Learning English as a second language in South Korea: Perceptions of 2nd year college and university students and their English speaking instructors.

Presented in Partial fulfillment of the Requirements for

The Master Degree of Education of Second Language Learning at the

Graduate School of

The University of Southern Queensland

By

John G. Thornton

*****

The University of Southern Queensland

October 30th, 2009

Dr. Anne Dashwood, Adviser

ABSTRACT

This study aims to canvass views about foreign language learning from second year South Korean university students of English and native English instructors. Their beliefs are considered in juxtaposition with the principles of Second Language Acquisition theory (SLA) and within the broader context of South Korea in general. Hence, the significance of this study is educational and cross-cultural. It attempts (a) to describe and investigate perceptions of EFL instruction at the collegiate and university levels in S. Korea with 2nd year students and their instructors, (b) to identify some of the strengths and weaknesses of their approach to second language acquisition and explore how closely the student and teacher perceptions align with SLA theory, and (c) to explore the conditions in the S. Korean context that may have led to these beliefs.

This project applies a quantitative survey method, complemented with qualitative interviews, to a cross-section of 2nd year students from a two-year junior college, a private university, and a national university in Busan, South Korea. The raw survey data has been comparatively analyzed through mean, standard deviation, and T-test results, whereas the interviews have provided information that has been organized in support of developing themes.

The results showed that, generally, the students from all three types of education facilities shared similar perceptions toward second language acquisition. Likewise, the instructor's results were also consistent. However, there were significant differences between the instructors and students upon specific survey items and with their responses in juxtaposition with recent SLA findings.

Based on the findings of this project, this study will extend the data in the field of second language research in South Korea, as it has implications that directly encroach upon 'what' and 'how' instructors teach and in what ways students learn.

Dedication

For M and H,

……………………………………………and your patience.

Acknowledgements

Table of Contents

Chapter 1: The Context of the Study

Chapter 2: Review of Literature

Chapter 3: Research Methodology

Chapter 4. Results

Chapter 5. Discussion

Chapter 6. Conclusions and Recommendations

Appendix 1: Fig.S1. Lightbown & Spada's Survey: <u>Popular opinions about language learning and teaching </u>(2006). Page 93.

Appendix 2: Fig.S2. Instructor Survey/ Beliefs about Foreign Language Learning. Page 95.

Chapter 1

The Context of the Study

_____

Background

South Korea has achieved remarkable economic development from the1960s, known as the 'Miracle on the Han River', through the implementation of growth-oriented economic policies. Alongside its economic growth, opportunities for secondary education increased with its first national curriculum (1955 -1962). In the subsequent years to the year 1999, or towards the end of its sixth national curriculum, the Korean Education Ministry attempted to find new approaches to improve education across the nation as the conventional methods of education were no longer suitable. "In response to a changing society, the Korean government established a new vision for education. Unveiled by the Presidential Commission on Educational Reform in May 1995, this vision projected open, lifelong education that would provide individuals with equal and easy access to education at any time and place" (Diem, 2001, p.7). Likewise, from the year 2000 to the present has been a period of 'education restructuring', the seventh national curriculum, aimed at producing a knowledge-based society in order to meet the demands and challenges that come with globalization (Koh, 2007).

English education has become part of South Korea's national desire, as it is also tied to economic want to become an international hub of finance in its region. The idea being that, if English is used freely as the 'lingua franca' of business in the region, this will draw foreign investment to South Korea. Therefore, the sixth and seventh national curricula have attempted to increase the amount of Communicative Language Learning (CLL), moving away from the traditional behavioral techniques of rote memorization and grammar translation, for students in elementary, middle, and high school to help improve their speaking proficiency. However, "critics point out that in the ensuing five years most classroom practices have remained unchanged" (Diem, 2001, p. 8). One reason for this rigidity to change, despite locally elected

boards of education, is that education policy has to move through a hierarchical, top-down, model of decision making to become implemented, and this process is prejudiced against the contribution of parents and teachers (Diem, 2001). Although there may be a myriad of reasons why educational change is a difficult process in South Korea, many of the problems stem from three problematic spheres of influence: the College Entrance Exam (CEE), the Chaebol, and, in general, the Korean culture.

The Collegiate Scholastic Aptitude Test (CSAT)

One negative effect of the college entrance exam is that it creates an examination-centered education or a teaching-to-the-test mentality. Since the CSAT is critical to the type and rank of university the student attends, as well as the employment he or she seeks, this rationalization of teaching to the test affects curriculum management and development and, hence, subject content, teaching methodology, and evaluation assessment (Koh, 2007). Therefore, when the federal ministry of education suggests a change in direction, it is usually met with confusion on behalf of the students because teachers are then forced to teach and assess differently. Also, the parents complain because they believe a change in direction may take away from their child's opportunity in the future, believing the tried and true methods of the past should not be altered. The unwanted ideas toward change, and attitudes that envelope them are further exacerbated by the vast sums of money spent each year at 'cram schools' throughout the nation. One estimate has education costs at 17% of the nation's GNP, and 1.9% of that total, or 15 trillion won (15.8 billion US dollars) on foreign language education (Garakapati, 2008). Finally, the exam itself does not include an oral English proficiency part even though the English criteria are greatly considered for college entrance. This also has a decided 'negative backwash' effect upon the teaching and, subsequently, upon what the middle and high school students study.

The Chaebol

Coincidentally, the chaebol, or the large, diversified, international companies that provide employment for most people in South Korea, always include a TOEIC or TOEFL score box on

the front cover of their job application forms. As with the CSAT, the perceptions of employment opportunities attached to this score, and the prevailing sentiment of healthy economic future for the next generation, are extremely high. In this way, companies like Samsung, LG, and Hyundai, also enforce teach-to-the-test mentality and are partially accountable for the continual inflexibility in the education system. The test results prove the rigidity of the educational system as, coincidently, the traditional perceptions of education and advancement are still prevalent. From 2004 to 2005, the TOEFL scores of Korean applicants ranked 93rd among 147 nations. In September 2006, when a speaking section replaced the grammar section in the TOEFL exam, the South Korean rank dropped to 111th. In the speaking section alone, Korea ranked almost last at 134th (Chosun IIbo, 2007).

The Culture

The South Korean identity crisis has to be considered as a latent drawback to learning any foreign language. While some argue that there is no direct relation between language and national identity (Kuninski, 2000), South Korean purists believe English is a threat to their identity, and this idea can inform language belief(s). Historically, the Korean language was outlawed during the Japanese occupation of Korea (1910-1945), as was Korean culture and literature. Previous governments, the media and educators, have advocated the preservation of the Korean language and some have gone so far as citing that recent loan words of English, used in the Korean language (referred to as Konglish), are a threat to the purity of the Korean language and the Korean psyche (Park, 1989). For these reasons, the potential development and use of the English language in South Korean education are resisted.

Further, South Korean society is also patriarchic and hierarchical, dependant on gender and age for its leadership, and is therefore top-down in its decision making (Kim, 2004). It follows, then, that people in this society inevitably embrace a 'herd' or the collective mentality. This makes the 'idea of change', in the classroom or in approaches to employment or thinking for one-self away from the 'norm', difficult.

The Confucian religion is dominant in South Korean society and has a long tradition of respect for the teacher's position in the classroom. Consequently, the traditional perception of the teacher, being the center of all activity, limits the effectiveness of foreign language learning.

3

Generally, the teacher's unquestioned position, does not allow for, or makes awkward, student activities such as language exchange with one another and/ group activities. This inflexibility limits the number of new language methods to be employed, also making communicative language techniques redundant.

Introduction

This project embraces a small, cross-section of 2nd year students at three different higher learning education facilities in Busan, South Korea, and attempts to compare student and foreign instructor beliefs through a survey of '*Popular opinions about language learning and teaching*' (Fig.S1). This study aims to canvass views about foreign language learning from native English speakers and second year S. Korean university students of English. It considers these beliefs in juxtaposition with the principles of Second Language Acquisition theory (SLA). Significance of this study is cross-cultural, educational, and has implications that can directly encroach upon what and how a teacher teaches, and how, and in what ways, students learn. These findings and data may be used to benefit other students and researchers of second language learning in the future, and raise student awareness of SLA in the present.

The students range in age, generally, between 20 and 25 years, and will have begun their elementary education in the 1990s, a period just before the changes toward a more communicative learning with the national curriculum reform of 1995. Likewise, in their more formative years of secondary education, in their middle and high school years, most of the students should have been introduced to the communicative changes before their university entrance exam. Their responses could inform us if the changes in the national curriculum had any effect upon how they have learnt English as a second language. If not, then we might expect the responses to surround the more traditional behaviorist teaching methods.

In any event, the role of the foreign instructor cannot be overlooked as an influence upon the student responses as well. In 2007, South Korea employed 17,826 foreign language instructors and most of them native English speakers (Song, 2007). There has to be more effects, outside of 'Konglish', upon the English second language learners in this nation from having this many native speakers of English; where the native language is non-cognate with English. For better,

4

some foreign instructors have appropriate ESL/EFL degrees and certificates that leave them knowledgeable about how to conduct a second language classroom but, and for much worse, many only have a bachelor degree in any subject other than English or second language teaching. This leaves their range of responses wide open in terms of second language acquisition but closed, at the same time, if we consider they may all share similar beliefs about education since they share a similar background in western education and culture.

Ultimately, the administrations of the individual schools may have an effect upon the responses in this study. These administrations hire and can control the native instructor's curriculum. Therefore, they may also, wittingly or unwittingly, alter student and/ instructor perceptions through their own internal curricula policies, or through the use of external policies such as federal education curricula change or immigration visa requirements, for example. With regards to external policies, EFL curriculum at junior colleges, private universities, or national universities; where there are no guidelines for EFL education from the federal ministry of education outside of the duration of the course (minimum15 weeks) (M.R. Park, personal communication, April 20, 2009), schools are free to hire the most qualified instructors available or potentially 'tie' their English speaking employees to lapses in immigration policy, through their visa-status, to increase their school's federal subsidy allowance. Likewise, tertiary school administrators could choose to develop a curriculum based upon the student's requirements, through the work of a proper 'needs assessment'. Implicitly, for the students, and perhaps explicitly for the instructors, the beliefs of both groups are being influenced by the choices made by their school administrators.

This is the starting point of this study that attempts to sample the beliefs about foreign language learning and teaching in South Korea.

On the one hand, teachers are influenced by what they know, their background knowledge, and by their environment 'at work', the context they find themselves in that usually dictates over the curriculum they must teach. Their situation affects them in the present, as they teach, and afterwards with their reflections upon the outcome of each class. The instructor information from their work context has been gathered by means of interview style questions, and is brought together with their survey responses through triangulation of the data. The analysis of this data

can potentially allow us to see why teachers teach the way they teach since, to some extent, their teaching 'style' or methods must be based on what they believe. With over 17,000 native instructors in South Korea, increasingly made up of recent B.A. holders from English speaking Commonwealth nations, all of whom are qualified to teach at tertiary institutes by South Korean federal law; there is justifiable need to question their teaching method beliefs.

On the other hand, the information taken from the three groups of different, but typical, college and university students will permit us to connect with the 'mean' of student responses through the survey and this information can help us understand why these learners learn the way they do.

Finally, the nature of 'belief' itself, being either supported by theoretical fact and/ evidence or as social fact, dependant on other structures for belief, helps create an atmosphere of possibility to this study that can lead us in different and unexpected directions, reminiscent of the 'mysteries' at the center of studies in language acquisition itself: how languages are learned.

1. Statement of the Problem

This study will explore the beliefs of 'how foreign languages are learned' from 2nd year Korean students, majoring in English, and from their instructors. These results will then be juxtaposed with current SLA theory. The students and instructors have been solicited from three representative tertiary institutions in Busan, South Korea: a 2 year, private, community college, a private 4 year university, and a 4 year Korean national university.

South Korea is an interesting area for second language research for several reasons. First, South Korea has increased its desire to learn English as a second language since it feels that its economic expansion hinges on its ability to communicate with other, more 'globalized', English speaking nations. To this end, changes in the national curriculum since 1995 have emphasized a more communicative syllabus with regards to English as a second language. In terms of research, then, the changes in the national syllabus should be reflected in the present day college and university students' beliefs' as they were approximately 7 years old when the movement away from the traditional behaviorist methods of second language learning were dismissed. Contrary to this assumption, however, runs tradition of the college entrance exam (CSAT) that has been in

place for over 30 years. This exam embraces the more traditional language learning methods like rote memorization and grammar translation, and is responsible for a negative backwash (Hughes, 2003) effect upon the high school classrooms. One would think that these behaviorist methods would have been dismissed with the student's entrance to university but, since the major employers in South Korea demand TOEIC and TOEFL scores upon their job applications, they are reinforced again when students begin their employment search. In this way, the students in South Korea have been torn between differing language assessments, subsequently affecting their approaches to language learning, for their entire educational lives. Secondly, the native speakers in English instructors come from a variety of countries and academic disciplines, but generally share a 'western' educational background. These instructors are employed by different universities and colleges throughout South Korea and may be asked to teach from a syllabus provided by their individual employer. The instructor's beliefs are paramount to the methods he/she may employ in the classroom and, with success or failure may influence their pedagogic choices in the future. Finally, how closely will the student and instructor beliefs be related? There may be strong parity or disparity made evident from the data, however other possibilities may be triangulated by way of institutional and cultural differences or traditional practices. Therefore, research that investigates the perceptions of students and instructors of English at the college and university level should provide insight and/ implication towards change.

For the purpose of this study, a quantitative survey method with qualitative interview questions were applied and cross-referenced with three different levels of tertiary institutes, college, private university, and national university, to help achieve a representative sample of the beliefs of foreign language learning from students and instructors in Busan, South Korea. A survey questionnaire, jointly with semi-structured interviews, was used to collect data for this project.

2. *The Research Questions*

1. What beliefs about language learning do L2 learners embrace?

2. What differences are there in the beliefs of how second languages learned between 2nd year English students and their native English speaking instructors?

3. In what ways do the perceptions of students correspond with the English curriculum authorized by the college or university?

3. *Definition of Terms*

EFL: This acronym refers to English as a Foreign Language (EFL). This conveys the idea that a person is studying English as an additional language in an environment in which English is not the dominant language.

ESL: This acronym refers to English as Second Language (ESL). This conveys the idea that a person is studying English as a foreign language in view of the fact that their native language is not English but they are studying in a country where English is the language most often spoken. It is sometimes mistakenly made synonymous with EFL.

SLA: Second Language Acquisition (SLA) is the process by which people attain a second or additional language in addition to their native. The term second language is used to refer to a language learned after their mother tongue or first language.

CSAT: The College Entrance Exam (CEE) is the test all students must pass to gain entrance to a college or university in South Korea. Students are generally placed by their CEE score into a college or university of an equivalent level.

Chaebol: Chaebol refers to the South Korean form of business conglomerate. They are government-supported, economically powerful, multi-national companies that own and operate numerous international enterprises. They are a major employer of the people of South Korea.

Visa (immigration) requirements: The immigration law sets 'visa-levels' for foreign instructors in its country based on qualifications. For example, a PHD or MA holder in a needed or specific field of an academy would be considered an E-1 visa holder, and federal subsidy is possible for the employer. All other degree holders (i.e. BA History, BA Sociology, etc) would be given E-2 visas. However, if either holder marries a native South Korean, they receive an F-2 visa, which also allows subsidy from the federal government to stream to their employers. Therefore, it is possible, under these conditions, that employers could hire F-2 visa holders to gain subsidy, as opposed to hiring instructors upon their merit.

TOEIC: The Test of English for International Communication (TOEIC) is an English language test designed to measure English skills of people working in an international environment.

TOEFL: The Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL) evaluates the potential success of an individual to use and understand academic English at a college level. It is used as a scale of proficiency for non-native applicants at many English-speaking colleges and universities.

