac.nz

For queries regarding ethical concerns, you may contact:

The Chair, The University of Auckland Human Ethics Committee  
The University of Auckland  
Office of the Vice Chancellor  
Private Back 92019  
Auckland 1142  
tel: +64 9 373 7599 ext 83711

APPROVED BY THE UNIVERSITY OF AUCKLAND HUMAN PARTICIPANTS ETHICS COMMITTEE ON 08-Apr-2014 for (3) YEARS. REFERENCE NUMBER 011363
PARTICIPANT CONSENT FORM FOR PARENTS/GUARDIANS

THIS FORM WILL BE HELD FOR A PERIOD OF 6 YEARS

Project title: Exploring the Relationship between Creative Development and Language Learning:

Researcher: Vincent Greenier

I have read the Participant Information Sheet and I understand the intent and nature of the research project. I understand that my child’s participation is completely voluntary. I understand that I have the opportunity, at any point before, during, or after the research to ask questions and receive satisfactory answers about the research. I understand that I may choose to withdraw my child from the study at any time during the one year course, but data collected up to the point of withdrawal may be used in the research. I understand that the data will be stored in a secure location for an indefinite period of time.

The following is a list of provisions required for participation in this study. Please read the following carefully. Your signature at the end of the form indicates that you consent to all components of the study.

- I agree to allow my child to participate in this project as part of being enrolled in the course.
- I am aware that I may choose to withdraw my child from this course/research at any time, but that data that has been collected up to the point of withdrawal will be used in analysis for the research project.
- I am aware that I have the right to view the results of my child’s creativity tests, English proficiency tests after the conclusion of the study. I will be able to view the results of my child’s quizzes and tests related to the textbook after they are scored by the teacher; I also understand that these results will not be shared with other members of the class; and that any and all use of this data will be anonymized so that my child will not be identified in the research or any subsequent publications and/or presentations.
- I am aware that all classes will be recorded by a video recorder and digital audio recorder, and that these recordings will be used in the study with my child’s identity anonymized.
- I grant you permission to use all material collected in this research for any academic purposes relating to your doctoral research, such as discussions, publications, and presentations. I understand that my child’s confidentiality will be maintained at all times.
- I understand that my child’s data collected in this research may also be used in later publishing (other than the thesis). I understand that my child’s confidentiality will be maintained at all times.
- I grant you permission to share anonymized versions of my child’s recording and transcript with other co-investigators in future collaborative studies.
- In order to ensure confidentiality and to keep the recordings and transcription from being publically disseminated, I understand that only the researcher and the researcher’s supervisor will have access to the video and audio recordings and transcriptions for the lifetime of the archive.

Name of Participant
REQUEST FOR FURTHER CONTACT

I would like to have the following information or documents sent to me:

☐ summaries of any research findings that stem from this project
☐ electronic copies of any journal papers and/or presentations that stem from this project
☐ the result of the TTCT and TOEFL ITP tests at the conclusion of the study

I would like the above to be sent to me at the following address(es):

name (for use in correspondence)

email address

postal address

APPROVED BY THE UNIVERSITY OF AUCKLAND HUMAN PARTICIPANTS ETHICS COMMITTEE ON ______ for (3) years. REFERENCE NUMBER 011363
무료 원어민 영어수업 수강생 모집

뉴질랜드 오클랜드 대학교 승인 하에 진행되는 창의적이고 새로운 영어학습 커리큘럼 개발 프로젝트 수업에 참여할 학생들을 모집합니다. 이 프로젝트는 오클랜드 대학교 응용언어학 박사과정 중에 있는 연구자의 창의적 개발과 영어능력개발과의 관계에 대한 연구이며 영어를 학습하는 한국학생들에게는 절호의 기회가 될 것입니다.

- 레벨테스트(TOEFL주니어, IELTS 적성 시험(TTCT)를 통해 선발
- 100% 원어민 선생님과 함께 진행
- 학습 관련 자료 및 시험비용 일체 무료
- 다양한 학습법을 통한 창의적 학습기회
- 매주 1회 2시간, 약 1년 과정

연구담당자: Vincent Greenier (빈센트 그리니어)  
모집 인원: 20~30명(선착순)  
모집 대상: 중학교 1~ 2학년(예비 중1 포함)  
모집 기간: 10월 24일(금)까지  
수업 시간: 금 6:00 PM / 도 10:00 AM 택1  
수업 내용: 영어회화를 바탕으로 한 다양한 활동

