A Study on Pre-Service Teachers' Misconceptions about the Viewer

Jeong, Jinseok   Kangwon National University

I. Introduction

This study analyzes pre-service teachers' misconceptions about the 'viewer', which is one of the key concepts of narrative theory, with a focus on misconceptions in genre knowledge – a problematic phenomenon of literary education. The aim is to draw attention to and discuss the misconceptions of pre-service teachers, learners, and teachers regarding genre knowledge, and establish a framework of discussion that can be used as a reference in future research.

In literary education, genre knowledge means 'knowledge about the elements and features of a genre.' Typical examples include rhythm, image, event, narrator, and focalization. These concepts are attributes of genre that commonly appear in all literary works. Genre knowledge is involved in the process of interpreting and creating literary works beyond connoting in the text. Readers and writers refer to and apply genre knowledge to reading lyric poetry or writing about a certain experience in narrative texts. For this reason, discussion of genre knowledge remains valuable in the discourse of literary education.

One thing to note is that genre knowledge in literary education is not 'complete' by itself but is 'constructed'. Curriculums and textbooks

provide various genre knowledge, but that knowledge is not fully conveyed to teachers and learners in the class context. In terms of constructivism, "knowledge is not outside students, but is constructed based on each of their experiences."(Jeon, 2001: 210) If there is too much interference from incorrect descriptions in textbooks, incomplete explanations by teachers, or experience of prerequisite learning, learners may only partially understand, or even misunderstand, the concept of genre knowledge. This leads to misconceptions that require educational measures.

Misconception refers to "incomplete formative knowledge that remains as an unscientific concept within the learner's cognitive structure even after formal learning."(Yun, Kim & Park, 2007: 31) It is a problem in teaching knowledge, primarily because knowledge itself tends to be constructed. Learners may construct knowledge imperfectly or inappropriately in the process of learning. Moreover, misconceptions are present not only in learners but also in curriculums, textbooks, and teachers' explanations. Meanwhile, misconceptions are also problematic insofar as they affect other forms of learning. Once formed, misconceptions do not easily change or disappear, and have adverse effects on learning other knowledge.

Korean language education has only recently demonstrated interest in misconceptions. Kim et al(2009) examined the meaning and characteristics of misconceptions, status in Korean language education, and research direction in multiple aspects and identified the need to study misconceptions in Korean language education. Since then, the scope of discussion has been gradually expanding. In particular, discussions on grammar education are noticeable. Although no full-scale research findings have been collected, grammar education has been reporting misconceptions in detailed knowledge, such as in phonemes, morphemes, and parts of speech, based on the awareness that the concepts that construct subject knowledge are clear and the relations and structure among concepts are systematic. It has also been determining the characteristics of misconceptions that class par-

ticipants, such as teachers and learners, have(Nam, 2012; Nam, 2013a; Nam, 2013b; Jo, 2014; Lee & Jo, 2015; Bak & Kang, 2016; Shin, 2017; Jo, 2017).

However, there have been no discussions about the misconceptions of learners and teachers in literary education. This is due to the perception that literary knowledge is not as objective or clear as science or grammar. However, it is not productive to overlook the possibility of discussing misconceptions in literary education by distinguishing them from those in science, humanities, or grammar education. The concepts of all subjects have both a logical and interpretive character, although these may vary in degree. Studies on misconceptions in science education and grammar education are also conducted in light of this ambivalence(Jo, 2017: 346-348).

In this respect, the discussion by Kim(2009, 2013) and Jeong(2012) is noteworthy as it shares the awareness of problems in misconception studies. Their discussion reveals the problems by examining the definitions and descriptions of genre knowledge in the curriculum and textbooks, and provides suggestions for improvement. For example, Kim(2013) criticizes textbooks for incorrectly explaining point of view, i.e., by dividing the first person and third person in terms of 'inside and outside the story' even though the narrator cannot exist outside, or the use of the term 'omniscient author', which does not distinguish between the narrator and author. These incorrect descriptions are some of the misconceptions in textbooks, which are problematic as they cause teachers and learners to misunderstand the relevant concepts and keep them from properly understanding literary works when reading them based on these concepts.

Nevertheless, misconceptions in curriculums and textbooks are one of the factors contributing to the misconceptions of teachers and learners. The more important point is to verify how these misconceptions affect the cognition and performance of teachers and learners, and what status they have in learners' concept formation. Moreover, it is necessary to broadly analyze the aspects of misconceptions and

the causes of their formation. Even if there are no misconceptions in the curriculum or textbook and the teacher accurately explains the concept, it is still quite likely that misconceptions will be formed in learners.