4. Basic Assumptions

The participants in this project are 2nd year college and university English undergraduate students and native English speaking instructors, from a national university, a private university, and a community college, in Busan, South Korea. We assume that there are the fewest possible constrictions for English study at this level, such as the CSAT or the TOEIC or TOEFL scores needed for employment. Therefore, these students may well be freer and more oriented towards communicative approaches to language learning.

In terms of research methodology, the following assumptions have been made:

1. The subjects are competent of making reliable evaluations of their English abilities and the overall college EFL curriculum of their required English course program.

5. Significance of the Study

The purpose of this study is compare the beliefs or perceptions of how foreign languages are taught and learned from 2nd year English students with those of their native English speakers. These results will then be compared with current SLA theory. Beliefs can be categorized as facilitative or inhibitive depending on which forms of SLA are accepted as the 'norm' at that time. For example, in the 1950's grammar translation and rote memorization were the 'norm' to learning an additional language but, today, methods have become more communicative and emphasis is now on allowing learners to construct meanings through conversational models. Therefore, significance of this study can be cross-cultural and educational, as this study can have implications that can directly encroach upon what and how a teacher teaches and in what ways, and under what conditions, students have learnt and do learn. Beliefs, to some extent, must be based on what students and teachers believe to be true, derived from their own experience or

theoretical understanding with a foreign language. Likewise, at any given time, the constructs that are created through change or development in SLA theory are accepted and analogous with 'fact' because they are based on research results of both quantitative and qualitative results made by professionals in the field of second language acquisition. Beliefs, then, can be winnowed to a position that will coincide with accepted theoretical approaches or will be left some distance from it.

Beliefs can also be affected in the nearer present since students are taught by native teachers whose background knowledge of 'how to teach' has been 'affected', knowingly or without knowing, by his or her education or by their college administrators. As there are no federal Ministry of Education guidelines for the tertiary level English curriculum, the teachers' methods can affect student perceptions in a positive or negative way.

Potentially, beliefs of how foreign languages are learned are formed in a myriad of ways. This small project cannot explain how beliefs are passed on through different cultural circumstances, in culturally distinct societies, to their students and teachers. It can, however, accept the average response from both groups (students and instructors) and attempt to understand them in the present and through their relevant past. This study aims to canvass views about foreign language learning from native English speakers and second year South Korean university students of English. It considers these beliefs in juxtaposition with the principles of Second Language Acquisition theory (SLA).

By identifying the beliefs held by students about language learning, and contrasting these perceptions with their instructor's views, and the influences associated with their teaching English as a foreign language in South Korea, we learn about what the present day attitudes and approaches are towards learning an additional language in South Korea. From this point forward, this project can generate awareness, if not interest, about foreign language learning that can, in turn, influence other researchers.

Chapter 2

Review of Literature

_____

Introduction

This chapter presents relevant approaches and studies to beliefs about language learning and their effects upon attitudes towards English in the Korean tertiary context. This chapter consists of 5 parts: 1. Approaches to Belief structures. 2. A theoretical framework with reference to the differences between EFL and ESL. 3. SLA Approaches/ Beliefs. 4. Research upon student and instructor 'beliefs' in South Korea. 5. Korean Cultural Context.

Approaches to Belief structures

Beliefs are difficult to discuss. Mori points out that "one important finding of epistemological belief studies is that individuals' beliefs are characterized as a complex system consisting of multiple dimensions (Mori, 1999, p. 381). This makes it difficult to create a valid theoretical construct of beliefs for use in research.

One fundamental problem pertaining to beliefs about language learning is distinguishing beliefs from knowledge. Pajares observes that the difference between constructs, even if they are in degree and not in kind, will depend on how researchers choose to operationalize them. Hence, one main problem will always be the lack of commonly used operational definitions between what constitutes 'knowledge' and what constitutes 'belief' structures (Pajares, 1992).

Thus, there have been numerous attempts to define language learning beliefs. Bernat and Gvozdenko (2005) noticed that definitions of language learning beliefs vary dramatically, for example: 'mini theories about language' (Hosenfeld, 1978); 'insights about language' (Omaggio, 1978); 'culture of learning' (Bensen & Lore, 1999); 'learner assumptions' (Riley, 1980); 'implicit theories'(Clark, 1988); 'self-constructed representational systems' (Rust, 1980); and

'conceptions of learning'(Bensen & Lore, 1999). This selection of definitions suggests of the many different approaches from which language learning beliefs have been studied.

Generally, the literature on language learning beliefs can be separated into two different categories: facilitative and inhibitive beliefs. Facilitative beliefs are realistic, supportive, and positive, that increase motivation and lead to successful language learning. Inhibitive beliefs are unrealistic, unsupportive, negative beliefs that usually decrease motivation, create anxiety, and lead to ineffective learning (Bernat & Gvozdenko, 2005; Oh, 1996). At the classroom level, differences between teacher and student beliefs can cause dissatisfaction, anxiety, and tension between teachers and students (Cotterall, 1995; Kern, 1995; Berat & Gvozenko, 2005). Kuntz (1996) observed, 'knowledge of student beliefs makes it possible for teachers to create a mode of instruction in which students' needs and goals are satisfied'.

Research approaches to language learning beliefs

There are a variety of research methodological approaches that have been used to research language learning beliefs. All of the approaches use different data collection techniques and methods of analysis. Bernat & Gvozdenko (2005) suggest three general categories: the normative approach, the meta-cognitive approach, and the contextual approach. The following sub-sections refer to their work:

The normative approach: Normative approach research studies typically use standard surveys that present a series of statements of belief about language learning and offers language teachers an opportunity to state their level of agreement by indicating a position on a 'Likert scale'. Responses can be quantified and analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistics. This style of research in SLA literature has its origin in Horwitz's (1985) 'Beliefs About Language Learning Inventory', commonly known as the BALLI style. BALLI research has been conducted in many contexts. Despite the popularity of this approach, the inability of closed surveys to offer explanatory opportunities to respondents has been one of the greatest criticisms of normative approaches to researching language learning beliefs. Nevertheless, the BALLI strand of research seems to have generated interesting results that have provided a foundation for exploring beliefs. This project will use a normative research component to help uncover language learning beliefs.

The meta-cognitive approach: Meta-cognitive research studies include an interpretive paradigm to explore language learning beliefs through the use of semi-structured interviews and diaries to help researchers reflect upon their own learning (Bernat & Gvozdenko, 2005). The open response style of these types of studies allow research subjects to exceed the limited items and closed responses of a survey instrument, as it adds more flexibility to explore more deeply into conflicting areas of inquiry. Unlike the normative approach, the research subjects set the items to be explored, not the researcher (Goh, 1997; Wenden, 2001). This project will use a meta-cognitive approach to gain insight into beliefs.

The contextual approach: The contextual approach investigates language learning beliefs 'as embedded in student contexts' (Bernat & Gvozdenko, 2005). Similar to the meta-cognitive approach, the contextual approach uses an interpretive paradigm of primarily ethnographic methods. This type of research implicitly subscribes to the naturalist-ecological perspective which 'is the belief that the context in which the behavior occurs has a significant influence on the behavior' (Nunan, 1992). Benson & Lore (1999) questioned 'whether the notion of learner beliefs as conceived in the SLA literature is adequate to capture the complexity of learners' thinking' and maintained that 'the notion of approaches to learning is proposed as a category describing the level at which beliefs are made manifest in specific contexts of learning' (Benson & Lore, 1999). The contextual approach is relevant to this project in two general ways: first, the entire study has been is done in an EFL setting and second, Korean culture is a context of influence and, therefore, is one potential limitation to this study.

Theoretical framework - EFL and ESL

The acronyms ESL and EFL are often confused because they both suggest English learning but these learning environments are completely different. The acronym EFL refers to English as a foreign language. It is defined as "English for learners who come from a country where English is not spoken as a mother tongue" (Scrivener, 2005, p.426) and where English is almost always not spoken outside the classroom in public. Therefore, EFL students have fewer chances to practice with native speakers because the language outside the classroom is not English. However, like in China, S. Korea, and Japan, English is a central school subject because it is usually necessary to pass a university entrance examination. It may also be used as a language

for certain courses at a university, and/ a percentage of students' textbooks. It may be related for people who work in a tourism business, and for some sections of the civil service (Richards, 1985, p.3). EFL is also considered an 'additive bilingual situation' since the addition of a second language is unlikely to replace or displace the first language or culture (Lambert, 1980).

ESL, on the other hand, is an acronym that refers to English as a Second Language, and is usually for learners who come from a land where English is not spoken as the primary language of communication. Students learning under these conditions are required to speak English both inside and outside the classroom since English is the majority language. The popularity of ESL classes is growing through throughout the world, with the increasing movement of immigrants to English speaking countries like: England, Canada, the USA, South Africa, New Zealand, and Australia. Generally, in most of these countries, children are taught English as a second language to help prepare them to enter 'mainstream education' (Baker, 2003). In contrast with an EFL environment, where there is very little pressure upon their first language, learning of a majority second language may undermine person's minority language and culture (Baker, 2003). The Spanish speaking people living and working the United States, for example, is a typical example of a minority language group (Spanish) within a majority language group (English).

The differences between the contexts of EFL and ESL have implications as to what and how English is learned. Generally, ESL students have the context in which English is spoken already within their environment and this helps reinforce what they have learned. EFL students, on the other hand, have to try that much harder to understand the context in which English is spoken to become proficient speakers. For example, students in an ESL classroom typically come from different cultural backgrounds and do not share a first language. Their purpose for studying English is usually tied to employment and study or their immediate needs in an English speaking country. They often have access to authentic conversations in authentic situations on a day-to-day basis. Eventually, with some effort, they will be assimilated into that English speaking country, being able to understand shifts between literal and figurative meanings of English more readily, and be quicker to pick-up on distinctive cultural markers. EFL students, on the other hand, usually share a first language and are more likely educated through translation, vocabulary, and comprehension skills as the teacher is typically a non-native English speaker. Further, these

skills are usually tied to a test as part of an academic or employment skill set or an entry level job. In South Korea the college entrance exam (CSAT), TOEIC, and TOEFL tests provide a 'negative backwash' effect (Hughes, 2003) that has teachers teaching-to-a-test. However, if students do find themselves in a communicative classroom, native English speaking instructors should attempt to provide authentic materials whether or not they have been assigned by the administrative personnel from an education institute. Additionally, and especially if the languages are non-cognate, instructors have to have students realize authentic situations, present and model western social and cultural norms, and have also students not be ashamed or embarrassed to speak in a foreign language out loud in a classroom of their peers.

SLA Approaches/ Beliefs

Initial SLA approaches, theories, and hypotheses, that surround how we acquire a second language, have been derived from how we learned our first language. Long suggested in 1993 that there were 40 to 60 current SLA theories (Mangubhai, 2006), and this number has grown since that time. One of the on-going concerns is that no one theory can bring together all of the variables that go into learning a second language. Therefore, the term 'theory' is almost a misnomer for 'part' or a 'partial understanding' of how second languages are learned. The connection between theory, or approach, and belief was made explicit by Edward Anthony in the 1960's: "approach is the level at which assumptions and beliefs about language learning are specified" (Richards, 2003, p.19).

This researcher's discussion will begin with the three traditional approaches of behaviorism, nativist, and the socio-cultural perspectives since collectively they provide a background network to talk about the psycholinguistic, social, and cultural approaches to how additional languages may be learned. Moreover, many of the teaching methods, and their subsequent classroom procedures, can be followed back or can be seen as derived from the ideas of one or more of these traditional approaches to language learning. However, making the field of approaches and/ beliefs far more complex to understand and contain, are the areas of research that lie outside the traditional approaches to how second languages are learned. For example, the effects of research discoveries in anyone area of psychology, especially cognition and motivation, theoretical linguistics, and/ social linguistics can affect the direction of research in the near future, forcing

researchers to re-access past assumptions of earlier approaches – much like what has happened to behaviorism in the field of language learning over the last 40 years. Essentially, the beliefs that make-up second language learning is an ever contracting and expanding field as research continues, since there are now a myriad of approaches, variations and combinations of different approaches, that seemingly make it possible to learn a second language in a variety of different ways. These variations will be considered in the fourth area of this review entitled 'individual differences'.

In a minimalist fashion, then, this section attempts to surround some of the more apparent and popular research in-and-around second language acquisition or the approaches that make-up the beliefs about language learning. The most contemporary research on language learning, in many of the traditional and 'outlying' areas, can be located via the internet through search engine journal title searches.

Behaviorist perspective

Behaviorists believe that language acquisition is mostly learned through imitation. The psychology that supports behaviorism believes "all learning is distinguished as associative learning, or as habit formation, conveyed by frequent involvement of a stimulus with a response (Hilgard, 1962). B.F. Skinner (1957), a behavioral psychologist, used the term 'operant conditioning' to describe verbal learning or an effect that is rewarded (Hadley, 2001). Conditioned responses work in two ways. A person first learns to comprehend a speech pattern by responding in a suitable manner and then, secondly, by that pattern being reinforced (rewarded) (Brown, 2000). Therefore, traditional behaviorist language learning methods center on procedures that "use repetition to reinforce habit because only those patterns reinforced by the community of language users will persist" (Hadley, 2001, p.56). Behaviorist methods such as imitation, audio-lingualism, grammar translation, descriptive linguistics, and memorization are common.

The *American Behavioral Scientist* (1960 -) is a journal that has essays on many of the psychological doctrines of behaviorism. Other journals that hold a large collection of essays on behaviorism and aspects of behavioralism and language include the *American Educational*

Research Journal (1964 -) and the American Psychological Association's *Behavioural Neuroscience* (1983 -).

Nativist perspective

The Nativist perspective, referring initially to Chomsky's (1966) belief that the ability to learn a language is innate, is in direct opposition to behaviorist theory. Chomsky states that all human beings have a biological controlled language activation device (LAD) that allows children to develop, use, and understand language. This portends the idea of Universal Grammar (UG), which advocates that human beings are genetically equipped with the capability that allows them to acquire language (Brown, 2000). LAD and UG are directly related to the Critical Period Hypothesis (CPH) that suggests there is a critical period for language learning before 'fossilization' or lower learning ability sets in. Lenneberg (1967) argued that the time previous to puberty, or biological event when the two halves of the brain matured, was the best time for language learning because the brain was more plastic or pliable. Krashen, Long and Scarcella (1979) essentially believed the same and suggested through their work that the earlier second language acquisition is begun, the better it is for the learner. Nativists believe children are actively generating and testing hypothetical grammars in their minds and, through inference and practice, children learn to use and understand a language. This is one of the major differences between behaviorist and nativist approaches since they believe humans have the cognitive ability to learn language and not just form patterns of recognition. In other words, the process of learning a language is completely different for nativists since they believe that language learning is more unconscious than conscious. For this reason nativist ideas have led many more psychological theories and hypothesis, both conscious and unconscious positions, on the nature of language and language learning. Generally, nativists believe that most important learning is developed inside the mind, realizing that learning can be improved or made worse by aspects of learning that occur in the environment outside the mind.

Many theories and hypothesis have been developed from Chomsky's ideas in language acquisition and linguistics. *The Journal of Chomskyan Studies* is dedicated to Chomsky, published by *The International Society of Chomskyan Studies*. Since Chomsky's thought on language is like an umbrella over most of the field of language acquisition, especially nativist claims to generative grammar - there is an immense amount writing devoted to his thought. For

example, the changes to the field of language and linguistics after Chomsky might read like an index to a handbook of linguistics, which might include: generative linguistics, pragmatics, discourse analysis, first language acquisition, linguistics and second language acquisition, bilingualism, sociolinguistics etc. *The Linguistic Review* is one journal of the many that operate within the framework of generative grammar.