 찾아오시는 길(수업 장소)

궁금하신 점이나 자세한 사항 문의는 아래의 번호로 연락 주십시오.
- 빈센트 (연구자) ☎ 010-2732-7120  
- 이메일 vgr876@aucklanduni.ac.nz  
- 전화번호 (연구보조) ☎ 010-8582-0389  
- 이메일 cherry0389@naver.com  
- 전화번호 (학급장) ☎ 010 4715 2445 ☎ (054)621-5747  
- 이메일 y2kwithu@hanmail.net

주소: 안동시 용상동 현대아파트상가 203호 (농협은행 앞 3층)
Appendix C: Sample list of questions for “Comprehensive Note-Taking” (Lofland & Lofland, 2005)

1) Where are students sitting at the beginning of class?

2) How does the teacher explain the unit and/or the project to students? What questions do students ask?

3) How are conversations started in group work in the PBL class? Who starts talking first? What do they say?

4) Are students taking note of the teacher and or the researcher during the lesson? In what ways?

5) In the textbook-driven class, are students completing the activities in the book? How do they prepare to do a speaking task?

6) How do students respond to the teachers questions?
Appendix D: Example of Researcher’s Field Notes (from October 16, 2015).

[Handwritten notes, two pages, with various observations and reflections on lessons and teaching strategies.]
Appendix E: Semi-structured Interview Questions with Students

- How often do you have the opportunity to learn this way?
- Explain a time you showed your creativity in school.
- What did you learn from the textbook/project?
- Tell me about something you’ve made as a school project or a presentation you have done.
- Tell me how you usually learn English in your regular school classes. Do you like this style of learning? Why or why not?
- How do teachers in your school help you be more creative?
- Do you feel you are being creative in this [research] class? Why or why not?

Appendix F: Semi-structured Interview Questions with the Teacher?

- How will your previous teaching experience help you with teaching this class?
- Do you like the textbook? Do you think the textbook is good for helping students be creative in English?
- What do you want to more of in the Textbook-driven class? What do you want to do more of in the PBL class?
- Is there anything you would like to change about either class? Why or why not?
- What are the problems you have had so far with the students in either/both of the curricula? Do you think these problems have anything to do with the type of curricula?
- How do you think you have helped students with the curricula in both classes?
- In your opinion, which class is going better?
- What have you learned by doing this research project so far?
Appendix G1: Interview Schedule with Case Studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Interview #1 Date</th>
<th>Interview #2 Date</th>
<th>Interview #3 Date</th>
<th>Interview #4 Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>Duration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Textbook-Driven Group</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kellan</td>
<td>22 May 2015</td>
<td>7 August. 2015</td>
<td>20 Nov. 2015</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project-based Learning Group</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>29 Nov. 2014</td>
<td>12 Sept. 2015</td>
<td>21 Nov. 2015</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix G2: Teacher Interview Dates and Durations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11 November 2015</td>
<td>24:20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 November 2014</td>
<td>30:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 January 2015</td>
<td>25:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 March 2015</td>
<td>27:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 June 2015</td>
<td>8:50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 August 2015</td>
<td>19:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 September 2015</td>
<td>32:20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 November 2015</td>
<td>36:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 December 2015</td>
<td>30:50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflective Essay</td>
<td>2,218 words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 January 2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix H: Focus Group Questions (Conducted by School Administrator in Korean)