Studies on misconceptions in literary education must also expand their scope of discussion to misconceptions of the subjects that construct knowledge, such as teachers and learners. Teachers' and learners' misconceptions about genre knowledge are very diverse and complicated as they include incorrect descriptions in the curriculum and textbooks. This is because misconceptions occur in multiple aspects in the process of concept development; that is, from ambiguity to clarity and inaccuracy to accuracy beyond the issue of right or wrong terms of description(Nam, 2012: 6). Considering these facts, inquiry of misconceptions in genre knowledge by teachers and learners should not be overlooked or postponed any longer.

Based on the awareness of this matter, this study will explore the possibility and direction for research on misconceptions in literary education by analyzing the aspects of pre-service teachers' misconceptions about the viewer.

First, this study will examine the misconceptions regarding the 'viewer'. The viewer refers to "the position or quality of consciousness through which we "see" events in the narrative"(Abbott, 2008: 233). The viewer is the term used in the curriculum, in which the term 'focalizer' in narrative theory was replaced with a more comprehensible term. In this context, the curriculum replaced the terms 'focalizer' and 'narrator' in the narrative theory with the terms 'viewer(보는이)' and 'speaker(말하는이)', respectively. Genette(1985: 286) was the first to raise the issue of the viewer. He criticizes the conventional discussion about point of view for laying too much emphasis on person, so that it overlooks the fact that the delivery of characters and events is involved with 'who sees' along with 'who speaks'. He proposes, for the first time, the concept that readers not only 'listen' to the story world in the process of reading but also 'see' it, and in that sense,

understanding the viewer as distinct from the speaker contributes to in-depth interpreting of literary works.

Since the late 1990's, literary education researchers have examined the meaning and characteristics of focalization, and identified the need to teach that concept at secondary schools(Lim, 1997; Seon, 2004; Park, 2008; Kim, 2009; Jeong, 2018). The viewer was first presented in literature domain in the 2015 Revised Curriculum. In this curriculum, the first through third years of middle school are expected to attain the following achievement standard: "to receive literary works with a focus on the perspective of the viewer or speaker." According to this achievement standard, middle schools must teach students how to receive literary works by finding the viewer in the text and focusing on his or her perspective. Considering that the viewer is a concept unfamiliar even to teachers and that it is difficult to distinguish it from the speaker, it can be expected that diverse learners' and teachers' misconceptions will be formed in the process of teaching the concept. Examining the aspects of misconceptions about the viewer will contribute to resolving pending issues about knowledge construction in literary education and setting the direction for a solution.

Second, this study will concentrate on categorizing the aspects of misconceptions in genre knowledge. There are various categories of misconception studies, such as identifying types of misconception, exploring the cause of misconception formation, presenting solutions to misconceptions, and creating a map of misconceptions. Studies on misconceptions begin by identifying the various aspects of misconceptions and categorizing them. Examining the cause of misconceptions or creating a map is only possible after collecting sufficient baseline data about types of misconception. In particular, since there has been no discussion on teachers' and learners' misconceptions in literary education, the results of analyzing types of misconception will contribute to driving and promoting follow-up research.

Third, this study will examine the aspects of pre-service teach-

ers' misconceptions about genre knowledge. Sensitive awareness of misconceptions in subject knowledge and knowledge about various types of misconception is necessary expertise for teachers. Teachers sensitive to misconceptions can design their classes according to the cognitive level of learners. They can also reflect on their knowledge construction and improve their classes. Considering that the idealistic model of teacher education is as 'reflective practitioners', pre-service teachers must be more sensitive than others to misconceptions of themselves and learners(Ko & Lee, 2014: 449). A study on pre-service teachers' misconceptions may be applied to the contents of teacher education, and may inspire pre-service teachers' introspective awareness about misconceptions.

II. Subjects and methods

To identify the aspects of pre-service teachers' misconceptions about the viewer, it is necessary to obtain and analyze the data of misconceptions among pre-service teachers that have learned the concept of the viewer. To this end, a total of 68 data cases were collected from the college of education at C University located in Gangwon-do, consisting of 35 students taking the junior course and 33 students taking the senior course on modern novel. For analysis, 47 cases were selected as the final research data, excluding 19 cases of redundant data from students taking both courses and 2 cases of data from two students with no experience of learning about the viewer.

Table 1. Subjects and classification code

Task	Subjects	Classification code
ⓐ Report knowledge construction about the viewer	33 students taking Course A in the senior year of C University in Gangwon-do	ⓐ-A-serial number
	35 students taking Course B in the junior year of C University in Gangwon-do	ⓐ-B-serial number

Most students were juniors and seniors in the department of Korean language education at the college of education, who had learned about the viewer in the course 'Theory of Modern Novel Education' in the first semester of their junior year. The key learning contents are as follows.[1]

Table 2. Key learning contents about viewer

* The viewer's definition: the position or quality of consciousness through which we "see" events in the narrative.