Some of the more resilient ideas of how second languages are learned, conscious or subconsciously, were subsequently presented in Krashen's (1982) Input theory and its five hypotheses. 1. The Learning/acquisition Hypothesis states that one can 'acquire' language in two ways. The first, the most important, is by a subconscious process, like the way children learn through the building-up of understanding through comprehensible language from a parent or guardian, and the second is through conscious 'learning' or by way of the development of l monitoring language rules and usage. 2. The Natural Order Hypothesis (NHO) suggests that "the acquisition of grammatical structures proceeds in a predictable order" (p.12), though the order may differ from a learners first language to additional languages. 3. The Monitor Hypothesis suggests the 'learning' serves as only a conscious editor or monitor as opposed to the subconscious knowledge previously acquired (Krashen, 1985). 4. The Input Hypothesis makes a case for the way in which language is made comprehensible, through the development of language structures " a bit beyond our current level, to i+1" (Krashen, 1985, p. 2). 5. The Affective Filter Hypothesis states learners must be open to input in order to acquire language. If not, an 'affective filter', or the construct of a mental block may be stopping the learner from acquisition (Krashen, 1985). These ideas helped lay the pathway for continued research into each of these hypotheses.

Krashen's hypotheses are one of the cornerstones of second language acquisition and therefore most every critical journal and website has articles and essays that refer, implicitly or explicitly, to his work. *The Annual Review of Applied Linguistics (ARLA)* (1999 -) is one of many linguistic journals that critically impart Krashen's work, and the *Annual Review of Language Acquisition*, is a journal whose presence is partly derivative of Krashen's success.

Psycholinguistic research delves into cognition or the science related to how learners of additional languages think and learn. Intelligence, or cognitive ability, cognitive controls, cognitive styles, learning styles, and learning strategies are all research areas of great interest.

Intelligence can be broken down into different abilities like analytical, creative, and practical abilities (Sternberg 1998). Further, Gardner (1983) broke intelligence into seven different abilities, or multiple intelligences, and this led to studies that worked towards balancing student weakness with their strengths. "Gardner's multiple intelligences have a vast implication for education in terms of exploration of ways teachers can cater for a wide range of learners in their classrooms (Mangubhai, 2006). Cognitive controls refer to the influence of a person's thought has over an individual's perception. Likewise, cognitive styles are the habits an individual has developed through perceiving. One of the most researched areas is that of Field Dependence (FD), the inability to see embedded figures in a larger picture, and Field Independence (FI), or the ability to block out certain information and concentrate on embedded figures. Early work by Naiman, Frohlich, Stern, & Todesco (1978) made the connection between FD/FI to second language learning. Generally, testing against several different measures of language proficiency, higher FI led to more affirmation of the ability to learn (Abraham 1983, 1985) (Chapelle & Roberts, 1986). These studies have led to developments such as the Group Embedded Figures Test (GEFT), a measurement for the ability to cognitively take apart reassemble visual stimuli (Mangubhai, 2006).

Cognitive styles convey ideas about the way people process information in their mind. Jonassen and Grabowski (1993) suggest that cognitive styles develop from cognitive controls, thus a person's mental ability creates habitual ways of processing information. People usually process information in the same way but are not limited to one style. Cognitive styles are important to the socio-linguistic approaches to language learning because they suggest how people may or may not interact with the environment around them.

Although learning styles are generally typical to the person (e.g. some learn better in visual, audio, tactile, or physical learning environments), they have been defined in many different ways. For example, as 'applied cognitive styles' (Jonassen and Grabowski, 1993); person's desired method of perceiving and processing information (Kolb's 1979); as relating to fundamental aspects of the environment, sociological, emotional, and the physical realms (Dun and Dun, 1978); as related to social interaction (Grasha and Riechmann, 1982); and as thinking patterns and/ mind sets (Gregorc 1984). When learning styles are used in conjunction with

language learning some learners will learn quicker and more deeply using their preferred style. Learning strategies refer to the strategies used by people to learn language. Stern (1983) refers to strategies as the "approach employed by the language learner, leaving learning techniques as a term to refer to particular forms of observable learning behavior, more or less consciously employed by the learner" (p.405). Whether people use learning strategies consciously or subconsciously, or by using both in different ways, is controversial because 'where thoughts' originate in the mind is still a mystery. Weinstein and Mayer (1986) and O'Malley & Chamot (1990) both refer to this problematic area indirectly as they attempt to define learning strategies: with the former they are "defined as behaviours *and thoughts* that a learner engages in during learning and that are intended to influence the learner's encoding process"(my italics)(Weinstein & Mayer, p. 315); and with the latter they are" *special thoughts*, or behaviours that individuals use to help them comprehend, learn, or retain new information"(my italics)(O'Malley & Chamot, p.1). By sheer numbers alone, learning styles can be seen as a challenging field: Oxford (1990) lists 6 different groups of learning strategies in two different classes, direct and indirect strategies, that totaled 19 different strategies; Chamot (1990) cites over 100 different learning strategies for specific types of learning situations.

There are general second language research journals, such *Second Language Research* (1985 -), that hold critical essays and articles upon many acquisition topics including cognitive controls and styles, and learning styles and strategies. More specifically, there are several journals that deal directly with cognitive processing and psychology, such as the *Journal of Cognitive Processing* (2004 -) and the *Journal of Cognitive Psychology* (1996 -).

Finally, one the most important theories in cognitive science is that Connectionism (Rogers & McClelland, 2004), a theory of how the mind works, built upon ideas of how the brain and its neurons work collectively as parallel distribution processing (PDP). Generally, this involves the physical environment of the brain and learner cognition or how linguistic knowledge is categorized so that it can be retrieved quickly. There are many hypotheses as to how any learner may process language, such as: Input processing (Van Patten, 1984) suggests that learners can't pay attention to 'form' and 'meaning' at the same time; and the Processability theory (Pienemann, 1998) states that the language features at the beginning or at the end of a sentence

are easier to process; the noticing hypothesis (Schmit & Frota, 1998) suggests that nothing is learned unless it is consciously noticed first.

The Journal of Developmental Linguistics (1990 -), *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience* (1992 -), and the *Journal of Cognition and Development* (1999-) all contain theoretical essays specific to cognition, cognitive strategies and styles, at all ages of life, and attempt to differentiate the biological and cultural influences upon cognitive change.

Socio-cultural perspective

The socio-cultural perspective attempts to reconcile features of second language learning that happen outside the mind with features inside the mind. This approach was made renowned by J. Piaget (1955) and L.S. Vygotsky (1962), who have competing general theories of cognitive development based on the ideas of Constructionism, or the philosophy whereby all human knowledge is constructed by the learner. Vygotsky's approach is regarded as a socio-constructivism since he believed that conscious social interaction is the key to individual cognitive development, whereas Piaget's ideas are regarded more as cognitive constructivism since he believed the individual learns by way of developmental stages. They both believe, however, that language and language learning are mediated through social and cultural factors. Vygotsky's approach suggested ways in which an invigilator can mediate and arrange effective learning in conversation. The invigilator, or a 'more knowledgeable other' (MKO), draws out the learner's ability by locating their 'zone of proximal development' (ZPD), or "the distance between the a student's level of development as revealed when problem solving without adult help, and the level of potential development as determined by a student problem solving in collaboration with peers and teachers" (Vygotsky, 1962). In this way, as children interact with others, at play at school and at home, they develop models of communication. For Piaget, the processes of 'Assimilation and Accommodation', as complimentary processes, shows how the adoption of information from the outside world to the inside world of the mind is made (Piaget, 1950). Simply put, a person develops a new field or mental category to accommodate new information if, previously, there has been no category developed to store it. Piaget believed these processes are continually working but we are processing familiar information most of the time

(Atherton, 2005). Therefore, people learn language by developmentally increasing their schemata about language.

The confluence of Vygotsky and Piaget's constructionist ideas has led to the present day preference of communicative language learning or approaches to language learning through conversational interaction. There are many SLA approaches that has have been developed from interaction in conversation. Swain's Output theory (Swain, 1995), for example, suggests learners realize what abilities they are missing in conversation when they notice differences in conversation with others. This helps them construct or reconstruct their own language production. This theory advocates that speakers can notice the differences between themselves and another speaker in conversation, which may also be used to develop rules about language discourse and how these rules apply to other linguistic situations.

The Journal of Cognitive Development (1986 -) is dedicated to Piaget, and its publisher, *Jean Piaget Society*, lists a large number of related internet links on its website. Vygotsky's work is frequently cited on *The European Journal of Cognitive Psychology* (1989 -). *The Journals of Constructionist Psychology* (1988 -) and *Language and Social Psychology* (1982-) both conform to the ideas of Piaget and Vygotsky.

Individual differences

Motivation and attitudes toward learning an addition language are deemed extremely important for success (Gardner & Lambert, 1972). Motivation has been identified as the learner's orientation with regard to the goal of learning a second language (Crookes & Schmidt, 1991). There is no one definition that can be used to define 'motivation' since there are too many personal variables and contexts to consider for one language learner. Likewise, Dornyei (1998) states "that motivation is indeed a multifaceted rather than a uniform factor and no available theory has yet managed it in its total complexity" (p.131). For example, if the learner is an adult, "what are the motives for learning a second language? Are they economic cultural, social, vocational, integrative or for self esteem and self-actualization?" (Baker, 2003, p.123). Also, older learners have a decided attitude toward additional language learning previous to starting the process of language acquisition (Larsen-Freeman and Long, 1991). Conversely, Mangubhai (2006) concludes that most children learning a second language have not developed

an attitude, enthusiastic or unenthusiastic, toward a second language (McNamara 1973, Genesse and Hamayan 1980).

However, since individuals have different reasons for learning a second language, motivation has been defined as either a goal, a reward, a will or a desire, to succeed. Two types or different definitions of motivation are used as a stable starting point for most discussions on the topic of motivation.

Integrative Motivation: It is thought that students who are most successful when learning a target language are those who like the people that speak the language, admire the culture and have a desire to become familiar with or even integrate into the society in which the language is used (Falk 1978). Instrumental Motivation: is generally characterized by the desire to obtain something practical or concrete from the study of a second language (Hudson 2000). Further, the integrative and instrumental motivations are comparable with the definitions of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation, the former coming naturally from within the student and the latter is referred to as reward, not unlike a goal. Other definitions of motivation have been defined by "two key factors: the individual's *expectancy of success* in a given task and the *value* the individual attaches to success in that task" (Dornyei, 1998, p.119)

Personality type, according to Ellis (1994), is another motivational variable. Extroverts seem to have more motivation, or an enthusiasm to try harder, and "are credited with a willingness to take risks", and the "strength of learners' motivation can be expected to have a causal effect on the quantity of learning strategies they employ" (Ellis, p.542). Attitudes toward learning, anxiety while learning (MacIntyre & Gardner, 1989), and self esteem (Brown 2000) are all sociological factors that can have an impact upon learning a second language.

Also, language aptitude, as suggested by Harley and Hart (1997), has been described as "one of the central differences in language learning" and "consistently the most successful predictor of language learning success" (Skehan 1989, pg. 25, 38). It follows that if a learner has the aptitude for a language, that learner may be more motivated to learn. According to Carroll (1981), there are the four areas that make-up any learner's aptitude ability: 1. Phonetic coding ability, 2. Grammatical sensitivity, 3. Rote-learning ability, and 4. Inductive language learning ability.

Many of the factors that influence second language learning are written about in the *Modern Language Journal (MLJ)* (1906 -), and in the many Journals of Applied Linguistics (many of which are regionalized to their geographical setting), such as: *Australian Journal of Linguistics* (1980 -), the *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics (ARAL)* (1977 -), the *Canadian Modern Language Review* (1943 -), the *Oxford Journal of Applied Linguistics* (1979 -), the *Journal of Asian Pacific Communication* (1989 -), the *Regional Language Center Journal (RELC)* (1970 -), the *Journal of African Language and Linguistics* (1979 -), and *English Language and Linguistics* (1997 -).

Bilingualism is another area of research that has developed its own theories as to how bilingual children acquire two or more (multilingualism) languages. For example, Cummins' (1984) 'interdependence hypothesis' suggests that a learner's second language competence is dependent upon the development of the same learner's first language. The threshold model accounts for three different stages in bilingual development where only in the first stage, "when there is low level of competence in both languages, there may be negative or detrimental cognitive effects" (Baker, 2000. p.176). Within the field of bilingualism, there are extra internal factors to consider; though comparable with second language learners, since these types of learners must considered different and, therefore, learn in slightly different learning contexts.

All three, *The Journal of Bilingualism*: *Language and Cognition* (1998 -), the *Bilingual Research Journal* (1992 -), and the *International Journal of Bilingualism*, have articles and essays that support many different areas of bilingual research.

Research upon student and instructor 'belief' in South Korea

There has been a great deal of global research upon student beliefs. From Horwitz's (1987), initial BALLI language learner belief research covered five areas: (1) the difficulty of language learning, (2) aptitude for language learning, (3) the nature of language learning, (4) learning and communication strategies, and (5) motivation and expectation. However, as accurate and as popular as it has been, Horowitz research is conducted by survey method and this has been criticized for its lack of depth. In contrast, Ellis (2008), who recently explored the nature of learner beliefs through three different longitudinal studies involving German students, and

Japanese and Chinese students in New Zealand, concluded that "researchers wishing to investigate learner beliefs would do better to rely on qualitative methods such as interviews and diary studies rather than questionnaires" due to the "situated and dynamic nature of learner belief systems and the indirect relationship between beliefs and learning" (p.1). The interviews compliment the survey instrument because they help explain the indirect relationships of 'what is being taught' and 'how it is being taught' by allowing for contexts for the quantitative data in the study (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

In South Korea, with regards to the combining survey and interview methods, there have not been many studies that include native English speaking teacher beliefs, as Jung (2005) suggests: "little research has been conducted to verify the effectiveness of native-speaker teachers in the Korean context" (p.36). Typically, written in Korean, most studies involve Korean English teacher beliefs independently or in comparison with their student's beliefs by survey only. In the pre-1990s, though there had not been any studies upon South Korea student populations, since the nation had been mostly rebuilding its national education system. Interest in student beliefs for research purposes had not begun to take root until after 1987. Park (1995) surveyed 332 Korean university EFL students' beliefs about language learning, language learning strategies, and the relationships among their beliefs, strategy use, and L2 proficiency. Park found three variables predicted students TOEFL scores to some extent. One was a belief variable (i.e. beliefs about self-efficacy and social interaction) and two were strategy variables (i.e. independent/interactive strategies and meta-cognitive strategies). Those learners who reported having confidence in learning English and the intention of speaking to others in English tended to use English actively, especially outside the classroom, and to monitor their progress in English carefully. These behaviors were also related to improvement in L2 proficiency (Ellis, 2008). Jung (2005), focused her research on curriculum at Pusan National University (PNU), specifically upon first year student and native-teacher "perceptions of the current effectiveness/quality of college English instruction at PNU" (p.141), and goes on to comment that "several universities changed traditional reading programs to conversational programs by employing native English speaking instructors" (p.39). Her research supports the fact that there have been changes to the curriculum toward more communicative teaching and learning at the elementary, middle, and high school

levels and that these changes have had an effect upon university curriculums and hiring practices.

More specifically, research upon native teacher beliefs about 'language learning and teaching' in an EFL setting is limited, especially at the university level in South Korea. One reason for this lack of research is the fact that the Federal Ministry of Education offers no guidance at the tertiary level of English study, only that the length of the English course be at least 15 weeks. This is unfortunate because teacher beliefs have a direct impact on how learners learn. Richards and Lockhart (1996) state that "teachers' belief systems are founded on the goals, values, and beliefs teachers hold in relation to the content and process of teaching, and their understanding of the systems in which they work and their roles within it" (p. 30). Richards summarizes that teachers' belief systems are derived from a number of different sources (Kindsvatter, Willen, and Ishler, 1988): they are "(a) their own experience as language learners, (b) their experience of what works best, (c) established practice, (d) personality factors, (e) educational based or research based principles, and (f) principles derived from an approach or method" (p. 30-31). Understanding teacher beliefs, and the impact of those beliefs in the field of EFL language teaching, is a growing research subject area since beliefs and value systems are the background to teacher decision making in the classroom. So towards these ends, there are several native and foreign educator sources available that provide a platform for comments upon the changes in the state of English education in South Korea, from elementary through to high school. The Korean government's Ministry of Education and Human Resources deals exclusively with education issues through its Korean Educational Development Institute (KEDI) website. This site carries an online Journal entitled 'KEDI Journal of Educational Policy' where some background essays (The Korean Education Series), written in English, are held. It also has an archive research and conference reports dating back to 2002. For example, Kim (2007) *Korean Education Longitudinal Study of 2005* discusses "academic achievement and learning experienced by academic achievement and learning experienced by student as they proceed through secondary school and tertiary education or their careers"(sic)(p.1).