- When you first started this class, what did you expect?
- What do you think you learned from this class?
- What do you think was the aim of this course?
- Do you think this course improved your English?
- Do you think this course improved your creativity?
- If there’s a school like this, would you like to go or would you recommend it to others?
- What do you want to change about the class?
- What part of this class did you find the most difficult and what did you find the most beneficial?
Appendix I: Heinle Cengage World English 1™ Unit Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Focused listening: Personal introductions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Asking for and giving personal information. Contractions: -m, –t, –s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“People from Around the World.” Writing about a person and her occupation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Work, Rest, and Play</td>
<td>Review: Simple present tense. Adverbs of frequency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Daily activities. Party words.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Focused listening: A radio celebrity interview.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Talking about daily schedules and free time. Verbs that end in -s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“Carnival: One Festival, Many Faces.” Writing a descriptive paragraph.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Going Places</td>
<td>Possession. Imperatives and should for advice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Travel preparations and stages. Travel documents and money.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>General listening: Conversations at travel destinations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Giving personal information for travel forms. Rising intonation in lists.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Food</td>
<td>Count and noncount nouns: some and any. How much, how many with quantifiers: lots of, a few, a little.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Food. Diets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>General and focused listening: In a restaurant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Role-play: purchasing food at a store. Ordering from a menu. Reduced forms: Do you have… and Would you like…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“Bugs as Food.” Writing a favorite recipe.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sports</td>
<td>Present continuous tense. Stative verbs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Doing sports. Team sports. Individual sports.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>General and focused listening: Every day activities vs. today’s activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Talking about what people are doing now. Discussing favorite sports. Reduced form: What are you…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“Climbing the Dragon’s Spines.” Writing an email.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Destinations</td>
<td>Simple past tense: Be.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Travel activities. Emphatic adjectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“The City of Machu Picchu, the Cradle of the Inca Empire.” Writing a postcard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UNIT 6</td>
<td>Talk about past vacation trips. Exchange information about vacations. Use was/were to describe a personal experience. Talk about a discovery from the past.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix I (Continued): Heinle Cengage World English 1™ Unit Objectives

### Unit 7: Communication
- Talk about personal communication
- Give and write down contact details
- Describe characteristics and qualities
- Compare different types of communication

#### Grammar
- Verbs with direct and indirect objects
  - Linking verbs

#### Vocabulary
- Communication
- Electronics
- The senses

#### Listening
- Focused listening: A radio call-in program

#### Speaking and Pronunciation
- Asking for contact information
- Describing sights, sounds and other sensations
- Endings -ty and -teen

#### Reading and Writing
- "The Secret Language of Dolphins"
- Writing a text message

### Unit 8: The Future
- Talk about plans
- Discuss long- and short-term plans
- Make weather predictions
- Discuss the future

#### Grammar
- Be going to
- Will for predictions

#### Vocabulary
- Plans
- Weather conditions

#### Listening
- General listening: A talk show

#### Speaking and Pronunciation
- Talking about weekend plans
- Discussing the weather
- Reduced form of going to

#### Reading and Writing
- "Future Energy"
- Writing statements about the future

### Unit 9: Shopping for Clothes
- Make comparisons
- Explain preferences
- Talk about clothing materials
- Understand and describe a process

#### Grammar
- Comparatives
- Superlatives

#### Vocabulary
- Clothing
- Descriptive adjectives
- Clothing materials

#### Listening
- Focused listening: Shoe shopping

#### Speaking and Pronunciation
- Talking about clothes
- Shopping—at the store and online
- Rising and falling intonation

#### Reading and Writing
- "Silk—the Queen of Textiles"
- Writing about favorite clothes

### Unit 10: Lifestyles
- Give advice on healthy habits
- Suggest ways to improve bad habits
- Ask about lifestyles
- Evaluate your lifestyle

#### Grammar
- Modal verbs: could, ought to, should, must, have to
- Questions with how

#### Vocabulary
- Healthy and unhealthy habits
- Compound adjectives

#### Listening
- General listening: Personal lifestyles

#### Speaking and Pronunciation
- Discussing healthy and unhealthy habits
- Giving advice for improving habits
- Should, shouldn't?

#### Reading and Writing
- "The Secrets of Long Life"
- Writing a paragraph about personal lifestyle

### Unit 11: Achievements
- Talk about today's chores
- Interview for a job
- Talk about lifetime achievements
- Discuss scientific achievements

- Present perfect tense
- Present perfect tense vs simple past tense

#### Vocabulary
- Chores
- Lifetime achievements

#### Listening
- Listening for general understanding and specific details: A job interview

#### Speaking and Pronunciation
- Interviewing for a job
- Catching up with a friend
- Reduced form of have

#### Reading and Writing
- "Uncovering the Mysteries of the Universe"
- Writing an email to catch up

### Unit 12: Consequences
- Talk about managing money
- Make choices on how to spend your money
- Talk about how our actions can have positive consequences
- Discuss ways to prevent habitat destruction

#### Grammar
- Real conditionals (also called the First conditional)

#### Vocabulary
- Personal finances
- Animal habitats

#### Listening
- Listening for specific details: At a travel agency

#### Speaking and Pronunciation
- Making decisions about spending money
- Talking about important issues
- Sentence stress