* The viewer's status: Narrative mediation has long been perceived only as the question of 'who speaks'. However, narrative mediation is also the question of 'who sees' in addition to 'who speaks'. Here, the 'who' in 'who sees' is the viewer. The viewer may be a character or a speaker.

* The meaning of 'see' in the viewer: In the 'viewer', 'see' has a perceptual facet, psychological facet, and ideological facet beyond physical vision. In other words, 'who sees?' indicates 'Who perceives, conceives, assumes, understands, desires, remembers, dreams? and so on'.

* Why the selection and arrangement of the viewer is important: Readers are strongly influenced by not only the speaker's voice but also the viewer's view. Depending on who is selected as the viewer, readers may have a different understanding, feeling, and judgment about the characters and events.

* Cases of analyzing literary works with a focus on the viewer: Yeom Sang Seup's "Three Generations", Lee Tae Jun's "Paegangraeng"

This study selected 'diagnostic tests' to obtain data and diagnose the aspects of misconceptions(Treagust, 1988: 161-164). In this method, participants narrate the contents that they know about the

---

1   The theoretical books used as a reference to teach about the viewer include Genette's Narrative Discourse, Rimmon-Kenan's Narrative fiction, Bal's Narratology, O'Neill's Fictions of Discourse and Abbott's The Cambridge introduction to narrative.

concept in subjective form. In learning of literary knowledge, it is important to know the concept and apply it to reading literary works. Therefore, the participants were asked to use the works presented as 'Examples' in explaining the concept.

The specific research procedures are as follows. First, from September 3 to 4, 2018, pre-service teachers were notified that the task in class would be used as data for the research purpose, and their consent was obtained. They were provided with the 'Manual and Consent Form for Research Participants'. This process was approved by the IRB(KWNUIRB-2018-07-006). Second, to write the teaching plan about 'receiving literature with a focus on the perspective of the viewer or speaker' from September 10 to 14, 2018, the participants were given the task to explain the viewer. To examine the aspects of misconceptions formed after learning, it is necessary to analyze knowledge construction according to the learning experience. Since pre-service teachers have experience learning about the viewer, they were not provided with a separate course about the viewer simply for this task. Moreover, they were asked not to refer to any books or theses about the viewer in the process of writing their explanations of it. Meanwhile, parts of Lee Hyo-Seok's "When Buckwheat Flowers Bloom" and parts of Eun Hee Kyung's "Great and Special Lovers" were provided as Example 1 and Example 2, and they were given the condition to use these texts. Third, this study analyzed the existence, aspects, and causes of misconceptions from 47 cases of data collected from pre-service teachers, from September 17 to 28, 2018. Cases in which the misconceptions were similar were categorized into the same type, and the types were labelled based on the characteristics of each aspect. Moreover, this study examined the characteristics of each type of misconception and analyzed the causes of their intervention in the formation of misconceptions.

III. Results and discussion

As a result of diagnosing and analyzing misconceptions from the aforementioned research data in Chapter 2, misconceptions were verified in 22 out of 47 data cases. These misconceptions can be categorized as shown in Table 3.

Table 3. Type of misconception about the viewer

Type	Content	Number
Type 1	The type that confuses the viewer with 'showing'	10
Type 2	The type that misunderstands the viewer as a type of point of view	8
Type 3	The type that fails to perceive the distinction between viewer and speaker	4
Total		22

1. Type 1: The type that confuses the viewer with 'showing'

The most common type of misconception about the viewer is that which explains the viewer based on showing, which is one of the modes of presentation. Showing is the oldest literary term that explains the modes of presentation along with telling. In the third book of Plato's *Republic*, Socrates categorizes poets speaking in their own voice as 'diegesis', and borrowing the voice of a character as mimesis. These dichotomous terms had their meaning either expanded or diminished in the history of poetics, and were established as the terms 'telling' and 'showing' by the end of the 19th century. Telling is a mode of presentation mediated by the narrator who explains, comments about, and evaluates events as well as the psychology and behaviors of the characters in general. On the other hand, showing is "the supposedly direct presentation of events and conversations, the narrator seeming to disappear and the reader being left to draw his own conclusions from what he 'sees' and 'hears'"(Rimmon-Kenan, 1983: 106-108).

Nevertheless, some pre-service teachers explained the concept of the viewer based on the use of showing.