Though this researcher could find few research projects upon student or instructor beliefs on language learning at the tertiary level, there are several Korean websites with data bases that

cover most general educational topics. The Applied Linguistics Association of Korea is the site for articles and essays written in the Korean Journal of Applied Linguistics (1978 -). The Korean Institute of Curriculum and Evaluation (1998 -) (KICE) website lists all ongoing research projects (in English) and is responsible for CSAT, national curriculum and education development, and educational testing at the elementary and secondary school level. Finally, the Language Research Journal (1965 -), published by Seoul National University in English, has an article and abstract search database in general and applied linguistics.

Korean Cultural Context

There are several native and foreign sources available that provide commentary upon the issues that have affected, and continue to affect, the state of English education in South Korea. There are two national English daily newspapers in South Korea, The Korean Times and The Korean Herald, outside of the international and domestic news; they feature cultural information in an attempt to explain Korean culture to foreign residents. These include M. Breen (2004), both as a weekly columnist in the daily 'The Korean Times' and as a writer of a non-fiction text entitled *The Koreans*, which provides valuable insight into the Korean psyche, the importance the Eastern concept of 'saving face', the prominence of Confucianism in Korean society, and the significance of changes in South Korean society. Other articles by various native writers and foreign residents provide daily coverage of different problems Westerners have integrating with South Korean norms. As Stevens (2009) suggests, these differences make South Korea a 'strange' place in contrast with the rest of the world, but others, like Huer (2009), suggests that constant change is the norm in South Korea. Likewise, statistics are constantly given prominence in these newspapers, especially South Korean performance on TOEIC and TOEFL tests. Most recently in 2008, for example, South Korea placed 140th out of a field of 152 countries in TOEIC proficiency; which is hard to believe if we consider how much money is spent on foreign education every year: 15 trillion won, approximately 15.8 billion US dollars or 1.9% of the GDP is spent annually on foreign language education (Garikipati, 2008).

Other essays, mostly from internet sources, help provide coverage to important areas of religion, philosophy, and beliefs. Insight into the *Role of Religion in Korean Higher Education* (Lee, 2002) is a good example of the condensation of religion in Korean culture and its effect on

the students in colleges and universities. The Asian Studies Network Center, founded by the University of Texas, provides many links to essays on Belief systems, like Korean Buddhism and Confucianism. The Center for Korean Studies at the University of Hawaii (Manoa) publishes a Journal entitled *Korean Studies* (1977 -) and a Korean Book series entitled Hawai'i Studies on Korea Series. Both sources contain academic writing that supports recent and historical information that attempt to explain the present day situations in South Korea.

Chapter 3

Research Methodology

_____

Research Design

The purpose of this study is to canvass views about how languages are learned from native English speaker instructors and second year South Korean university students of English from three different tertiary institutes in Busan, South Korea. It considers the beliefs between these instructors and students in juxtaposition with each other and, in general, with the principles of Second Language Acquisition theory (SLA).

Both quantitative and qualitative research methods are engaged in this project. The difference between them is explicit. Qualitative methods are concerned with describing without the aid of numerical data, while quantitative analysis attempts to 'quantify' results based on numbers. With the latter case, the 'quantification' of measurable factors is analyzed by amount and frequency whereas in the former, generalized information is its strong point (Best & Kahn, 1998). This project uses a survey as part of its quantitative measure and an interview method to gather generalized information qualitatively.

The survey method directly ascertains views about language learning from student and instructor perspectives. It is an important technique when the purpose of the research is to describe and explore experience, like this study's aim: to canvass views about foreign language learning and teaching. In addition, upon the conclusion of the survey itself, space was provided for written script, allowing participants to express their views, if any, in areas that may have not been touched on in the survey.

To compensate for the limitations of the survey method, semi-structured interviews were used to gather data. Interviewing is one of the most powerful tools used to understand people's points of view, beliefs and attitudes. Because of its interactive nature, interviewing has many advantages over other types of data collection strategies (Best & Kahn, 1998). The interviews

compliment the survey instrument by providing better understanding of contexts, as if offers solid descriptions and explanations for the quantitative data in the study (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

Population and Sample

The city of Busan has 3 national universities and many more private universities and colleges. A representative sample was taken from 3 different education facilities in Busan: one 4-year National university, one 4-year private university, and one 2-year junior College. Each university and college has its own department of native English instructors who teach non-integrated speaking, writing, and/ listening courses to South Korean students. This researcher has sampled 6 native instructors quantitatively through the survey instrument, two instructors from each school, and completed 3 semi-structure interviews, one instructor from each school, all from the same population that completed the survey instrument. A total 30 students completed the survey instrument, 10 students from each school. A sample of this variety and size should allow for an equitable analysis of student and instructor beliefs from each institute.

Instrumentation:

The survey instrument, Lightbown & Spada's <u>Popular opinions about language learning and teaching</u> (2006) (Fig.S1), was modified and used to collect data for this study. This survey's response-field instrument, in the Instructor and Student surveys (Fig.S2 and Fig.S3) , were reduced to only 4 possible answers from a range response-field in the original Lightbown & Spada survey (Fig.S1), which included a total of 6 possible responses positions between 'Strongly agree to Strongly disagree'. This change allowed no 'neutral' position on the Likert-scale and therefore worked to dissuade 'fence sitting' by the respondents throughout the survey. The original survey's response field was also reversed to read, from left to right, strongly disagree, disagree, agree, and strongly agree. In addition, a written response question, question 18, was added to this survey that asked the respondents if they had 'any other belief(s) about second language learning that have not been suggested within this survey', they were asked 'to write their response in the space provided' below this question. Finally, the student/instructor survey was translated into the Korean language (Fig.S3).

The purpose of using this modified survey is to allow responses to have more impact, as opposed to a survey with a neutral response position, and allow respondents a chance to write-in something that they may deem important that was not mentioned in the survey.

Essentially, then, the student and instructor surveys consisted of two parts. The first part consisted of 17 second language statements about language learning and teaching. These items were scored using a 4 point Likert-scale that ranged from '1' Strongly Disagree to '4' Strongly Agree. The second part of the survey asked respondents if they had 'any other belief(s) about second language learning that have not been suggested within this survey'.

In addition to the survey, all foreign language instructors were asked if they would fill out a brief background questionnaire and if they would be available to answer some interview style questions about the context of where they work and to elaborate on some of their beliefs and/ background information. The information obtained from the interviews, from the instructor comments and their complimentary background information helped deepen the explanations gathered from the survey data.

Reliability and Validity

Reliability and validity must be a concern in order to make this project's research trustworthy. Reliability is the degree of consistency that an instrument or data collection demonstrates, while validity is the quality of data collection that enables it to measure what it is intended to measure (Best & Kahn, 1998). To assure the content validity of the measurements, all items of this survey were first reviewed by two of this researchers native speaking instructors. After their approval of the English version of the survey, checking grammar and accuracy, the survey was translated into Korean by two different fluent, English speaking, Korean professors and a 3rd year English speaking Korean student of English. The instrument was corrected for errors of translation to insure that the meaning from English to Korean was the same.

To determine the reliability of the instrument, the survey was pilot tested on 20 of the researcher's 1st year English classes, two groups of 10 students, and on 3 English-speaking native instructors at the researcher's present university. The average scores for the entire survey were as follows:

(Fig.PRT) Pre-Test Results

Instructors	Student Group 1	Students Group 2
3.0/ 3.1/ 2.9	3.2	3.3

The survey was deemed to have 'face validity', as all of the students completed the survey without questions or problems, ensuring that the survey was valid for the respondents and the researcher.

Data Collection and Procedure

(a) Student surveys (n = 30): At each of the three schools, all students surveyed were 2nd year English major students. Each school, as well, has 2 school semesters, a spring semester that runs from March until June and a fall semester that runs from September until December. The data for this project was collected during the second semester, in the fall of 2008. The researcher presented consent forms to each of the school's English dept administrators whose job it was to coordinate their college's English program. After the consent forms were signed, the researcher contacted the instructors of the 2nd year English major classes and asked if one class of approximately 10 students may be surveyed by the researcher, in the instructor's presence. The dates were set as to when the survey is to be completed. On the day of the survey, each class instructor was given a packet of surveys for their respective class, each survey had a cover letter, written in Korean, explaining the purpose of the survey and asking their permission or consent to participate. After the surveys were completed, making certain that the students had enough time to respond, the surveys were collected directly by the researcher after they had been checked to see that all of the consent forms had been signed.

(b) Instructor surveys (n = 6): The researcher then asked the native English speaking instructors if they cared to participate in the survey, to a limit of 2 from each school. In addition, the instructors were asked if they would be willing to be interviewed. Arrangements were made as to the time and dates, that the individual instructor's would

be available to complete the survey. On the day of the survey, the instructor's survey, written in English, was given to the participating teachers along with a cover letter explaining the purpose of the survey; it also included a consent form to be signed. In addition, a brief background questionnaire was also attached at the end to the survey. After a sufficient amount of time had passed for the instructors to complete the surveys and background information questionnaire, the researcher collected the data directly.

(c) Instructor interviews (n = 3): Only 3 of the 6 native English instructors agreed to participate in an interview, all 3 however participated immediately after their survey. Face-to-face interviews were used because they helped to establish reciprocity between the native instructors and the native English speaking researcher (Denzin & Lincoln, 1998). The researcher interviewed with each of the three instructors, however the researcher did contact 2 instructors again by telephone to clarify some points made during the interview. The researcher moved to semi-structured interview approach, though the researcher had started with an organized approach, because, as the interviews progressed, and due to the digressive nature of the interview process, this style allowed the instructors freer expression. The information gathered through the interviews helped this researcher seek for different explanations of the survey data. The following four questions were asked of all native English instructors interviewed.

Q1. Were you told what to teach or how to teach by your institute?

Q2. Do you believe you are helping Korean students learn English as a second language? What feedback do you receive that informs you so?

Q3. How does your knowledge of second language acquisition compliment your school's second language curriculum?

Q4. Do you have any specific examples from your past where you felt your instruction or lesson plan was correct for the class level but, when you attempted to teach the lesson, it just didn't work out or, subsequently, it became difficult or awkward to follow your plan?

Data Analysis

Triangulation of the data is used to help make the project valid. This project will attempt to triangulate data in two ways: by data and methodological triangulation (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000).This project sampled 30 students and 6 instructors in the Busan area. This number of research subjects should provide enough similarities between participants to allow triangulation, or the integration views and data from the surveys, interviews, instructor questionnaires, and the schools traditional practices involving curriculum and methods of teaching.

From the corresponding values taken from the surveys, mean scores and standard deviations were computed and displayed in chart form. The mean and deviation on all survey items were also compared (Fig.3-a: Mean and Standard Deviation). Also, since all survey items are the same between the students and instructors, P Values (T-tests) were completed between the instructors and schools (Fig.3-c: P values/instructors & schools) and between the Schools (Fig. 3-d: P values between schools) to help determine the significant differences in mean scores.

The data was interpreted and compared between students and teachers of the respective schools and between schools. These research findings, along with the statistics, helped to create results. The results were sent to the representative schools upon request and used in the researcher's dissertation.

Limitations of the Study

Cross cultural interpretations:

One delimit has been build into the survey itself. There is no 'fence sitting' or 'neutral' agreement in the survey. This 'choice' has been undone due to the hierarchical nature of S. Korean society. Generally, the students are not used to making decisions for themselves rather they look to an authority figure, usually someone much older than themselves, to decide what is correct. The students now have to choose between agreement and disagreement on the survey items.

A student limit to this survey project is based upon the fact that students, because they have been generally taught through behavioral study methods (survey items 1, 12: (Fig.S1: Lightbown

& Spada's Survey: <u>Popular opinions about language learning and teaching</u> (2006)), may all respond positively to these items, which in turn would be considered inhibitive since their responses would lead them away from learner-learner interaction and promote teacher centeredness. However, bias is part of what makes 'beliefs' beliefs, thus the teachers will potentially respond negatively to the same items.

The survey statements can be considered a limitation because some of the statements are unclear as to how they can be interpreted. Some of the statements on the survey may be misunderstood or misinterpreted due to the 'vagueness' of the statements. For example, a limited knowledge of parental effect on a learner's grammatical development (statement 1, (Fig.S1: Lightbown & Spada's Survey: <u>Popular opinions about language learning and teaching</u> (2006)) may not be understood by a respondent due to a different cultural background (i.e. in South Korea some children begin to attend school at 3 years of age and, thus, their parents have very little influence upon their practical education).

Instructor knowledge, or 'pedagogic competence' (Peacock, 2009), is a limiting factor for this project since, if the instructors are not skilled in second language education, then there is no proper way to gauge that impact upon the students and/ their perceptions of the curriculum, as it also muddles the differences between belief and knowledge.

Indirect Institutional influence through federal government work visa policy

One other major limitation to this project derives from the S. Korean work visa policy. In its attempt to assist English education, the S. Korean government provides more subsidies to all higher learning institutes that employ native foreign speakers employed under the 'F' series visa status and less if the native speaker is an E1 or E2 visa holder. This would not necessarily sound an alarm if it were not, however, for the sheer numbers of foreigners employed and the type of work visas they carry: potentially employers are not hiring instructors based upon their educational background but whether or not the instructor is married to a Korean national or not. Under this present 'work visa' system in S. Korea then, the possibility of 'educational visa gaps' between instructors and their respective college or university employers, can extend to problematic relationships between students and instructors.

There are several ways in which 'relationships' can be confused but yet these are perhaps best juxtaposed with an ideal employee institute situation. For example, since college and universities are free to choose a curriculum that best suits their student's needs, ideally the curriculum should focus on "learners, the subject matter, and society" (Gunter, Estes & Schwab, 2003). If a college or university attempts such an approach, this would also entail curriculum designers to gather information on the needs of the students, the societal purpose of the learning institution, and the subject matter" prior to its assessment (Gunter, Estes & Schwab, 2003). Ultimately, the curriculum designers would: (i) set goals and rationale for instruction, (ii) define the objectives, (iii) decide on means of assessment, and (iv), and construct a breakdown of units of study for the course (Gunter, Estes & Schwab, 2003). Under these assessment circumstances, ideal instructors would include holder's higher education degrees in the field of second language (PhD, MA in TESOL/Applied Linguistics). These instructors would be given an E1 visa by immigration officials from the federal government in S. Korea. The situation would be considered 'ideal' because the visa is consistently tied to the educational background of the instructor. Therefore, there would be a minimal problematic gap in the relationships between the institute, the instructor, and the students (i.e. the student is more than likely getting a quality education). In terms of belief, then, the influence of this type of institute, through its curriculum design, may match or lead the instructor toward standard theoretical beliefs in SLA theory. Hence a comparison of survey results between instructors and students may show a widest possible variance.

However, it is possible of conceive of situations where control of the curriculum may be entirely handed over to the native instructor to decide since, for example, the institute may have a greater purpose than an English education in the community (Gunter, Estes & Schwab, 2003). In situations such as these, we might conclude that the onus of a program falls squarely on the native instructor or what he/she knows and believes about approach, design, and procedure of second language learning. Typically, we would assume the college or university would employ instructors with MAs in either TESOL or Applied Linguistics to insure that their student's education is facilitated correctly (E1 visa holders) but this may not necessarily be the case.