#### Reading and Writing
- "Habitat Destruction"
- Writing a letter to the editor
## Appendix J: 10Cs of Project-Based TESOL Curriculum: Project Element Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **STAGE 1:** Coaching | 1 | **Teacher** explains the main language points from the textbook and may use a worksheet or other type of activity to check comprehension. If they do not fully understand at this point, that is okay – they will learn through the project. :)  
Teacher explains the project. |
| **STAGE 2:** Concept Generation | 2 | **HOMEWORK #1:** Each student will think of 3~10 ideas and email them to the teacher before the next class. It is important to require **progressively more ideas with each new project** to improve divergent thinking skills. When the teacher receives the emailed idea lists from students, he/she decides on groups of 3~4 students, and compiles the ideas for each group onto a list. The ideas on the list are left anonymous at this point and students do not know who will be in their group. |
| **STAGE 3:** Confrontation | 2 | **HOMEWORK #1:** Each student will think of 3~10 ideas and email them to the teacher before the next class. It is important to require **progressively more ideas with each new project** to improve divergent thinking skills. When the teacher receives the emailed idea lists from students, he/she decides on groups of 3~4 students, and compiles the ideas for each group onto a list. The ideas on the list are left anonymous at this point and students do not know who will be in their group.  
Teacher gives each student an anonymous list of their group’s ideas. Students take about 10~15 minutes to choose which ideas they like most. When they have finished selecting their favourite ideas from the list, the teacher will then announce the groups for the project.  
Students get into their groups and vigorously (but politely) debate ideas, attempt to merge their favourite ideas into one, and eventually, come up with a plan for their project. |
| **STAGE 4:** Comprehension | 2 | **HOMEWORK #2:** Students listen to their conversation during Stage 3 and complete a worksheet designed by the teacher.  
**STAGE 5:** Creation | 3 | **Class 3:** Students make the project. Teacher will need to tolerate some silence during this period. Don’t worry, they’re learning. |
| **STAGE 6:** Critique | 3 | **HOMEWORK #3:** After students have made the project, they will need to take a copy home (or a picture if it’s a visual arts project) and decide what they want to change. It is best to make a worksheet here (or just give them the Change Worksheet) or they probably won’t complete this stage. |
| **STAGE 7:** Change | 4 | **Class 4:** Class begins with a group discussion about the things they like, don’t like, and what they want to change. The teacher may choose to move to the different groups and discuss briefly with them their ideas for change, but it should be a mostly student led discussion. After about 15~20 minutes, students should begin with making changes. |
| **STAGE 8:** Culmination | 5 | **Class 5:** Students perform or present their project in front of the class. |
| **STAGE 9:** Collaborative Reflection | 6 | **Class 6:** The class following the presentation should be a collaborative feedback session. Groups should ask other groups about their ideas and, if the class is comfortable, offer feedback, suggestions, and possibly even a “friendly” evaluation. |
| **STAGE 10:** Composition | 4 | **HOMEWORK #4:** Students write an essay about the project. The teacher may choose to leave this open-ended (such as journal writing) or may ask some specific prompts to connect once again the language points and thematic concepts to the project. |
# Appendix K: Worksheet for Comprehension Stage: Listen & Understand

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Name: ___________________  Date: ___________  Project # _____</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Rank your Speaking in the first two stages of this project? On a scale of 1-10, 1 being the worst and 10 the best, how do you rank your speaking skills? _____. Why?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>두 개의 프로젝트 할 때까지의 자신의 영어 말하기의 등급을 매겨 주세요. 본인이 생각하는 자신의 말하기 실력을 표시해 주세요. 왜 그렇게 생각하나요?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>What would you like to improve about your speaking? Why? Your listening ability in the first two stages of the project? On a scale of 1-10, 1 being the worst and 10 the best, how do you rank your listening skills? _____. Why?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>자신의 말하기 실력 중 어떤 부분을 창조시키고 싶나요? 왜?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Rank your Listening ability in the first two stages of the project? On a scale of 1-10, 1 being the worst and 10 the best, how do you rank your listening skills? _____. Why?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>두 개의 프로젝트 할 때까지의 자신의 영어 말하기의 등급을 매겨 주세요. 본인이 생각하는 자신의 말하기 실력을 표시해 주세요. 왜 그렇게 생각하나요?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Did this listening homework help you think more about the project? Explain. 듣기 숙제는 자신이 프로젝트에 대해 더 많이 생각할 수 있도록 도왔나요? 설명해 주세요.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>What did you learn from listening to the recording of yourself and your group? 자신이나 자신이 속한 그룹의 녹음파일을 듣는 것으로부터 무엇을 배웠습니까?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Where did you get your ideas for this project?</td>
<td>이 프로젝트를 위한 아이디어들을 어디서 얻었습니다?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. In your first group discussion for this project, what did your group talk about the most? Why?</td>
<td>이 프로젝트를 위한 첫 번째 그룹토의에서 주로 무엇에 관해 얘기하였습니다? 왜?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Write at least 3 new vocabulary items you learned while talking with your group members? What do the words mean?</td>
<td>8. Write at least 3 new vocabulary items you learned while talking with your group members? What do the words mean?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. What is YOUR best idea for this project so far?</td>
<td>이 프로젝트에 관한 지금까지의 자신의 최고의 아이디어는 무엇입니까?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. What are you thinking about as you listen to your group’s recorded conversation?</td>
<td>10. What are you thinking about as you listen to your group’s recorded conversation?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix L: Critique Stage Homework Assignment Worksheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change #1</th>
<th>What is the change? Describe the change in detail.</th>
<th>How does this change improve your project (or why do you want to change it)?</th>
<th>TEACHER’S COMMENTS / QUESTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Change #2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change #3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change #4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change #5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
활동 1-3: 질문하고-그리고-추측하기