(1) The speaker is how the narrator directly reveals the personalities and psychology of the characters and information about the events. With direct narration in which the narrator interferes between the readers and characters, the distance between the characters and readers increases, whereas that between the narrator and readers decreases. The viewer is the way the personalities and psychology of the characters and information about the events are indirectly implied by the conversations or actions. The conversations or descriptions decrease the distance between the characters and readers, whereas they increase the distance between the narrator and characters, or narrator and readers. [ⓐ-B-24]

(2) The viewer is literally a person who sees the phenomenon objectively at a distance rather than subjectively. Example 1 shows the narration as if watching the feelings of the characters from the side, and thus Example 1 shows the concept of the viewer, whereas Example 2 shows the concept of the speaker by revealing each thought on the surface in the narration. [ⓐ-A-18]

(3) Example 1 is narrated from the viewer's point of view. This method makes readers feel as if they have become an observer, which helps them better understand the literature overall. However, as they are observers, there are limitations in terms of the details they know about the internal psychology of the protagonist or surrounding characters as well as the events. Example 2 is narrated from the speaker's point of view. This method describes the situation by setting the protagonist or another character as the speaker, allowing readers to read and understand the literature according to the speaker's explanation. This may give a biased view (unlike the viewer), and may cause difficulty in interpreting the literature overall. [ⓐ-A-8]

In (1) above, the viewer is defined as the method that indirectly implies the characters and events through conversations and actions.

This is consistent with the definition of showing. Here, the viewer is confused with 'showing', which is one of the dichotomous modes of presentation.

The following characteristics of misconception can be identified in this type. First, the term 'speaker' is explained based on 'telling', another mode of presentation. This definition of the speaker is consistently present in the misconception of Type 1. The viewer-speaker pair is replaced by the showing-telling pair. Second, in applying the viewer to literary works reading, the viewer is used as a category that divides the work, not as a tool that analyzes it. As shown in (2) and (3), Example 1 is defined as a work in which the viewer stands out, whereas Example 2 is defined as a work in which the speaker stands out.

There are two factors involved in the formation of the misconception whereby the viewer is confused with showing. The primary factor is the misunderstanding with regard to 'see', which is one of the key concepts of the viewer. The viewer is the subject of seeing in narrative mediation. One thing to note is that 'see' here means more than simply 'seeing with the eyes'. As pointed out by Rimmon-Kenan(1983: 77-82), the viewer's seeing includes not only the perceptual facet but also psychological and ideological facets. In other words, "who sees?" refers to "Who perceives, conceives, assumes, understands, desires, remembers, dreams?"(O'Neill, 1992: 334). However, pre-service teachers that demonstrated this type of misconception all limited 'see' to 'seeing with the eyes'.

The second factor is the intervention of prerequisite learning about the characters. As two different modes of presentation, showing and telling are concepts learned by pre-service teachers in high school. These concepts are mostly presented in chapters covering the characters of novels, describing 'showing' as indirect presentation and 'telling' as direct definition. Pre-service teachers do not face much difficulty in understanding these concepts, because the contrast between indirect and direct that indicates the contrast of showing and telling,

and the contrast between 'only outside' and 'to the inside' help them more intuitively understand these concepts. Pre-service teachers that are familiar with these concepts may have absorbed the viewer within their knowledge about showing rather than perceiving it as a new concept.

2. Type 2: The type that misunderstands the viewer as a type of point of view

Another type of misconception is misunderstanding the viewer as a type of point of view. Point of view is the concept of 'how and in what position the narrator speaks', and is the most widely known concept in narrative theory. Brooks and Warren(1959: 148) provide a detailed explanation about types of point of view. As shown in the aforementioned definition of the concept, what is important in point of view is 'in what position' or 'how' the narrator speaks. According to these two criteria, point of view can be categorized into four types: first-person central point of view, first-person peripheral point of view, third-person omniscient point of view, and third-person objective point of view.

However, some pre-service teachers explain the viewer as a type of point of view.

(4) The viewer can be regarded as a first-person point of view. The speaker can be regarded as a third-person point of view. In Example 1, the narration is conducted from outside the story, and thus the narrator cannot be considered a character. The explanations help readers understand the personalities of the characters or relationships among them, and thus the narrator in Example 1 is the speaker. Example 2 is shown through direct conversation, and the narrator can be regarded as a character as he or she is inside the story. The conversation enables readers to directly understand the personalities, relationships between characters, and conflicts, and thus this is the viewer's point of view. [@-A-15]

(5) I think the speaker is the person who leads the story in the first-person central point of view or first-person peripheral point of view in literature. The viewer is the person who observes how the story proceeds from an objective position in the third-person point of view. For instance, in Example 1, the story is narrated from the viewer's point of view and the characters inside the story, such as Heo Saengwon and Dong-yi, are the speakers. In Example 2, the story is also narrated by the viewer, who seems to observe the conversations of the woman and man that are the speakers. [ⓐ-B-6]

(6) In Example 1, I think the viewer is someone who observes and narrates the events. The viewer merely predicts the psychology and thoughts of the characters through their actions. In Example 2, the speakers are 'she' and 'he'. Their conversations are directly quoted, and the speakers (he, she) are expressed as 'I' to narrate their psychology. I understood the concept of viewer and speaker as the third-person objective point of view and first-person central point of view. I am not certain whether this is a correct understanding. [ⓐ-B-5]

In (4), the viewer is described as the first-person point of view. On the other hand, (5) describes the viewer as the third-person point of view, and (6) as the third-person objective point of view. The contents of misconception are different, but all are the same in terms of misunderstanding the viewer as a type of point of view. The characteristics of this type of misconception are as follows.