Finally, it is also conceivable that some colleges and universities aspire to offer second language programs as a means of drawing more applicants to their schools but, at the same time, do very little about the quality of their second language education programs. Here, foreign language classes and their instructors may be used as financial means to an end. This is indicative of the visa status of the foreign instructor since it is more than likely that they have hired not for their qualifications to teach. Typically, the visa holder may have only a BA in a major in something other than second language learning (Business, History, or Sociology etc.) but because he/she is married to a Korean national, they provide the greatest possible subsidy to their college or university from the Federal government as F series visa holders. Thus, the beliefs of the instructors in these latter employment situations may possibly not show as wide a variance with the student responses of the ideal circumstances presented above simply because the instructor has more flexibility to choose his/her own curriculum(more often than above, the instructor will choose behaviorist methods to practice).

**Note: in the above context all F series employment visa holders can have higher standing degrees (PhD, MA, or 4 year Honors degrees) or they may have a 3 year BA degree (minimum requirement). In other words, there is no direct correlation between an F series visa and an academic standard as there are with the E1 and E2 visa holders.

Chapter 4

Results

_____

   This chapter reports the results of the quantitative data collected, from the survey findings of both the South Korean tertiary students and the native English speaking instructors, the native English speaker instructor data, and the qualitative data collected by way of interviews with the native speaking instructors.

Part 1: Student Respondents (n=30: n1, n2, n3)

   Copies of the survey were distributed to the students by their native English instructors at their respective schools. School 1 had 10 student responses (5 male, 6 female), School 2 had 9 student responses (4 male, 5 female), and School 3 had 11 student responses (8 male, 3 female); total [17 male, 14 female]. Ideally, 10 respondents from each school were asked for but some students were absent on the day the survey, this only slightly affected the sample of School 2 (one less respondent). For the purpose of this study, the response rate is considered 100% since the proposal asked for approximately 10 students from three different tertiary schools and a total of 31 student samples were collected. All of the students are 2 year English majors, between the ages of 21 and 24, and seemed to be acquainted with second language pedagogy, as they gave the impression to be genuinely interested in the survey. The surveys were completed in fall of 2008.

    The student mean scores on all the individual survey items can be seen together in the chart below (Fig.1-a: Student Mean Scores/ Popular opinions about language learning and teaching). The mean, or average, response taken from an individual school's group of students, juxtaposed together with the other two school's mean responses, provides an average of all student responses to the items, allowing for an easy comparison of the mean scores from individual survey items. The mean scores were derived from the following: Likert scale: 1 strongly disagree, 2 disagree, 3 agree and 4 strongly agree applied to the survey 'Popular opinions about language learning and teaching' (Fig.S1: Lightbown & Spada's Survey: Popular opinions about

<u>language learning and teaching</u> (2006)). Thus any score less than 3 is considered disagreeing, likewise any score above 3 means agreement with the item.

(Fig 1-a) Student Mean Scores/ Popular opinions about language learning and teaching

Item #.	Statement	School 1.	School 2.	School 3.
1.	Languages are learned mainly through imitation	3.4	2.9	3.5
2.	Parents usually correct young children when they make grammatical errors	3.0	2.3	3.0
3.	Highly intelligent people are good language learners	2.8	2.8	2.4
4.	The most important predictor of success in second language acquisition is motivation	2.8	2.9	3.0
5.	The earlier a second language is introduced in school programs, the greater the likelihood of success in learning	3.1	2.7	3.5
6.	Most of the mistakes that second language learners make are due to interference from the first language	3.0	2.8	3.3
7.	The best way to learn new vocabulary is through reading	3.2	2.8	2.7
8.	It is essential for learners to be able to pronounce all the individual sounds in the second language	3.7	3.6	3.9
9.	Once learners know roughly 1000 words and the basic structure of a language, they can participate in conversation with native speaker	2.6	2.6	3.1
10	Teachers should present familiar rules one at a time and learners should practice examples of each one before going on to another	2.7	3.0	2.8
11.	Teachers should teach simple language structures before complex ones	3.0	3.2	3.3
12.	Learner's errors should be corrected as soon as they are made in order to prevent the formation of bad habits	3.3	2.7	3.4
13.	Teachers should use materials that expose students to only those language structures they have already been taught	2.0	2.0	2.4
14.	When learners are allowed to interact freely (for example, in group or pair activities), they copy each other's mistakes	3.4	2.9	2.9
15.	Students learn what they are taught	3.5	2.9	2.9
16.	Teachers should respond to students by correctly rephrasing what they have said rather than by explicitly pointing out the error	3.4	3.2	3.3

17.	Students can learn both language and academic content (for example, science and history) simultaneously in classes where the subject matter is taught in their second language	3.2	2.4	2.9

Part 2: Instructor Respondents (n= 6)

Initially 2 instructor respondents were desired from each of the three schools. The response rate was 100%, as these requirements were met. However, the response rate for the interview dropped to 50% (n= 3) as only one teacher from each school agreed to an interview. The academic fields of the native English instructors varied between under graduate degrees in Biology, History, Business/Economics, English, and Communications, with only one having a master degree. All native speaking instructors had between 4- 9 years of experience in S. Korea and, at present, had between 12 to 18 hours a week of second language teaching. The surveys and interviews were completed in fall of 2008.

The mean scores on all individual survey items of the instructors can be seen in the figure below (Fig.2-a: Instructor mean Scores/ Popular opinions about language learning and teaching.). The mean or average response taken from the instructors provides an overview, allowing for an easy comparison of the mean scores from individual survey items. The mean scores were derived from the following Likert scale: 1 strongly disagree, 2 disagree, 3 agree and 4 strongly agree applied to the survey (Fig.S1: Lightbown & Spada's Survey: Popular opinions about language learning and teaching (2006)).

(Figure 2-a) Instructor mean Scores/ Popular opinions about language learning and teaching.

Item #.	Statement	Instructors
1.	Languages are learned mainly through imitation	2.7
2.	Parents usually correct young children when they make grammatical errors	3.0
3.	Highly intelligent people are good language learners	2.5
4.	The most important predictor of success in second language acquisition is motivation	3.5

5.	The earlier a second language is introduced in school programs, the greater the likelihood of success in learning	3.8
6.	Most of the mistakes that second language learners make are due to interference from the first language	2.8
7.	The best way to learn new vocabulary is through reading	2.7
8.	It is essential for learners to be able to pronounce all the individual sounds in the second language	2.8
9.	Once learners know roughly 1000 words and the basic structure of a language, they can participate in conversation with native speaker	2.8
10	Teachers should present familiar rules one at a time and learners should practice examples of each one before going on to another	3.0
11.	Teachers should teach simple language structures before complex ones	3.3
12.	Learner's errors should be corrected as soon as they are made in order to prevent the formation of bad habits	3.5
13.	Teachers should use materials that expose students to only those language structures they have already been taught	2.5
14.	When learners are allowed to interact freely (for example, in group or pair activities), they copy each other's mistakes	2.8
15.	Students learn what they are taught	2.2
16.	Teachers should respond to students by correctly rephrasing what they have said rather than by explicitly pointing out the error	2.8
17.	Students can learn both language and academic content (for example, science and history) simultaneously in classes where the subject matter is taught in their second language	3.0

Instructor (Native Speaker) data

This section presents English native speaker data and the interview findings as they relate to curriculum and methods of teaching in the Korean socio-cultural context.

(Fig 2-b) Instructor (Native speaker) data   Native Speakers (N=6)

Instructors	Years employed in S. Korea	Type of Education degree (B.A, MA etc.)	Type of Visa
Instructor 1	7	MA History + TESOL	F2

Instructor 2	5	B.A. Economics	F2
Instructor 3	6	B.A. Sociology	F2
Instructor 4	6	B.A. (Eng) Lit+ TESOL	E2
Instructor 5	9	B.A. Geography	E2
Instructor 6	8	MA Ed. MA(Eng) Lit	E1

All of the instructors have spent several years teaching in S. Korea (average=6.83 years). They all have various educational disciplines, one having an Education degree and two others have Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL) certificates. Three instructors have a Visa status of F2, which means they are married to a Korean national. Two others have E2 visas, standard teaching visa for S. Korea. One instructor has an E1 visa, a teaching visa that indicates a higher educational degree.

Differences between non-native and native English speaking instructors

The students have Korean speaking English teachers that prepare them for TOEIC and TOEFL exams and teach them practical English and grammar through L1. These teachers are always graduate students or graduates of Literature and Language departments throughout South Korea, and are employed by the colleges or universities on a temporary or term basis. They do not sign one year contracts. Their knowledge of English grammar and syntax is usually quite extensive but they typically lack pronunciation skill and the lexical resource to speak fluently in the English language. This latter point accounts for the interest by many administrations in South Korea to hire native speaking foreign teachers for their schools.

Instructor Interview Data

The interview findings are based upon the questions asked by the researcher (Transcripts of the foreign instructor interviews) of the three (n= 3) instructors that allowed an interview. Of all the instructors that took the survey, only three, all native speakers, allowed themselves to be interviewed. Therefore the results of the interviews are influenced by these 3 native speakers,

and they are considered representative since all of the instructors have spent an average of at least 6 years teaching in S. Korea. A summation of the answers to interview questions by the respondents is presented here.

Q1. Were you told what to teach or how to teach by your institute?

The three respondents answered no to this question but included that they could make their own lesson plans loosely based on a textbook offered by their institute.

Q2. Do you believe you are helping Korean students learn English as a second language? If so, what feedback, if any, do you receive?

All three respondents suggested that there was a lack of desire to really learn the language. All deferred to the fact that the students either work too hard at their other classes at university and/ English class is something that students do not take seriously because it is too difficult or the learning context of too many students in the classroom is counter-productive.

Q3. How does your knowledge of second language acquisition complement your school's second language curriculum?

Only one of the three respondents has an education degree, whereas the other two have Bachelor of Arts degrees. All respondents seemed to think (i) that that their degree did not need to complement the institute's second language curriculum because they developed their own lessons (?), and (ii) that the administration did not give any extra impetus towards learning English as a second language other than providing a standard ESL or EFL textbook, or an English textbook created by the institute's own Korean staff, as a guide for future lesson plans.

Q4. Do you have any specific examples from your past where you felt your instruction or lesson plan was correct for the class level but, when you attempted to teach the lesson, it just didn't work out or, subsequently, it became difficult or awkward to follow your plan?

Two of the three respondents answered this question with a direct 'no', response. One of the two suggested that 'he' treated each class as a distinctive 'level', meaning all the students were regarded as at the same level of English proficiency. The final respondent suggested that he had

had awkward moments, even though he had thoroughly prepared for the class, but that these quickly subsided when 'he' realized the students did not understand the lesson.

Statistical Analysis

Statistical analysis across the data from the four different groups, the native instructors and the three schools, allows for a check of variance, if any, through different statistical measures, namely: the mean, standard deviation, and P values.

Standard Deviation (SD), which is a measure of the spread of a set of values taken from the mean value, is very low across the field responses between the native English speaking instructors and the students from 3 schools. This suggests that student responses from all three schools are within a statistically similar range.

(Fig. 3-a) Mean and Standard Deviation

	Instructors	School 1	School 2	School 3
Mean	2.9	3.1	2.8	3.1
SD	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4

Likewise, if we compare the instructor Mean with the average Mean of the three schools, the difference is only .10 or 1/10. There the instructor and the student's view are statistically the similar.

(Fig. 3-b) All item Mean - Instructors and Students

	Instructors	Students
Mean	2.9	3.0

Finally, the two-tailed P values between the instructor's results and the three individual schools are not statistically significant to merit any probability of error. The P value is a probability, with a value ranging from zero to one. P-values are used to help show difference if populations really have the same mean overall. The two-tailed P value was chosen over the one-

tailed P-value because no group showed a significant difference in mean scores. In other words, assuming the null hypothesis, the two-tailed P value best answers the question: what is the chance that any school, or the instructors, would have their 'mean' as far apart as observed in this experiment with any group having the larger mean? The results standard threshold value of 0.05 was used to predict any significant difference.

(Fig. 3-c) P-values between instructors & schools

	Instructors and School 1	Instructors and School 2	Instructors and School 3
P value	0.38	0.31	0.35

However, one close statistically relevant difference occurred with the two-tailed P value test when School 2 was compared with School 3. Here the P-value, being equal with .05, suggested that there was a greater probability than a random chance of difference between the two school's mean scores. However, School 2's P-value with School 1 is not statistically significant though it is close at .051.

(Fig. 3d) P values/between schools

	School 1 & School 2	School 1 & School 3	School 2 & School 3
P value	0.051	0.97	0.05

The differences between School 2 and 3 may be attributed to one or many factors. For example, the differences in teaching method used, or the types of curriculum implemented, at either school may have influenced the student's responses to the survey on their beliefs about language learning.

SLA Groupings of Survey items

The survey '*Popular opinions about language learning and teaching*' (Fig.S1) has been broken into 8 different groups relative to specific areas of research and pedagogy in the field of second language acquisition (SLA). These groupings allow us to focus on the results of these

45

specific groups, which clearly illustrate the differences between instructors and students. These differences will be more thoroughly explained with the discussion in chapter 5.

Group one consists of two statements that suggest the SLA approach of behaviorism: Statement 1: Languages are learned mainly through imitation. Statement 12: Learner's errors should be corrected as soon as they are made in order to prevent the formation of bad habits.

(Fig. 4-a) GR1/ Behaviorist	Instructors	School 1	School 2	School 3
1. Languages are learned mainly through imitation	2.7	3.4	2.9	3.5
12. Learner's errors should be corrected as soon as they are made in order to prevent the formation of bad habits	3.5	3.3	2.7	3.4

With statement 1, the instructors and the students from School 2 both disagree; whereas the students from School 1 and School 3 agree with the statement. The instructors disagreed more so than any of the student groups. In statement 12, the instructors believe in 'error correction' more than the students do. However, the instructors, School 1, and School 3 all agreed with the statement, whereas School 2 disagreed.

Group 2 consists of three statements that center upon Bilingualism: Statement 5: The earlier a second language is introduced in school programs, the greater the likelihood of success in learning. Statement 6: Most of the mistakes that second language learners make are due to interference from the first language. Statement 17: Students can learn both language and academic content (for example, science and history) simultaneously in classes where the subject matter is taught in their second language.

(Fig-4b) GR2/ Bilingualism	Instructors	School 1	School 2	School 3
5. The earlier a second language is introduced in school programs, the greater the likelihood of success in learning	3.8	3.1	2.7	3.5

6. Most of the mistakes that second language learners make are due to interference from the first language	2.8	3.0	2.8	3.3
17. Students can learn both language and academic content (for example, science and history) simultaneously in classes where the subject matter is taught in their second language	3.0	3.2	2.4	2.9

The results from Statement 5 conclude that the instructors and School 3 agree that 'the earlier' second language training is initiated, 'is better' for the learner, but School 1only marginally agrees. School 2 disagrees with the statement.

With Statement 6, the instructors and School 2 disagree that most mistakes in L2 are caused by L1 interference, whereas the students in School 1 and School 3 agree with the statement.

For Statement 17, Students in schools 2 and 3 do not believe they can learn content in L2; the instructors minimally agree students can.

Group 3 is made up of two questions that refer to grammar teaching.

Statement 10: Teachers should present familiar rules one at a time and learners should practice examples of each one before going on to another. Statement 11: Teachers should teach simple language structures before complex ones.

(Fig 4-c) GR 3/ Teaching grammar	Instructors	School 1	School 2	School 3
10. Teachers should present familiar rules one at a time and learners should practice examples of each one before going on to another	3.00	2.7	3.0	2.8
11. Teachers should teach simple language structures before complex ones	3.3	3.0	3.2	3.3

The instructors and School 2 both minimally agreed with Statement 10 that teachers should teach familiar grammatical rules individually, giving students time to practice each one before moving on to the next. The students in School 1 and school 3 disagreed with this statement.

All the respondents for Statement 11, though School 2 minimally so, all agreed that simple language structures should be taught before complex ones. The average mean score for this statement is 3.2.

