Example #1

In recent years, there has been increased interest on the topic of leadership in language teaching with the hopes of strengthening English Language Teaching (ELT) professionalism by placing more attention on teachers’ evolving roles both inside and outside the classroom (see Christison & Murray, 2009; Coombe, McCloskey, Stephenson, & Anderson, 2008; Fenner, 2016; Author 2 & Author 1, 2016; Koosha, Liaghat, & Sadeghdaghighi, 2015). This has led to an emerging discussion in the field which has posited good teacher leadership as an essential component in ELT, with increasing recognition that a focus on fostering the understanding and growth of leadership can make invaluable contributions to successful teaching and learning (Coombe et al, 2008; Johnson & Burton, 2000).

At present, most of the existing literature on leadership in ELT has been concerned with program management, organizational structure, and other aspects of administration (Christison & Murray, 2009; Coombe et al, 2008; Muijs & Harris, 2003; Pennington & Hoekje, 2010; White, 2008), leaving leadership at the classroom level relatively unexplored. This may in part be due to the concepts of good leadership and good teaching possibly overlapping where good leadership may be simply viewed as a naturally embedded component of effective instruction. Although the two concepts are interrelated, we strongly believe that further attention needs to be given to leadership in its own right in order to better understand what it actually entails and how it relates to teaching practices.

Given the rapid changes in English as a second language (ESL) and English as a foreign language (EFL) teaching approaches and the growing diversity of learners and contexts, arguably some of the most essential qualities teachers can possess include a sense of empowerment in their classrooms and schools (Lieberman & Miller, 2004; McGee, Haworth, & MacIntyre, 2015), and an understanding of how to appreciate and inspire students as individuals. While there has been an explosion of research on teacher leadership in general education (see Curtis, 2013; Berry et al, 2010; Lieberman & Miller, 2004), the concept remains in its nascent stages in the ELT context, despite its importance being indicated in the growing call for more research on the topic (Christison & Murray, 2009; Shields & Sayani, 2005).

Example #2

Usage of technology enhanced learning tools inside and outside the classroom is an increasingly important area in language pedagogy. Of concern to this area is the plethora of new technologies becoming available and the evolving debate surrounding growth of anew generation of students who have been termed the digital natives. Below I will report on a study that sought to explorewhether a group of EFL students within an English medium university in Asia could be characterized as digital natives, and how this influenced their reported usage and learning benefit perceptions of different technology enhanced and non-technology enhanced language learning tools.

Previous studies have defined the term digital nativesas a demographic group that has been raised in the era of wide-scale technology integration within manyareas of their lives. [Prensky (2001](#_ENREF_13), [2005](#_ENREF_14), [2009](#_ENREF_15))proposedthis generation’s upbringing in technologically saturated environments has resulted in an adapted brain structure, which in turn has brought about fundamentally different modes of cognition to previous generations. It has been argued that this digitized lifestyle meansdigital native learning preferences are being unmet by current educational institutes, and this digital divideis responsible for disenfranchised students([Oblinger, 2003](#_ENREF_11); [Underwood, 2007](#_ENREF_18)).

Other studies suggest second language learning contexts and tools have generallyadapted well to the evolving technological landscape, and including newer technologies is often justified based on language learners being digital natives.For example, recent work has identified a large number of technology enhanced tools and methods have been explored for use across the four skill areas of language learning([Conole, 2008](#_ENREF_2); [Conole, de Laat, Dillon, & Darby, 2008](#_ENREF_4); [Kennedy, Judd, Churchward, Gray, & Krause, 2008](#_ENREF_8); [Levy, 2009](#_ENREF_9), [2014](#_ENREF_10); [Peters, Weinberg, & Sarma, 2009](#_ENREF_12); [Steel & Levy, 2013](#_ENREF_17)). What we know about student preferences for language learning technologies is based on a range of questionnaire studiesexamining students usage and perceived benefit to learning from different technology enhanced tools ([Conole, 2008](#_ENREF_2); [Conole et al., 2008](#_ENREF_4); [Peters et al., 2009](#_ENREF_12); [Steel & Levy, 2013](#_ENREF_17)). Evidence from [Conole (2008](#_ENREF_2)) and [Steel and Levy (2013](#_ENREF_17))suggested changing non-learning technology patterns are influencing student preferences for these language learningtools also, as the digital native argument suggests. Both studies explored technologies utilized by second language students within either Australian or British contexts, and found wide-spread use and perceived benefits of language learning technologies, which spanned across differentfields of study.[Peters et al. (2009](#_ENREF_12))conducted a similar study on students of French as a second language and found a similar high preference for technology enhanced learning tools.In addition, [Conole et al. (2008](#_ENREF_4)) found that students pursue technologychoices for language learning autonomously, with these choices being based on personal preference rather than institution or teacher prescription. [Levy (2014](#_ENREF_10))also suggested that a prerequisite for encouraging student autonomy is the use of tools and modes of learning that reflect the means and modes of students’ everyday lives. This study also identified how students now carry out the majority of non-learning media consumption through technological means. Seamlessly integrated spheresbetweenlearning and personal technology usage have been termed as studentpersonal learning environments, which[Reinders (2014](#_ENREF_16))also noted as the types of environments favored by digital natives.