First, the participants perceive point of view as a parent category of the viewer and speaker. Point of view is basically related to the speaker, approaching the speaker in terms of narrative structure, and thus as a structural attribute of the speaker. However, this type of misconception perceives point of view as a parent category to which the speaker belongs. Second, the participants explain the viewer and speaker in terms of the difference in 'what position they speak', which is a standard aspect of point of view. In this type of misconception, the pair of viewer and speaker is replaced by the pair of inside the

story and outside the story. One thing to note is that this replacement appears in different aspects among the pre-service teachers. As shown in the previous case, some explain the viewer as the first-person point of view and others as the third-person point of view. This is different from Type 1 where the participants all confused the viewer with showing.

In the formation of the misconception that the viewer is a type of point of view, it seems that the experience of prerequisite learning about point of view may have had a greater impact than linguistic misunderstanding. Point of view is an aspect of the curriculum that has represented the study of novels in literary education since the 4th Curriculum. Most pre-service teachers learn point of view as a key tool of mediation that expresses the characters and events at the story level in the second year of middle school. One thing to note is that learning about point of view has long meant learning about its types.[2] When learning about the viewer and the speaker in terms of two levels that mediate the story, pre-service teachers constructed their knowledge wrongly by simplifying mediation as point of view and levels as types.

3. Type 3: The type that fails to perceive the distinction between viewer and speaker

Not clearly perceiving the distinction between viewer and speaker is also one of the misconceptions about the viewer. The speaker is the term used in the curriculum, in which the term 'narrator' in narrative theory was replaced with a more comprehensible term. The

---

2   According to a study that traced the history of education on point of view, Korean language education circles have pointed out the issues in relation to the typology of point of view since the 7th Curriculum, and changed the focus of learning from study of types of point of view to study of the speaker's characteristics and defects. Even so, types of point of view have lasted persistently in the contents of education through textbooks, manuals for teachers, and study materials(Jeong, 2013: 441-458).

speaker is the one who tells a story(Abbott, 2008: 238). Readers hear a voice that talks about the story while reading a novel, and that voice belongs to the speaker. In the history of narrative theory, the speaker has been regarded as the most essential as well as the only tool of narrative mediation. This indicates that the distinction between viewer and speaker was not clearly perceived before Genette proposed the concept of focalization. Difficulty in perceiving this distinction can also be found in the knowledge construction of pre-service teachers.

(7) The speaker is the person who speaks about the characters and events. In Example 1, the speaker is someone outside the story, who discusses the conflict between Dong-yi and Heo Saengwon. That is the speaker. The viewer is related to the question of 'through whose eyes the story is conveyed'. In Example 2, the struggle between man and woman is conveyed through the eyes of someone outside the story. That is the viewer. [ⓐ-A-27]

(8) The viewer is the person who focuses on someone. The viewer is well revealed in Example 2. "A thought suddenly occurred to the woman. He doesn't care about me now because he thinks he owns me." The fact that the narrator changes from "the woman" to "me" shows that the narrator is focusing on the woman. The speaker narrates a story from someone's point of view. The speaker is well revealed in Example 1. Heo Saengwon is established as the speaker, narrating his thoughts about the Chungju lady and Dong-yi. [ⓐ-A-10]

In (7), the viewer is related to the question of 'through whose eyes the story is conveyed'. However, in analyzing the work, this pre-service teacher point out the speaker as the viewer, who is gazing at the man and woman outside the story. This confusion between the viewer and the speaker can also be found in (8). In this case, pre-service teachers think of the viewer as the person who focuses on someone, and point out the speaker as the subject of focalization in the analysis. This shows that they fail to clearly perceive the distinc-

tion between the viewer and speaker.

The characteristics of this type of misconception are as follows. First, the misconception originates from the target of the concept rather than its definition. In the aforementioned cases, descriptions such as 'through whose eyes the story is conveyed' or 'person who focalizes' include the subordinate concepts of the viewer such as 'conveying through the eyes' and 'focalization', and thus cannot determine the misconception by itself. However, the "speaker" is noted as the subject of the viewer in the analysis. The content of their analyses provides an important foundation for determining the misconception. Second, the viewer's 'see' is perceived as a narration level act. Narrative theory defines the speaker's 'tell' and the viewer's 'see' as different levels of act. While the former is at the narration, the latter is at the text(Rimmon-Kenan, 1983: 3-4). However, this type of misconception overlooks this difference and places the viewer's 'see' at the narration or confuses the levels of 'see' and 'tell'.