Group 4 consists of five statements which centre upon teaching method and pedagogy. Statement 7: The best way to learn new vocabulary is through reading. Statement 8: It is essential for learners to be able to pronounce all the individual sounds in the second language. Statement 13: Teachers should use materials that expose students to only those language structures they have already been taught. Statement 15: Students learn what they are taught. Statement 16: Teachers should respond to students by correctly rephrasing what they have said rather than by explicitly pointing out the error.

(Fig. 4-d) GR4/ Teaching method and pedagogy

	Instructors	School 1	School 2	School 3
7. The best way to learn new vocabulary is through reading	2.7	3.2	2.8	2.7
8. It is essential for learners to be able to pronounce all the individual sounds in the second language	2.8	3.7	3.6	3.9
13. Teachers should use materials that expose students to only those language structures they have already been taught	2.5	2.0	2.0	2.4
15. Students learn what they are taught	2.2	3.5	2.9	2.9
16. Teachers should respond to students by correctly rephrasing what they have said rather than by explicitly pointing out the error	2.8	3.4	3.2	3.3

With Statement 7, except for the students at School 1, instructors and students disagree that vocabulary is best learned through reading.

With statement 8, outside of the instructor disagreement, the students believe that all the individual sounds have all to be learned in L2.

In statement 13, all respondents disagree that only structures taught should be in the learning materials.

The responses to Statement 15 indicate that the instructors do not believe students learn what they are taught, nor do the students of schools 2 &3, but School 1 students believe they do learn what they are taught.

In Statement 16 the students believe that teachers should respond to the meaning but the instructors believe that explicit grammar correction is the best way for students to learn.

Group 5 has only two statements that can be seen as dependent upon socio-cultural perspective (Vygotsky, 1962). Statement 1: Parents usually correct young children when they make grammatical errors. Statement 14: When learners are allowed to interact freely (for example, in group or pair activities), they copy each other's mistakes.

(Fig. 4-e) GR5/ Socio-cultural

	Instructors	School 1	School 2	School 3
1. Parents usually correct young children when they make grammatical errors	3.0	3.0	2.3	3.0
14. When learners are allowed to interact freely (for example, in group or pair activities), they copy each other's mistakes	2.8	3.4	2.9	2.9

The results of Statement 1 suggest that the instructors, School 1, and School 3, minimally agree that parents usually do correct young children; School 2 disagrees with this statement.

With the 14th statement, the instructors and the students at School 2 and 3 do not believe mistakes are copied in interaction. However, the students at School 1 believe that in interactive pair work and group activities they do copy each other mistakes.

Group 6 also has only one statement, it is dedicated to motivation. Statement 4: The most important predictor of success in second language acquisition is motivation.

(Fig. 4-f) GR6/ Motivation	Instructors	School 1	School 2	School 3
4. The most important predictor of success in second language acquisition is motivation	3.5	2.8	2.9	3.0

The instructors and, minimally, the students in School 3 believe that motivation is important factor toward L2 learning, but students at two schools, 1 and 2, do not believe motivation is the most important.

Group 7 consists of 2 statements that relate to intelligence and/ aptitude. Statement 3: Highly intelligent people are good language learners. Statement 9: Once learners know roughly 1000 words and the basic structure of a language, they can participate in conversation with native speaker.

(Fig. 4-g) GR7/ Intelligence:	Instructors	School 1	School 2	School 3
3. Highly intelligent people are good language learners	2.5	2.8	2.8	2.4
9. Once learners know roughly 1000 words and the basic structure of a language, they can participate in conversation with native speakers	2.8	2.6	2.6	3.1

All respondents in Statement 3 disagree with the statement. The average mean score is 2.6 which much less than agreement.

In statement 9, both instructors and students from two schools do not believe that learners can participate in conversation when they have 1000 words of vocabulary.

Summary

The following chart (Fig. 4.h) provides a summary of survey items where the respondents were in (i) total agreement 4-0; (ii) 3-1 agreement; (iii) split response 2-2; (iv) 1-3 disagreement; (v). total disagreement 0-4.

    i.   Total Agreement 4-0: Statement: 11

    ii.   Agreement 3-1: Statements: 2, 5, 8, 12, and16

    iii. Split response: 2-2: Statements: 1, 4, 6, 10, and 17.

    iv. Disagreement 1-3: Statements: 7, 9, 14, and 15.

    v.   Total Disagreement 0-4: Statements: 3, and 13.

(Fig 4.h) Statements of Agreement and Disagreement

	Agreement	Disagreement
GR 1		
1 s	School 1, School 3	Instructors, School 2
12	Instructors, School 1, School 3	School 2,
GR 2		
5	Instructors, School 1, School 3	School 2
6 s	School 1, School 3	Instructors, School 2
17 s	Instructors, School 1	School 2, School 3
GR 3		

10 s	Instructors, School 2	School 1, School 3
11	Instructors, School 1, School 2, School 3	
GR 4		
7	School 1	Instructors, School 2, School 3
8	School 1, School 2, School 3	Instructors,
13		Instructors, School 1, School 2, School 3
15	School 1	Instructors, School 2, School 3
16	School 1, School 2, School 3	Instructors
GR 5		
2	Instructors, School 1, School 3	School 2
14	School 1	Instructors, School 2, School 3
GR 6		
4	Instructors, School 3	School 1, School 2
GR 7		
3		Instructors, School 1, School 2, School 3
9	School 3	Instructors, School 1, School 2

Triangulation of Data

In this section, the triangulation data, quantitative data gained from the surveys with the instructors and the students and the qualitative information gained from the interviews with the instructor's, will be explained (Transcripts of the foreign instructor interviews).

From the survey response data we have concluded that generally all survey responses were mixed results except statement 11 where all respondents agreed, and statements 3 and 13, where all respondents disagreed together. In other items, specifically 8 and 16, the instructors stood apart from the 3 schools. Here the differences between the instructors and the students were the greatest. Also, statement 4, about motivation, also provided interesting insight into instructor and student beliefs because this item was so close to being a one-sided response, where the

instructors countered the beliefs of all three schools. The interview questions are used to fill in unexplained areas 'between the quantitative data' if you will. For example, if there is a discrepancy of 27.5%, as there is between the instructors and School 3 with statement 8, 'is it essential for learners to be able to pronounce all the individual sounds in the second language', the interview findings can help explain that the instructors believe pronunciation is not as important as meaning as their lessons are constructed to serve students of a very low ability in English.

With statements where all respondents agree or disagree together, the interviews add explanations as to why this may be so. For example, with statement 13, all the respondents disagreed that, teachers should use materials that expose students to only those language structures they have already been taught', but through the interviews we find out that they probably disagreed with this statement for different reasons. The teachers might want to provide broader and more varied material but we know through the interviews that they are limited by class size, being too large, and by having students of different levels of English proficiency in their classes and, undoubtedly, access to authentic material. Everyone agrees varied material is better but the EFL context of teaching in South Korea does not permit it.

Information from the interviews also help explain differences between students and instructors in areas like motivation, attitudes toward curriculum, and important skills deemed important for one group or the other. Other information includes rounded versions of class sizes, the type of textbooks used, administrative attitudes towards e of the instructors, difficulties teaching with a large class size, student behavior, and the expectations of students through the eyes of the instructor's. For example, we learned that the instructors were wary of their student's attitudes towards learning because they commented on their student's want of higher grades regardless of the work they put in to earning it. This might account for the discrepancy between the instructors and students with regards to motivation. On the other hand, in a likewise fashion, the instructors showed very little concern for the planning and carrying out of their lesson plans. Generally, all of the foreign professors have had more than 6 years experience teaching in South Korea and have therefore build up an attitude towards their individual institute's administration and their students needs and/ proficiency levels. From this perspective, knowing the students

might very well revert to their traditional educational methods away from modern communicative methods. Therefore, this accounts for the gap between instructors and students upon behaviorist leading statements, for example, in the survey.

Chapter 5

Discussion

_____

In this chapter, the research questions will be answered through a discussion format and the project conclusions and recommendations will be drawn thereafter. The three research questions to be answered are as follows:

1. What beliefs about language learning do the second language learners embrace?

2. What differences are there in the beliefs of how second language languages are learned between the 2nd year Korean speaking English students and their native English speaking instructors?

3. In what ways do the perceptions of the students correspond with the English curriculum authorized by the college or university?

(*note: all statistical information of the mean scores have been taken from Appendix 1 and translated to percentages for the discussion in this chapter)

Discussion

The first two research questions (1 & 2 above) will be answered in a contiguous fashion after a short discussion of the relevant second language acquisition research. Similarly, the items of discussion will be grouped as found in chapter 4: a. Behaviorist (survey items 1 and 12), b. Bilingualism (survey items 5, 6, 17) c. Grammar (survey items 10 and 11), d. Teaching Method and Pedagogy (survey items 7, 8, 13, 15, and 16), e. Socio-cultural (survey items 2 and 14), f. Motivation (survey item 4), and g. Intelligence (survey items 3 and 9). Finally, research question 3 will be discussed with reference to the qualitative data collected and the Korean context of this project.

Behaviorist (a):

The behaviorist approach to second language acquisition states that "one learns to comprehend an utterance by responding appropriately to it and by being reinforced for that response" (Brown, 2000, p.22). From this perspective, all learning "is viewed as a response to stimuli, whether the behavior is overt or covert" (Hadley, 2001, p.55). The results are mixed in this grouping so neither the students nor the instructors are in concordance with the psychology that supports behaviorism: "all learning is distinguished as associative learning, or habit formation, conveyed by frequent involvement of a stimulus with a response" (Hilgard, 1962). This is a surprising result because the students do have a strong background in rote education partially due to the fact that communicative language techniques developed later in South Korea. However, the students in this project are of the age to have been a part of the first wave of national curriculum changes, specifically from the year 1999 and into the seventh national curriculum.

Behaviorist	Instructors	School 1	School 2	School 3
1. Languages are learned mainly through imitation	2.7	3.4	2.9	3.5

The students of School 1 and 3, by an average of 85 % (3.4) and 87 % (3.5) respectively, 'agree' that languages are learned mainly through imitation. This is perhaps due to their traditional 'rote' education, developed through their middle and high school years, where much of how they learned involved memorization, translation, and mimicry.

The instructors disagreement with this statement, at 67% (2.7), along with the students from School 2 (though minimally so), may have been due to their role in the education system at their university or college. Being limited by larger classes and teaching structural based lessons, by way of a textbook, inevitably leads to the instructors to confront the fact that many of their students are imitating or repeating the textbook or lesson word-for-word much of the time. In this context, the instructors may be frustrated with the responses they get in their classrooms, as their response was significantly lower at 67.5 % (2.7) than the highest school response (85% by School 3) and 15% (.6) off the average student mean score. This suggests that the instructors

believe 'imitation' is important, but not as much as the students believe it is to learning a second language.

Behaviorist	Instructors	School 1	School 2	School 3
12. Learner's errors should be corrected as soon as they are made in order to prevent the formation of bad habits	3.5	3.3	2.7	3.4

B.F. Skinner, a behavioral psychologist, used the term operant conditioning; to describe how 'verbal learning' is accomplished. He believed that "only those patterns [of language] reinforced by the community of language users will persist" [my brackets] (Hadley, 2000, p.56).

However, in an era of teaching that has become more communicative, where meaning is more so reinforced than (behavioral) form, it is believed that "constant correction of error disrupts communication and content learning in the classroom" (Met & Lorenz, 1997).

With Statement 12, 'learner's errors should be corrected as soon as they are made in order to prevent the formation of bad habits', the instructors and the students of Schools 1 and 3, believed that learner errors should be corrected immediately, whereas the students from School 2 tended to disagree more with this statement. Again, the students may agree with this statement due to their strong background in behaviorist techniques.

However, the instructors believe, at 87.5% (3.5), that errors should be corrected as soon as they are made, along with Schools 1 (3.3), at 82.5 %, and School 3, at 85%, (3.4). Since the more recent communicative research indicates that 'constant correction' may interfere with language learning, the instructor response runs contrary to communicative language learning. This response may indicate lack teacher knowledge or procedural skills, as the onus is on the teacher to decide when to use corrective feedback. Obviously, the situation and the type of student dictate how errors should be corrected. On the one hand, a student may make the same error continually; in this case corrective feedback may be used beneficially. On the other hand, a student may be too self-conscious of their own errors; in this case it may be better for the student

to continue as best they can uninterrupted by the teacher since corrective feedback will only work to reinforce the negative aspects of the learner's speech, reducing their motivation to learn.

Bilingualism (b):

Nativists believe that human beings have the innate ability to learn language. This is partially done through what nativists believe all human beings possess a Language Activation Device (LAD) that works on input and produces grammar, subconsciously processes language (Brown 2000). The Critical Period Hypothesis (CPH) put forth by Lenneberg (1967) stated that the "language acquisition device, like other biological functions, works successfully only when it is stimulated at the right time" (p. 19). Lenneberg suggests that "animals, including humans are all genetically programmed to acquire kinds of knowledge and skill at specific times in life" (Lightbown & Spada, 2008, p.17). The LAD has been generally been accepted but age variations do exist with researchers and theorists. For example, Patkowsky (1980) suggests that a critical period for second language learning does exist. He found that learners; studying over the same time frame, under the age of fifteen achieved higher syntactic proficiency than those who were over the age of fifteen. Also, Johnson and Newport (1989) believe that there is a critical period for second language learning. They believe that after the age of six, the ability to learn a second language begins to decline. Bialystok (1997) suggests, by way of her studies with adults and young learners, that the ability to learn declines at about the age of twenty.

Bilingualism:	Instructors	School 1	School 2	School 3
5. The earlier a second language is introduced in school programs, the greater the likelihood of success in learning	3.8	3.1	2.7	3.5

The research indicates that 'earlier is better' with regards a second language education but success in learning still depends upon what the objectives of the individual second language learner are. If native speaker proficiency is wanted then starting second language education at an early age may be necessary. If EFL and/ English for a Specific purpose (ESP) is the goal, then number of hours exposed to a native speaker may have to be increased or decreased depending upon the goal desired.

58

Only School 2 disagreed, believing that second language success can be at later period than childhood. However, the instructors, at 95% (3.8), greatly approved of the statement as did the students from School 1 and 3. School 2 average mean score of 67.5 % (2.7) varies slightly with School 1 at 77.5% (3.1) but more so with School 3 at 87.5% (3.5). This variance with statement may simply be because some the students at School 2 believe that second language acquisition is not age related. However, this is not been confirmed by the SLA theories and hypothesis.

Similarly, studies in second language acquisition theory do not confirm or deny whether L1 interferes with acquisition of L2 because there are too many variables attributed to individual learners, such as age, social environment, types of language, attitudes to language learning, and the native speaker for example. Interference refers to the likely interdependence between a person's first and second language, as opposed to independent systems for each language. These different bilingual neurological systems were believed to be related by the way in which each language was acquired (Lambert, 1990). For example, a compound or interdependent system "would be engendered through experiences in mixed acquisition contexts; for instance, in settings where the same interlocutors used two language interchangeably to refer to the same environmental events, as often happens in infant bilingualism when two languages start from infancy" (Lambert, 1990, p.204). A coordinate relation would, conversely, "would be developed through experience in two distinct linguistic settings where interlocutors rarely switch languages, as happens when a second language is started after infancy and in a context quite different from the home" (Lambert, 1990, p.204). In both examples, then, there is potential for interference between languages, though undoubtedly more potential exists in a coordinate relation between first and second languages where age and the environment are the critical factors.

The communication between to the two language systems in bilinguals is referred to as 'interlanguage'. Accordingly, Selinker (1974) suggests there are five "processes that he believes to be central to second-language learning and acquisition, each of which can force non-native items, rules, subsystems to appear and possibly remain indefinitely in the interlanguage systems of language learners. These five processes are: language transfer, or interference from mother tongue, transfer of training, or errors due to the nature of the language learning materials and approaches themselves, strategies of second language learning, or error due to the learner's own

approach to the material to be learned, strategies of second language communication, or errors due to the way in which the learner attempts to communicate with native speakers in natural language-use situations, and over generalizations of the target rules, or errors due to the way in which the learner restructures and reorganizes linguistic material" (Hadley, 2001).