 처음 세 가지 활동은 아래에 있는 그림을 잘 들어다 보고 해야 한다. 이들 활동은 알지 못하는 어떤 것들을 알아내기 위하여 질문을 하거나 사건의 원인과 결과를 추측하는 일을 당신이 얼마나 잘 할 수 있는지를 알아보기 위한 것이다. 아래의 그림을 들여다보라. 무슨 일이 벌어지고 있는가? 당신이 확실히 말할 수 있는 것은 무엇인가? 그리고 어떤 일이 일어나고 있으며, 그런 일을 일으키게 한 원인은 무엇이며, 그리고 그런 일이 결과는 어떻게 될 것 같은지를 이해하기 위하여 당신이 알아 본 필요가 있는 것들은 무엇인가?
활동 1: 질문하기

앞쪽에 있는 그림에 대하여 당신이 생각해 볼 수 있는 질문들을 아래의 번간에 많이 적어 보라. 두산 일이 벌어지고 있는지를 확실히 알기 위하여 몇어 뿐 필요가 있는 질문들을 많이 적어 보라. 그룹을 보면 바로 대답할 수 있는 그런 질문은 하지 말라. 필요하면 앞쪽에 있는 그림을 알아든지 다시 들어다 볼 수 있다.
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Appendix M (Continued): TTCT Activity 2 (Uses picture from Activity 1)

활동 2: 원인 추측하기

2쪽에 있는 그림이 보여 주고 있는 행위를 들여다보다. 그리고 그러한 행위를 하게 된 '원인'들을 생각해 보고 이들을 아래의 빈칸에 할 수 있는 한 많이 나열해 보라. 그러한 원인들은 그림에 있는 일이 벌어지기 바로 전에 일어났던 것일 수도 있고, 또는 이미 오래 전에 있었던 것일 수도 있습니다. 할 수 있는 데로 많은 추측을 해보라. 추측하기를 두려워하지 말라.
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활 동 3: 결과 추측하기

2쪽에 있는 그림에서 받아지고 있는 일 때문에 앞으로 일어날지도 모르는 것들을 아래의 빈칸에 가능한대로 많이 나열해 보라. 바로 다음에 일어날 것 같은 것들 뿐 아니라 먼 미래에 일어날 것 같은 것들도 나열해 보라. 가능한 한 많이 추측해 보라. 추측하기를 두려워하지 말라.
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활동 4: 작품 향상시키기

아래에는 우리가 장난감 가게에서 2,000원 정도면 살 수 있는 속이 채워진 장난감 원숭이를 그린 스케치(그림)가 있다. 높이는 약 15cm이고 무게는 300g 정도이다. 이 장난감 원숭이를 아이들이 보다 더 재미있게 가지고 놀 수 있는 것으로 고칠 수 있는 (바꿀 수 있는) 아주 현명하고, 재미있고, 그리고 독특한 방법들을 이쪽과 다음 쪽의 반칸에 나열해 보라. 고치는데 비용이 얼마나 들 것인지는 대략하여서는 걱정하지 말라. 이렇게 하면 아이들이 이 장난감을 보다 더 재미있게 가지고 놀 수 있도록 고칠 수 있는지에 대해서만 생각하라.