In forming the misconception of not perceiving the distinction between the viewer and speaker, there is primarily an everyday experience about storytelling. When telling a story, we generally use our own voice to talk about what we have seen, understood, and remember. In this storytelling experience, the viewer and speaker are the same. The explanations of pre-service teachers such as "The viewer(focalizer) and speaker(narrator) might be the same because only the person who witnessed an event can tell the story about it" ([ⓐ-A-10]) and "I am curious whether the two concepts can be divided dichotomously even though there is a clear difference between the two" ([ⓐ-A-37]) originate from this experience. As such, everyday experiences of storytelling cause the participants to misunderstand the viewer and speaker as the same person in analyzing the work, even though they are described as conceptually different.

Prerequisite learning about the speaker is also one of the main causes. The concept of the viewer was first presented in the 2015 Revised Curriculum. Before then, the key element of mediation was

the speaker. One thing to note is that these curriculums describe the speaker as the subject of 'eyes'.

Table 4. Achievement standard about the speaker in each curriculum

Curriculum	Achievement Standard	Grade
7th	Determine through whose eyes works is conveyed.	8
2007 Revised	Determine through whose eyes the world of the literary works is conveyed.	7-9
2012 Revised	Receive literary works by determining through whose eyes the world of the literary works is conveyed.	7-9
2015 Revised	Receive literary works with a focus on the perspective of the viewer or speaker.	7-9

From the 7th Curriculum to the 2012 Revised Curriculum, the subject of eyes in the achievement standard was the speaker. This achievement standard relates to determining who the speaker is and how the personal characteristics of the speaker affect the reception of the work. Emphasis on the speaker as the subject of eyes may serve as an obstacle for pre-service teachers in separating the speaker from the viewer.

It should be noted that the materials selected for implementing this achievement standard in a textbook are first-person narrative in which a young girl and boy recall recent events. According to a study that explored the history of accepting the speaker in literary education (Jeong, 2013: 456), the works included in textbooks to teach students about the speaker are Ju Yo-seop's "The Houseguest and My Mother" and Kim Yu-Jeong's "The Camellias." These works are first-person narrative recalling recent events, and the speaker and viewer comprise the same 'I'. The experience of learning about the speaker in fictions where the speaker and viewer are not separated serves as an obstacle to accepting the possibility that the speaker and viewer may exist separately in a fiction.

IV. Implications

This study has examined and categorized aspects of pre-service teachers' misconceptions about the viewer, which is one of genre knowledge, while discussions about misconceptions are nonexistent in literary education. The results can be used significantly in learning about the viewer, research on misconceptions of genre knowledge in literary education, and teacher education.

First, there are implications for learning about the viewer. Information about pre-service teachers' misconceptions about the viewer provides cognitive grounds for proper knowledge construction in developing teaching materials and designing classes about the viewer. The results of analyzing misconceptions in subject knowledge provide information not only about 'what must be known' by pre-service teachers but also about 'what they misunderstand', 'how they misunderstand', and 'what causes them to misunderstand'. This information provides insight into ways to increase the possibility of proper knowledge construction in selecting and systemizing contents of education.

The aspects of pre-service teachers' misconceptions about the viewer could be categorized into the type that confuses the viewer with 'showing', the type that misunderstands the viewer as a type of point of view, and the type that does not perceive the distinction between the viewer and the speaker. These aspects are related to the fact that when pre-service teachers construct knowledge about the viewer, they are greatly affected by prerequisite learning experiences related to showing and telling, types of point of view, and the speaker. Using these experiences is a key strategy to learn and understand knowledge, because knowing itself has a procedural and constructive character. The problem is that these prerequisite learning experiences have an excessive effect and absorb the viewer as one of the existing concepts rather than perceiving it as a new concept. In this sense, learning about the viewer must include contents or learning activities

that verify the relations and differences between the existing concepts of narration and the viewer.

Meanwhile, many pre-service teachers who demonstrated misconceptions misunderstood the meaning of 'see' as a subordinate concept of the viewer. The viewer's 'see' is a complicated act that has not only perceptual but also psychological and ideological facets. However, pre-service teachers perceived the viewer's 'see' only in terms of the visual facet or misunderstood it as 'objectively conveying the character's actions and events', 'view' in the point of view, and the speaker's 'perspective'. This misunderstanding about the viewer's 'see' is a concern raised several times in various discussions about focalization(Rimmon-Kenan, 1983: 71-72). In this sense, it is important to clearly explain the meaning and various facets of "see" as the subordinate concept in learning about the viewer. If necessary, inquiry activities can be organized to compare the adjacent concepts of 'see', such as 'show' of 'showing'.