Other variables that can affect language acquisition, causing interference, include: the types of languages, being cognate or non-cognate with each other, and the syntax patterns between languages. On an individual basis, "their aptitude for learning languages, cognitive style , motivation, attitude, previous knowledge, learning style, learning strategies and personal variables such as anxiety have variously been thought to influence second language acquisition" (Baker, 2003, p. 121).

Bilingualism:	Instructors	School 1	School 2	School 3
6. Most of the mistakes that second language learners make are due to interference from the first language	2.8	3.0	2.8	3.3

Students from School 1 (75 %, 3.0) and 3 (82.5%, 3.3) agree that 'most of the mistakes that second language learners make are due to interference from the first language', though research suggests that there are too many other variables to conclude 'interference from L1' is responsible for most mistakes when acquiring a second language. Student perceptions may be bound up in their own problems of translation or understanding L2, typically thinking in L1 before answering in L2 for example, and therefore assume that 'interference' is most likely the reason for errors.

The instructors and School 2 disagreed with statement 6 at 70% (2.8) on the other hand. These beliefs may based upon the 'expected' development of the students on the instructor's part, wishing there students to be of a higher level of English or, in another way, realizing that their lessons are of a very low level that translation between languages is not necessary. The interview responses confirm the latter. Likewise the students from School 2 may perceive themselves as of a higher level than their lesson plans.

Content-based instruction, as statement 17 suggests; 'Students can learn both language and academic content (for example, science and history) simultaneously in classes where the subject matter is taught in their second language', is one of the main teaching methodologies in bilingual education. Content-based instruction means "the learner uses the target language in order to acquire knowledge and learns a great deal of language as a natural by-product of such use" (Celce-Murcia & Olshtain, 2003, p.188). Content-based instruction is closely related to bilingual and immersion education programs and its use usually varies widely in terms of the second language input because research suggests that the development of the first language is an important initial indicator of a learner's success or failure. Cummins' interdependence hypothesis suggests that a learner's second language competence is dependent upon the development of the same learner's first language. "The more developed the first language, the easier it will be to develop the second language" (Baker, 2000, p.167). Cummins (2006) reports that this "hypothesis has been consistently supported in empirical research across a wide range of sociolinguistic contexts (Cummins, 2006 p.198). Coincidently, the Threshold Theory suggests that there are different three levels or thresholds of competence that can be reached and each may hold advantages and disadvantages for the second language learner. "The first threshold is a level for a child to reach to avoid any negative consequences of bilingualism. The second threshold is a level required to experience the possible benefits of bilingualism" (Baker, 2000, p.167). The threshold model accounts for three different stages in bilingual development. The first stage or the beginning stage "are for those whose current competence in both their languages is insufficiently or relatively inadequately developed, especially compared with their age group. It is at this level "when there is low level of competence in both languages, there may be negative or detrimental cognitive effects" (Baker, 2000. p.176) with content teaching. At the second level, "will be those with age-appropriate competence in one of their languages but not in both" (Baker, 2000. p.176). Thus "a partly bilingual child will be little different in cognition from the monolingual child and is likely to not have any significant positive of negative cognition differences compared with the monolingual" (Baker, 2000, p.176). At the third level, balanced bilinguals have "age-appropriate competence in two or more languages" [and] it is at this level that the positive (cognitive) advantages of bilingualism may appear" [my brackets] (Baker, 2000, p. 176).

Generally, there is a short delay in accomplishment when the curriculum is taught through the second language, as with content teaching (Baker, 2000) but once the languages become balanced the results are positive.

Bilingualism:	Instructors	School 1	School 2	School 3
17. Students can learn both language and academic content (for example, science and history) simultaneously in classes where the subject matter is taught in their second language	3.0	3.2	2.4	2.9

The student responses were split from School 2 and 3's disagreement with content teaching in L2, whereas the instructors and School 1 agreed with the statement, at 80% (3.2) and 72.5% (2.9) respectively. The difficulty in learning through a second language offers several difficulties in comprehension as compared with EFL learning, where the texts are arguably somewhat structurally designed for comprehension and continuity. The instructors stated that they were teaching students that had not been level tested for English, or are considered 'one level', and this may be why the responses were mixed. As above, with statement 6, the students may perceive that they are capable of studying content in the second language because their English lessons are easy at such a low level, whereas other students, particularly students that may have a difficult time in the English, do not believe in content learning in L2.

Grammar (c):

Second language acquisition theorists and hypotheses do not agree with this statement 10, 'Teachers should present familiar rules one at a time and learners should practice examples of each one before going on to another', for several reasons. Even though the Natural Order Hypothesis states that "the acquisition of grammatical structures proceeds in a predicable order" (Krashen, 1982, p.12) and "acquirers of a given language tend to acquire certain grammatical structures early, and others later" (Krashen, 1982, p.12) it in no way suggests how these structures are acquired. Arguments against the sequencing of grammatical rules extend from the nativist approach to language acquisition. "The term nativist is derived from the fundamental

assertion that language acquisition is innately determined, and that we are born with a genetic capacity that predisposes us to a systematic perception of language around us, resulting in the construction of an internalized system of language" (Brown, 2000, p.24). Research from this perspective, in children's language development, has led to the understanding that children do not learn sequenced grammatical rules. "Rather, the child's language at any given stage is systematic in that the child is constantly reforming hypothesis on the basis of the input received and then testing those hypothesis in speech (and comprehension). As the child develops, those hypothesis are continually revised, reshaped, or sometimes abandoned" (Brown, 2000, p.25).

Grammar:	Instructors	School 1	School 2	School 3
10. Teachers should present familiar rules one at a time and learners should practice examples of each one before going on to another	3.00	2.7	3.0	2.8

Though the research does not support them, the instructors and School 2 weakly agreed with the statement (75% (3.0)), that teachers should present familiar rules one at a time. Their responses may be due to the difficultly in learning and comprehending a second language, as most agree that teachers should proceed slowly without too much variance. School 1 and 3 disagreed. The instructor agreement may be at least partially due to their experience teaching in an EFL context in S. Korea, and the fact that many of them have taught in S. Korea for an average of 6.8 years. Hence, the students appreciate being moved through EFL lessons at a slow pace so that comprehension is maximized. Unfortunately, only a few learners benefit from this type of instruction. On the other hand, to suggest that teaching method mimic the order second language students 'predictably' learn grammatical rules in no way incorporates 'how' student actually arrives at understanding the rule completely. Consequently, teaching grammatical rules one at a time may only benefit the one potential learner who is ready to accept that rule at that precise time because it fits in his/her sequence of development.

Statement 11 states that 'teachers should teach simple language structures before complex ones', and all respondents agreed with this statement. Based on the Natural Order Hypothesis, it

depends on level of the learner at the time of instruction because students will only learn certain language structures in a specific sequence or order. The Natural Order Hypothesis states that there is a natural pre-determined order in which we can acquire language (Krashen, 1982).

Grammar:	Instructors	School 1	School 2	School 3
11. Teachers should teach simple language structures before complex ones	3.3	3.0	3.2	3.3

The student agreement (School 1, 75% (3.0), School 2, 80% (3.2), and School 3, 82.5% (3.3)) is undoubtedly analogous to their traditional behaviorist study methods and the fact that they study in an EFL environment. However, if more complex structures are presented before simpler ones, it should not matter to any individual learner based on Krashen's hypothesis. More important is that the input is comprehensible regardless of the skill type the structure is being taught through: listening, reading, speaking, or writing. Further, to insure that the structures are comprehensible there must be variance at the level of lesson plan to include different learning and cognitive styles of the learners since, due to the potential of range of learner ability, any one structure may be deemed simple or complex by any one learner. The instructors, though in agreement at 82.5% (3.3), 'agreed' , though this may be because they lack knowledge of Krashen's hypothesis and, also, because the instructors teach in an EFL environment and are appreciated more so by their students to teach in predictable ways so as to maintain coherence and the comprehension of their students.

Teaching, Method, and Pedagogy (d):

Statement 7, 'the best way to learn new vocabulary is through reading', is in accordance with most SLA research. Reading is one of the best implicit ways of advancing vocabulary, as opposed to explicit work through vocabulary lessons. Though this researcher agrees that "...knowledge can be gained and represented either implicitly or explicitly" and that "both contribute to language learning" (Doughty & Williams, 1998). Therefore, the argument holds that a learner can explicitly learn from context while reading; for the purposes of this study

'explicit' refers to the conscious act 'vocabulary' or 'lexis' achievement, whereas this researcher regards 'reading' as an subconscious act of increasing vocabulary or lexis.

Teaching, method, and pedagogy:	Instructors	School 1	School 2	School 3
7. The best way to learn new vocabulary is through reading	2.7	3.2	2.8	2.7

The instructors and students of School 2 and 3 disagreed with the statement believing that there are ways other than reading to increase vocabulary. However, only School 1 agreed with the statement at 80% (3.2).

One of the most important reasons why School 1 may have agreed with the statement is because students receive language in practical contexts and can consequently understand how the lexis items fit into a text, gaining a greater sense of the text as a whole. Scrivener suggests that reading is a better development tool over vocabulary lessons since the "co-text provides important exposure for learners to samples of language being used" ("the text that immediately surrounds a lexical item is referred to as co-text" (2005, p.230). "This suggests why texts are often more useful for teaching lexis than lessons that focus on lexis as separated, stand alone items without such surrounding language" (Scrivener, 2005, p.230).

There are several reasons why 'reading' in this EFL context doesn't always coincide with vocabulary development. The instructors may have a difficult time finding authentic reading material for different levels of English outside a prescribed textbook. Also, for reading to be effective, learners must be exposed to vast amounts of comprehensible text, since the knowledge gained from single usage of a lexical item may be forgotten unless it is soon followed by continual usage or reinforcement. Therefore, repeated exposures are necessary to achieve 'word meaning'. Knowing 98% of the vocabulary in a text is necessary for both unassisted comprehension (Hu and Nation, 2000) and to provide enough coverage to give learners a reasonable chance to infer the meaning of unknown lexis (Hirsh and Nation, 1992). However,

teachers and learners should be aware that too many explicit or de-contextualized vocabulary lessons can limit the learners' ability to use vocabulary in novel contexts (Beglar & Hunt, 2005).

Obviously the instructor needs to strike a balance between comprehensible reading through structural and de-contextualized material. So, on the one hand, the instructor's response may be due to lack of knowledge as the research does show that reading in context and reading in general is one of the best ways to increase vocabulary for language learners. But on the other hand, being limited by class size, different levels of students in the same class, and exposure to authentic reading material outside the textbook, can make the instructor attitude towards class preparation lacking.

With regards to second language learners developing pronunciation skills; statement 8, 'it is essential for learners to be able to pronounce all the individual sounds in the second language', it is not essential for learners to be able to pronounce all the individual sounds of their second language. Generally, the phonology of a language is described as either segmental and suprasegmental systems, where "segmental refers to the individual vowel and consonant sounds and their distribution, while suprasegmental refers to the patterns of rhythm (i.e. the timing of syllable length, syllable stress, and pauses) and the intonation contours (i.e. pitch patterns) that accompany sound sequences when language is used for oral communication" (Celce-Murcia & Olshtain, 2000, p.31). Likewise, phonetics is the science that describes all the sounds in languages. If learners can produce all the sounds in a given language's alphabet that is only the start of understanding how a language is 'heard'. It is not essential however to being to speak and communicate in a language. Phonology, the way speech sounds form systems and patterns, on the other hand, is considered more important because "it permits a speaker to produce sounds that form meaningful utterances, to recognize a foreign accent, to make up new words, to add the appropriate phonetic segments to form plurals and past tenses, to produce aspirated and unaspirated voiceless stops in the appropriate context, to know what is or is not a sound in one's language, and to know that different phonetic strings may represent the same morpheme" (Fromkin & Rodman, 1998, p.254).

It will always help to know all the phonetic sounds (segments) that make up a language but it is not essential. It is more important to know its phonology (suprasegmentals) as well. In

English is an intonation language where pitch rises and falls dependent on the structure and situation of the language's use. English also has several different varieties dependent upon what part of the world you are in. Therefore, essential knowledge of phonetics is reduced because the sounds and sound patterns will vary throughout the world in English.

Teaching, method, and pedagogy:	Instructors	School 1	School 2	School 3
8. It is essential for learners to be able to pronounce all the individual sounds in the second language	2.8	3.7	3.6	3.9

The students from all three schools 'strongly agreed' with statement 8, responding with an overall average of 90% (3.7) to this survey item. Student perceptions may be linked to their own poor speaking/pronunciation ability, therefore they may be overly sensitive to problems of pronunciation. Also, lack of phonological knowledge, along with the fact that Korean is spoken with few intonation markers, makes the shift to speaking English less assuring.

The instructors disagreed having an average of 70% (2.8). The difference of 22.5% (.9) between the instructors and students is significant with statement 8. Reasons why the instructors do not totally agree with the statement may be due to lack of knowledge or, in this case, not realizing that the students struggle very to comprehend what is said in 'real time'. The students may feel they need to know every sound of a language because they do not always understand what is being said to them in the English classroom. The instructors may realize that much 'meaning' in English is emphasized through the use of intonation and so there is no need to emphasize every particular phoneme or sound in the English language.

Most second language acquisition researchers would disagree with statement 13, 'teachers should use materials that expose students to only those language structures they have already been taught'. On the contrary, teachers should use materials that expose students to many different language structures that they have not been previously taught. The reason behind this stems from learning just like first language learners: being continually exposed in society to many different language structures and forms on their way to becoming fluent speakers. Generally, this approach assumes that learners learn from comparing and contrasting different

structures. However, the teaching method statement (above) presumes that the language structure used is a form of comprehensible input but it remains inconclusive as to whether the materials are being used to focus on form or meaning. In terms of form, according to Hatch (1978), pedagogical approaches to second and foreign language teaching has been "that we first learn structures, and then practice them in communication" (Krashen, 1982, p.21). This idea is supported by research that suggests that second language acquisition occurs along a determined sequence of grammatical structures. Methods that support this type of classroom teaching are referred to as a 'bottom-up' style and are closely related to behaviorist methods of teaching. Bottom-up "language processing relies heavily on linguistic features such as spelling patterns, grammatical inflections, and word choices…" and can associated with "gestures and illustrations and so on" (Celce-Murcia & Olshtain, 2000, p. 14). Conversely, if function or meaning is emphasized, as with communicative approaches, then repetition of patterned learning is not beneficial for the learner. Krashen's four part 'input hypothesis' model suggests that input should relate to acquisition, not learning; students acquire by understanding language that contains a structure a bit beyond the student's current level of competence (i+1), and this is done with the help of context or extra-lingual information; and learner production ability emerges, it is not taught directly (Krashen, 1982). Krashen's hypothesis is not unlike having the teaching method working latterly by means of not exposing students to language structures that they have already been taught. Rather, the structure is learned "subconsciously" (Krashen, 1982) through wider and wider use of the structure in different contexts. As a teaching style, this style emphasizes top-down language processing whereby the students are compensated for their lack of proficiency and knowledge by relying heavily on contextual features and prior knowledge to process new information (Celce-Murcia & Olshtain, 2000).

The negative aspects of structural, form focused, learning are student motivation, due to the lack of variation in lesson plan, students may not all be at the same level, and constraint on what can be discussed (Krashen, 1982).

Teaching, method, and pedagogy: (Mean scores)	Instructors	School 1	School 2	School 3
13. Teachers should use materials that expose students to only those language structures they have already been taught	2.5	2.0	2.0	2.4

The instructors and all students disagreed with statement 13, the instructors having the highest percentage at 60% (2.5) while School 1 & 2 had a percentage rating of 50%. From the student's perspective, this response is a contradiction with the earlier grammar statement 10, 'teachers should present familiar rules one at a time and learners should practice examples of each one before going on to another', and statement 11, 'teachers should teach simple language structures before complex ones', where the students, on average, agreed with these statements. Here, in statement 13, the students disagree and therefore choose to be introduced to materials they have not had any exposure to. The previous cautious approach to learning, indicative of behaviorist/structural approach is abandoned for a more modern, communicative approach here. Perhaps many students look toward English as an exciting and interesting class whereby they expect new and interesting materials to be used away from their traditional cultural environment.