The main challenges to thedigital native and dominant technology integration in language learningposition however are twofold. Firstly, there is increasing resistance to the term digital native being used to define an entire generation and the assumption that their learning preferences are fundamentally distinct from other generations. For example, [Jones, Ramanau, Cross, and Healing (2010](#_ENREF_7))argued that defining personal and learning characteristics based solely on year of birth is overly simplistic, and[Kennedy et al. (2008](#_ENREF_8)) suggested a sophisticated knowledge and understanding of technology and technology enhanced tools derives from a broad and varied range of experiences, which not all individuals within the same generation will have. The second major argument opposing the digital native argument rests on a lack of empirical support for the position. [Hargittai (2010](#_ENREF_6))found few of the claims proposed by the digital native literaturewereunderpinned by empirical evidence. For example, the study by [Jones et al. (2010](#_ENREF_7))discovered usage and perceived value of technology varied within the single generation of students that fit the characteristics of beingdigital natives, and[Kennedy et al. (2008](#_ENREF_8))suggests more empirical evidence is needed on technology learning preferences within this group. In the SLA field also,few studies have explored digital native learning preferences for both technology and non-technology enhanced tools. For example, the studies by [Steel and Levy (2013](#_ENREF_17)), [Conole et al. (2008](#_ENREF_4)), [Conole (2008](#_ENREF_2)) and [Peters et al. (2009](#_ENREF_12))only considered learner technology preferences without consideration for non-technology tool equivalents. What remains unclear therefore is whether digital native preferences for technologyenhanced language learning tools are replacing or simply adding to preferences for non-technology enhanced equivalent tools. In addition, the extent to which findings from the previous study contexts can be extrapolated to other EFL regions such as Asia remains unclear.

More research in this area is clearly needed. Based on this, the current study set out to explore:

1. The relationship between digital native characteristics and usage of and perceived benefit from different technology and non-technology enhanced language learning tools within an Asian EFL context.
2. Students’ usage of and perceived benefit fromdifferent forms of technology and non-technology enhancedlanguage learning toolswithin an Asian EFL context.
3. Which forms oftechnology and non-technology enhanced language learning tools are considered most over and underused by students within an Asian EFL context.

Example #3

Since its inception in the late 1960s, Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) has grown in popularity and has had widespread adoption in ESL countries (Li, 1998). However, when policies and curricula have shifted to CLT in EFL contexts researchers have been quick to find a gap between policy and practice (Nunan, 2003).  There is widespread documentation of teacher difficulty and/or resistance to CLT largely stemming from a lack of local contextual appropriateness and local contextual constraints (Bax, 2003; Incecay & Incecay, 2009; Liao, 2006; Menking, 2001). Some of the most common obstacles reported have been; grammar based examinations (Li, 1998), the context of the wider curriculum (Burnaby & Sun, 1989), lack of trained teachers (Anderson, 1993), too much preparation time required (Chau & Chung, 1987) and learner resistance (Shamin, 1996).

For the last 20 years, South Korea has been pushing for the implementation of CLT with changes to National Curriculum objectives, and in-service teacher training programs promoting its widespread usage. However, CLT continues to fail to gain extensive implementation into public school secondary classroom, and Grammar Translation and Audiolingual methods continue to be the dominant methods used across the country (Cho, 2010; Choi, 2008; Whitehead, 2016; Woo, 2001).

As teachers are the ones at ground level, they are the ones who experience the obstacles and difficulties first hand.  In order to understand the gap between CLT policy and practice in South Korean secondary classrooms, it is crucial to give in-service teachers a voice in regard to the contextual constraints and issues that they face. This study aims to do just that by examining 1) the reasons why CLT may be failing to take hold in South Korean secondary classrooms from the teachers’ perspective and 2) what can be done to support and/or facilitate the implementation of CLT in the future.