Finally, pre-service teachers' misconceptions about the viewer include not only concept definition but also concept structure. Understanding concept definition means that one knows the meaning of the concept and can apply it. Knowing the viewer means that one can understand the definition of the viewer and can interpret a literary work with a focus on the viewer. Understanding the concept structure means knowing that the concept is an element of a specific system and understanding its structure and location. In this perspective, knowing the viewer means understanding that this concept is an element of the narrative system and is located in the text distinguished from the story and the narration(Rimmon-Kenan, 1983: 71-74). The viewer may be one of the characters or the speaker. However, in terms of structure, the viewer is distinguished by principle from the character in the story and the speaker in the narration. The misconception whereby the viewer is confused with showing, or the distinction between the viewer and speaker is not clearly perceived, is based on inadequate understanding of this structural dimension.

Therefore, in learning about the viewer, it is necessary to emphasize that this concept belongs to the text in the narrative system, that the text is a spoken or written discourse, and that it consists of the viewer; that is, focalization together with time and characterization(Rimmon-Kenan, 1983: 3). If necessary, inquiry activities can be organized to compare which layers of narrative the characters, viewer, and speaker belong to.

Second, there are implications about studies on misconceptions of genre knowledge in literary education. As examined above, discussions about misconceptions began later in Korean language education than in other subjects. Moreover, most initial studies have been in grammar education. However, considering the status of knowledge as contents of literary education and the functions of genre knowledge, which meta-cognitively adjusts appreciation and the creation of works and intensifies literary experience, literary education must also lead to the inquiry of knowledge construction and the misconceptions of learners, pre-service teachers, and teachers beyond misconceptions about curriculums and textbooks. To this end, it is necessary to establish perspectives and methodologies to approach misconceptions in genre knowledge, and to provide an analytical framework and categories for future reference by specifically verifying the aspects of misconceptions. This study analyzed the types and formation causes of misconceptions by analyzing data in which pre-service teachers explained the viewer. Of course, 47 data cases are not sufficient to holistically examine pre-service teachers' misconceptions about the viewer. Data must be collected and analyzed continuously, and the subject of misconception must be expanded to other elements of genre knowledge aside from the viewer. Research must be conducted on the misconceptions of learners and teachers in middle and high school. Research on misconceptions in literary education is expected to be conducted more actively by referring to and using the analysis methods, types, and formation causes of misconceptions described in this study.

Third, there are implications for substantializing teacher education in literary education. It is also difficult to find discussions about misconceptions by teachers or pre-service teachers in studies about misconceptions in Korean language education. This seems to be due to 'the traditional perception that regards teachers as authorities and experts of knowledge'(Nam, 2013b: 137). Teacher education also focuses on transmitting elaborate knowledge and the latest theories of curriculums and studies to pre-service teachers. However, it is necessary to consider that pre-service teachers and teachers are both subjects constructing knowledge and may thus be directly involved in misconceptions as well.

In this respect, it is not desirable to see misconceptions merely as a product of failure in education that must be eliminated. This is because misconceptions are the starting point of inquiry as well as the results of learning(Jo, 2014: 296). Pre-service teachers ask the question 'what they do not know' or 'what must be changed in the knowledge they have constructed', in addition to the traditional question of 'what they must know' through their misconceptions about the viewer. These questions are advanced to the question of 'what must they consider in teaching students about the viewer'. Inquiry and transformation of misconceptions based on these questions must make up the contents of teacher education. This is because teachers are 'reflective practitioners' who reflect on and change their knowledge as they feel responsible for the powerful influence their teachings have on learners' knowledge.

REFERENCES

Abbott, H. P. (2008). *The cambridge introduction to narrative*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Bak, J. M. & Kang, M. Y. (2016). A study on misconceptions of high school students about grammar: Focusing on the phoneme. *Korean Education, 108*, 59-88.

Bal, M. (2009). *Narratology-introduction to the theory of narrative*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Brooks, C. & Warren, R. P. (1959). *Understanding fiction*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.

Genette, G. (1985). *Narrative discourse*. Ithaca: Cornell Univ. Press.

Jeon, J. A. (2010). Constructivist's perspectives on knowledge reexamined. *The Journal of Curriculum Studies, 19*(2), 207-224.

Jeong, J. R. (2012). A proposal to improve the application of literary theories and concepts in literature textbooks: Focusing on the concepts of "empathy" and "sympathy". *The Journal of Korean Studies, 40*, 253-274.