1. 
2. 
3. 
4. 
5. 
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활동 5: 독특한 응도(양첩 징통)

 대부분의 사람들은 빈 양첩 징통은 내 던져 버린다. 그러나 그것들은 재미있고 독특하게 사용할 수 있는 응도(사용처)에는 수천 가지가 있을 것이다. 이쪽과 다음 쪽의 간간에 그러한 재미있고 독특한 응도들을 가능한 한 많이 생각하여 나열해 보라. 어떤 한 가지 크기의 징통에 제한시키지 말라, 필요하면 징통은 얼마든지 사용할 수 있다. 보았거나 들었던 응도(사용처)에 당신 스스로를 제한시키지 말라. 새로운 응도를 할 수 있는 한 많이 생각해 보라.
활동 7: 가상해 보기

아래에는 있을 것 같지 않은 장면, 실제에서는 결코 일어날 것 같지 않은 한 가지 장면을 제시하고 있습니다. 그런 일이 일어났다고 한다면 ‘가상해’ 보라. ‘만약에’ 이 불가능한 장면이 실제로 일어난다면 어떤 오싹오싹한 일들이 벌어질 것 같은지를 당신의 상상력을 사용하여 생각해 보라.

당신의 상상 속에서, 아래의 장면이 실제로 일어난다고 ‘가상해’ 보라. ‘그리면’ 이 러한 장면 때문에 어떤 일들이 벌어질 것 같은지를 많이 생각해 보라. 바꾸어 말하면, 어떤 결과(결말)들이 벌어질까? 가능한 한 추측을 많이 해 보라.

불가능한 장면 - ‘온 세상에 큰 안개가 지속하게 내려 우리가 다른 사람을 볼 때 볼 수 있는 것은 그 사람의 반 뿐’이라 가상해 보라. 어떤 일이 일어날까? 다음의 쪽에 당신의 아이디어(생각)와 추측들을 나열해 보라.
## Appendix N: Structure and Instructions of Korean TTCT Type B (Translation of Appendix M)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Instructions</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Activity 1 - Asking questions</td>
<td>Think of and record as many questions as possible to the picture prompt.</td>
<td>5 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 2 – Guessing Cause</td>
<td>Think of and record as many <em>causes</em>, or reasons, for the actions and events in the picture from Activity 1.</td>
<td>5 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 3 – Guessing Results</td>
<td>Think of and record as many events as possible that could actually happen in the future as a result of the actions and events in the picture.</td>
<td>5 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 4 – Enhance the Work of Art</td>
<td>Think of many good ways to play with the toy that is pictured (a monkey).</td>
<td>10 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 5 – Unique Uses</td>
<td>Think of many fun and unique ways to use an empty can (given as a word prompt in the instructions rather than as a picture).</td>
<td>10 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 7 – Imagination</td>
<td>Examine a picture (provided in the book) and imagine that the whole world is fog and all we can see are people’s feet; provide as many explanations as possible as to what would happen if this situation were real.</td>
<td>5 minutes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. 환산표 이용
토トル 주니어의 시험에서 모의고사 점수를 실제 점수로 환산하는데 참고하는 환산표를 이용할 수도 있습니다. 시험의 모의고사는 총 120문항으로 이루어져 있기 때문에, 실제 ETS의 토トル 주니어 시험이나 정규 교재의 테스트 상의 문항 수(교재 상 1회분은 126문항으로 구성)와는 약간 차이가 있습니다. 하지만 이를 참고하여 점수를 가늠해 볼 수는 있습니다.

![보기](data:image/png;base64,iVBORw0KGgoAAAANSUhEUgAAAIoAAAACwCAYAAAAU0GFQAAAABGdSignature.png)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>모의 고사 점수 (Darakwon™)</th>
<th>실제 점수 (ETS™ TOEFL Jr.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>120점 (가장 높은 개수가 120개인 경우)</td>
<td>900점</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110점</td>
<td>875점</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100점</td>
<td>850점</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90점</td>
<td>825점</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80점</td>
<td>800점</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70점</td>
<td>775점</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60점</td>
<td>750점</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50점</td>
<td>725점</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40점</td>
<td>700점</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30점</td>
<td>675점</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20점</td>
<td>650점</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10점</td>
<td>625점</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

예컨대, 모의 고사 점수가 95점인 학생은 실제 시험을 봤을 때 825점과 850점 사이의 점수를 받게 될 것으로 예상할 수 있습니다.