Jeong, J. S. (2013). A historical consideration and improvements on 'point of view' in novel education. *The Society for Korean Language & Literary Research, 41*(3), 439-474.

Jeong, R. P. (2018). Perform perspective of focalization theory in reading novels education. *The Society for Korean Language & Literary Research, 46*(1), 333-359.

Jo, J. S. (2014). A study on learners' misconceptions about 'free' and 'bound' morpheme. *Grammar Education, 21*, 269-306.

Jo, J. S. (2017). An epistemological approach to grammar misconceptions. *Korean Language Education Research, 52*(4), 343-368.

Kim, D. H. (2009). A reflective study on the concept of 'point of view' in novel education. *Korean Literature Education Research, 30*, 393-421.

Kim, D. H. (2013). A study on the method of reestablishing theoretical conception for novel education. *Korean Literature Education Research, 40*, 163-205.

Kim, H. J., Kim, E. S., Nam, K. Y. & Park, J. H. (2009). Inquiring the direction of research for misconception in Korean language education. *Korean Education, 83*, 211-238.

Kim, S. J. (2009). A study on the relation between context and genre in narrative education. *Korean Literature Education Research, 30*, 291-312.

Ko, Y. J., & Lee, H. J. (2014). Pre-service science teachers' understanding of students' misconceptions in physics and perceptions on "teacher as a researcher"

through the research experience. *Journal of the Korean Association for Science Education, 34*(5), 449-457.

Lee, K. H. & Jo, J. S. (2015). A study on misconception typology of grammar teachers. *Korean Education, 120*, 107-152.

Lim, K. S. (1997). A study on the novel education through "focalization". *Korean Language Education, 95*, 109-129.

Nam, K. Y. (2012). Grammar education and grammar textbooks. *Korean Linguistics, 57*, 1-34.

Nam, K. Y. (2013a). Factors in grammar textbook leading to learners' misconception: In the units for 'word formation'. *Urimalgeul, 57*, 109-137.

Nam, K. Y. (2013b). Analysis on preservice Korean teachers' development of grammar assessment items. *The Journal of Curriculum and Evaluation, 16*(3), 121-145.

O'Neill, P. (1992). *Fictions of discourse: Reading narrative theory*. Toronto & London: University of Toronto Press.

Park, K. B. (2008). Reflection and proposal on education of viewpoint-narration of novel. *Korean Language Education Research, 31*, 323-356.

Rimmon-Kenan, S. (1983). *Narrative fiction: Contemporary poetics*. London & New York: Routledge.

Seon, J. W. (2004). Novel teaching for understanding and expression. *Korean Literature Education Research, 13*, 171-204.

Shin, M. S. (2017). Misconceptions and the customs of the textbook's embodiment method in Korean language education contents: Focusing on 'characteristics of language' in grammar area. *Grammar Education, 31*, 87-134.

Treagust, D. F. (1988). Development and use of diagnostic tests to evaluate students' misconceptions in science. *International Journal of Science Education, 10*(2), 159-169.

Yun, S. G., Kim, C. M., & Park, Y. H. (2007). *Misconceptions and instruction in biology education*. Seoul: World Science.

ABSTRACT

A Study on Pre-Service Teachers' Misconceptions about the Viewer

Jeong, Jinseok

This study investigated the possibility and direction for research on misconceptions in literary education by analyzing the aspects of pre-service teachers' misconceptions about the viewer. The viewer refers to the position or quality of consciousness through which we 'see' events in the narrative. Readers are influenced by not only the speaker's voice but also the viewer's view. Depending on who is selected as the viewer, readers may have a different understanding, feeling, and judgment about a literary work. The viewer was first presented in the 2015 Revised Curriculum. Considering that the viewer is a concept unfamiliar even to teachers and that it is difficult to distinguish it from the speaker, diverse learners' and teachers' misconceptions will be formed in the process of teaching the concept. This study analyzed the existence, aspects, and causes of misconceptions from 47 cases of data collected from pre-service teachers. Cases in which the misconceptions were similar were categorized into the same type, and the types were labelled based on the characteristics of each aspect. And this study examined the characteristics of each type of misconception and analyzed the causes of their intervention in the formation of misconceptions. The aspects of pre-service teachers' misconceptions about the viewer could be categorized into the type that confuses the viewer with 'showing', the type that misunderstands the viewer as a type of point of view, and the type that does not perceive the distinction between the viewer and the speaker. These aspects are related to the fact that when pre-service teachers construct knowledge about the viewer, they are greatly affected by prerequisite learning experiences related to

showing and telling, types of point of view, and the speaker. Finally, based on the results of the analysis, this study suggested three implications for learning of the viewer, studies on literature misconceptions and substantializing literature teacher education.