The instructors also disagreed with the statement. From the instructor's perspective, they may not want to introduce new material to their students that they have not been exposed to previously because that lesson may have unexpected outcomes for both the instructor and the student. This loss of control or exposure to the unknown is a form of risk taking that may not reflect well with their administration's expectations of their job performance, especially if there are student complaints. This risk is even greater if we remember the sizes of the classes are large and that the level of English may vary greatly from student to student in these classes.

Statement 15 insists that 'students learn what they are taught'. However, most students are at different developmental stages, so how they learn, through different cognitive and learning styles, may not allow them to learn exactly what they are taught. The natural order hypothesis (Krashen, 1982) suggests that learners learn grammatical features in a natural order or sequence.

In a second language, that order will not probably match the first language sequence, and it obviously may not allow a student to learn what is taught as part of that day's language lesson, especially if it does not match their current stage of development. In terms of cognition, field-independence, "the degree one perceives things globally or analytically" (Hadley, 2000), may have a bearing on whether they learn what they are being taught. Globally minded students may not care to learn precise grammatically correct speech as a more analytical students might, for example. Further, students may have a great deal of outside or pragmatic understanding, so even though they are being taught to learn something specific pertaining to language, they may wonder how what they are being taught relates to something they have previously learned and so, in this way, they may not 'learn what they are being taught.

Teaching, method, and pedagogy:	Instructors	School 1	School 2	School 3
15. Students learn what they are taught	2.2	3.5	2.9	2.9

Only School 1 agreed with this statement, with a percentage of 87.5% (3.5). However, research tends deny that students learn what they are taught because all students develop independently, and therefore not all can learn the same things at the same time unless it matches their current developmental level.

The instructors and School 2 & 3 disagreed with this statement. They decidedly believe that students do not necessarily learn what they are taught. Instructors of second language must realize that all students have different cognitive abilities that suit their learning styles and that these are all at different stages of development. It seems the instructors that responded to this survey understand that or guessed right and this might be based on the difficulty they have attempting to teach students at different levels of English ability.

Statement16 is a controversial statement in the field of teaching pedagogy: 'teachers should respond to students by correctly rephrasing what they have said rather than by explicitly pointing out the error', According to many second language theorists, there are many factors to consider

when 'correctly rephrasing' or using 'recasts'. Some of which depend on the teacher's judgment or their estimate of the learner's precise level of language development.

'Recasts' are common in language classrooms but their usefulness has been questioned from different theoretical positions and observations. The age of the learner generally determines whether the acquisition of the language is conscious or unconscious. For example, comprehensible input from a parent to a young child, or a recast from a parent to a child, is considered almost negligible from a nativist perspective because it has little impact on forms within UG and it will temporarily change language behavior and not first language grammars (Carrol, 1996; Cook, 1991; Schwartz, 1993). Krashen's input hypothesis suggests that language acquisition is an unconscious process whereas language learning can only be monitored and not reverted into acquisition. Therefore, it would be difficult for a recast to affect what has already been acquired.

Adult learners, on the other hand, do learn through conscious methods of language acquisition. 'Noticing', for example, is a skill that is activated by a recast. Generally speaking, in order for input to become intake for second language learners, at all levels, noticing differences must occur (Ellis, 1991). In order for recasts to facilitate acquisition, learners need to notice the gap between their erroneous forms and the correct forms (Gas & Varonis, 1994). Further, others believe that "subliminal language learning is impossible, and that intake is what learners consciously notice" (Schmidt, 1990, p. 149). Further, "this requirement of noticing is meant to apply equally to all aspects of language" (Schmidt, 1990, p. 149). The moot point of 'noticing' is of course that the learner must be consciously aware to notice the differences: "Nothing in the target language is available for intake into the language learners existing system unless it is consciously noticed" (Gass, 1991, p.136). Recasts, then, can also function as an 'attention getting' technique which help learners notice differences between learner language and the target language. Noticing the differences between languages for individual learners is referred to as 'metalinguistic awareness' (Bialystok, 1991) and is considered crucial to becoming a proficient second language speaker.

However, the potential ambiguity of recasts has been noted by many researchers. Learners may perceive recasts as conversational responses such as confirmation of meaning rather than

feedback on their poorly-formed utterances (e.g., Chaudron, 1988; Fanselow, 1977; Lyster & Ranta, 1997, Truscott, 1999).

Recasts, by their very nature of indirectly correcting student errors," have been found to be more effective if the teacher has a method of signaling to the student – tone of voice, gesture, or facial expression – that says to the student, 'I think I understand what you are saying, and I'm telling you how you can say it better'" (Lightbown & Spada, 2006, p.193). Ferris (1999), on the other hand, warns that "the research on second- and foreign language feedback needs to be assessed carefully before generalizations can be made, particularly because studies vary greatly on such key design features as duration of the treatments, the way feedback is given, the subjects involved, and the instructional methods (Hadley, 2001, p.319).

Teaching, method, and pedagogy:	Instructors	School 1	School 2	School 3
16. Teachers should respond to students by correctly rephrasing what they have said rather than by explicitly pointing out the error	2.8	3.4	3.2	3.3

Only the instructors believed that their recasts should explicitly point out the error made by the student. They disagreed with this statement, which is significant because the instructors undoubtedly use recasts in their classroom in both ways: to point out errors and to correctly rephrase utterance. The students believe, contrary to the instructors at an average approval rating of 82.5% (3.3), recasts should elide the error and simply rephrase a statement correctly. There are several potential reasons why Korean students agreed with this statement but one good reason is that nobody likes to be embarrassed in front of the class, especially if they have pronunciation or intonation skills. In another direction, away from the negative effects, it is always helpful to hear a second language spoken correctly, allowing a student to hear the utterance clearly. Recasts, used in this way, as the research suggests, can be extremely helpful to the student.

Socio-cultural (e):

Statement 2 suggests that 'parents usually correct young children when they make grammatical errors'.

Sociocultural	Instructors	School 1	School 2	School 3
2. Parents usually correct young children when they make grammatical errors	3.0	3.0	2.3	3.0

The instructors and the students of School 1 & 3 agreed that parents usually correct their children's grammatical errors, as all responses were the same at 75% (3.0) respectively. However, School 2 disagreed with the statement. SLA theory, however, suggests that there are too many 'parental variables' to accept or deny this statement. This statement does reminds us of Krashin's (1982) comprehensible input hypothesis since it suggestively supports the idea that 'caretaker', or parental speech, is a good example of the type of speech that can be acquired by any learner. He states that caretaker speech is "syntactically simpler than adult-adult speech", so it is more ""roughly-tuned" to the child's current level of linguistic competence" (Krashen, 1982, p. 22). Further, "caretaker speech is precisely adjusted to the level of each child, but tends to get more complex as the child progresses" (Krashen, 1982, p.22). However, there are too many 'parental' variables to agree or disagree with this statement. Specifically, this statement does not realize the parental background, the environment they were brought up in, their educational background, specifically to language and/ linguistics, and their present social situation or standing. Essentially, the quality of feedback to the child may have great variance even though they do learn to speak a language. Likewise, for second language learners, without the proper feedback, problems of intonation, pronunciation, word order, meaning etc. may continue on until properly corrected by another source.

Statement 14, 'when learners are allowed to interact freely (for example, in group or pair activities), they copy each other's mistakes', does not suggest that two students are interacting with each other in conversation are of equal level or not, but it does suggest that without the teacher as an interlocutor the students are prone to copy each other. If we assume that the students are of the same ability, then 'copying' would depend on the level of the students second language proficiency as to whether or not they would copy each other's mistakes. Through

conversation with each other, students can learn phonology, grammar, syntax, and semantics. The socio-cultural perspective, made renown by Vygotsky (1962), suggested ways in which an invigilator can intercede and arrange effective learning in conversation. The invigilator "stretches of the child's mental ability by locating his or her 'zone of proximal development' or "the distance between the a student's level of development as revealed when problem solving without adult help, and the level of potential development as determined by a student problem solving in collaboration with peers and teachers"(Baker, 2001, p. 327). Communicative learning was initially developed through these types of interactions in conversation. In conversation, speakers can also develop rules of discourse about language and how those rules apply to other linguistic situations. However, these types of rules can be either supported and reinforced or negated by conversational experiences. Therefore, it is believed that students of low ability and proficiency will, to some extent, copy mistakes made by another speaker, especially if a teacher is not present to help with recasts. Contrarily, speakers of higher ability will notice more errors of pragmatics, phonology, vocabulary, grammar, and discourse, for example, and be able to self-correct themselves. Advanced speakers should be encouraged to self-correct in the foreign language classroom context so that they can continue to develop their skills for self-correction outside the classroom.

Sociocultural	Instructors	School 1	School 2	School 3
14. When learners are allowed to interact freely (for example, in group or pair activities), they copy each other's mistakes	2.8	3.4	2.9	2.9

Only School 1 agreed that students working pairs tend to copy each other's mistakes, confirming at the 82.5 (3.4) percentile, so we must conclude that they believe that this is a proper approach to second language learning. This sort of activity can be indicative of the environment these students study under. There is a lack of opportunity to converse in an EFL environment, as there much fewer English speaking foreigners than Korean nationals. In this context, it is

understandable that one a Korean speaker of low English ability can be easily overwhelmed by a friend's higher level of English speaking ability and therefore want to copy this better speaker, not realizing the number of mistakes their friend makes.

The instructors, School 2 & 3, on the other hand, disagreed with the statement, believing that L2 learners do not copy each other's mistakes. This agreement does not conclude that pair work or group activities is problematic. For the students their response may be tied on their conversational experiences, being positive developing from correct language use. The instructors may also feel that they provide proper instruction in their classrooms so there is very little room for error in their student's conversations. The instructor's perceptions of the L2 speakers not copying each other's speech errors; we must assume, is based upon their 6.8, average, years of experience, in South Korea.

Motivation (f):

Statement 4 suggests that 'the most important predictor of success in second language acquisition is motivation'. Although there is agreement that students should be motivated to learn, Dornyei (1998) states "that motivation is indeed a multifaceted rather than a uniform factor and no available theory has yet managed it in its total complexity" (p.131). Outside of individual aptitude, definitions of an individual's second language motivation change with the context in which it is discussed. Like above, motivation has been defined as being integrative, for people "who hold the target language culture and people in esteem and would like to identify with them and hence participate in their culture" (Mangubhai, 2006). This type of motivation is individual, based on personality and attitude, and less dependent on external factors and, therefore, likely to be more durable" (Mangubhai, 2006). Instrumental motivation is derivative of the idea that individuals have goals to achieve but is more susceptible to breakdowns. The integrative and instrumental motivations are comparable with the definitions of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation, the former coming naturally from within the student and the latter is referred to as reward, not unlike a goal. Further, other definitions of motivation have been defined by "two key factors: the individual's *expectancy of success* in a given task and the *value* the individual attaches to success in that task" (sic) (Dornyei, 1998, p.119). Since, individuals

have different reasons for learning a second language, motivation has been defined as either a goal, a reward, a will or a desire, to succeed.

In another direction, personality type, according to Ellis (1994), is another motivational variable. Extroverts seem to have more motivation, or an enthusiasm to try harder and "are credited with a willingness to take risks" (p.542). Willingness translates into a powerful tool: "strength of learners' motivation can be expected to have a causal effect on the quantity of learning strategies they employ" (Ellis, 1994, p.542). Further, social psychologists generally "assume a direct influence of attitudes on behavior"; and "the more direct the correspondence between attitudinal and behavioral targets, the higher the correlation between attitude in action" (Dornyei, 1998, p.122) or motivation.

Finally, teachers can motivate students in many ways to help them overcome the challenge of learning a second language. For example, among the ten items Dornyei (1998) mentions that teachers do, the three foremost seem to be asking the teacher to be a model of behavior, setting a relaxed atmosphere, and 'make the language classes interesting' are most helpful for motivation. Learners do not need the extra pressure of an upset or angry teacher as this would have a negative effect upon student motivation because the classroom is an environment as well. Additionally, research has been done to show that what the teacher teaches can effect student behavior and/ motivation: "The fact that learning strategies vary according to learning tasks suggests that it might be possible to change learners' strategic behavior through training" (Ellis, 1994, p. 545). At best then, motivation is only part of what helps a learner succeed.

Motivation:	Instructors	School 1	School 2	School 3
4. The most important predictor of success in second language acquisition is motivation.	3.5	2.8	2.9	3.0

The students of School 1 & 2 disagreed with this statement, where as the instructors and School 3 agreed that motivation is an important factor in learning a second language. Interestingly, the instructors overwhelmingly agreed, at 87.5%, or 12.5 % higher than School 3 and over 17% more than lowest respondents from School 2, that motivation is essential to

learning a second language. The difference between the instructors and the student responses, generally, can be attributed to the instructor's own beliefs about their student's motivation. Two instructors suggested that their students are not motivated to learn, one suggesting that they only want a high grade to maintain a bursary, whereas another instructor stated the students are too busy with other classes. From the students point of view that agree, we must assume that extrinsic motivation is a continual source of motivation to learn to speak English but it is probably only part of what makes them succeed.

Intelligence (g):

Statement 3, 'highly intelligent people are good language learners', is difficult to accept or deny for many second language researchers. However, all respondents in this project disagreed with the statement.

Intelligence:	Instructors	School 1	School 2	School 3
3. Highly intelligent people are good language learners	2.5	2.8	2.8	2.4

There may be a variety of reasons why the respondents believe that holders of high intelligence quotients (IQ) are not always good language learners, though sometimes they are used to predict educational achievement. There are several other factors to consider that can attribute to the failure of a language learner before the IQ of the individual can be considered. Generally, if we can accept a high IQ as an indication of aptitude to learn, then we must agree with the statement. However, many researchers disagree. "It has been proposed that motivation (Gardner, 1985), or cognitive style (McDonough 1981), or degree of acculturation, (Schumann 1978, Neufeld, 1978) or personality and attitude (Hubbard 1975) are of greater significance than aptitude" (Skehan, 1989, p. 38). According to Carroll (1981), there are four qualities of language aptitude, of which the instructors or the students may have had knowledge of one of the four to help distance them from agreeing with the statement: i. Phonetic coding ability (an ability to form and retain associations between sounds and symbols), ii. Grammatical sensitivity (the

ability to recognize the grammatical functions of words in the context of sentences), iii. Rote-learning ability for L2 materials (the ability to make rapid and efficient associations between sounds and meanings and retain them), iv. Inductive language learning ability (the ability to infer rules from samples of language). In studies attempting to prove 'aptitudinal stability', the relationship between aptitude and first and second language ability, conclude "that aptitude differences are already present at a young age" (Harley and Hart, 1997). However, other researchers seem to relate language aptitude to experience not just IQ or aptitude. Carroll says that aptitude is "crucially dependent upon past learning experiences (Carroll, 1981, p.86; Skehan, 1989, p.39). Further, Mclaughlin (1990) states that "aptitude should not be viewed as a static personality trait; novices can become experts with experience" (p. 173).

Therefore, there are a wide variety of skills that are required to learn languages in general. An individual's IQ may indicate overall aptitude to learning but it does necessarily advocate strong language learning skills.

Statement 9 is generally true according to most research but language learners must be wary of what is inferred by the phrase 'participate in': 'once learners know roughly 1000 words and the basic structure of a language, they can participate in conversation with native speakers'.

It is clear that a student with knowledge of approximately 1000 words and the understanding of the languages syntactic structure can enter into a conversation with a native speaker of that language. However, knowledge of a linguistic system, the ability to combine phonemes into morphemes, morphemes into words, and words into sentences (Fromkin & Rodman, 1998) does not necessarily mean that the speaker understands other types of contexts critical to understanding language. For example, the situational context involves: "the speaker, hearer, any third parties present, along with their beliefs and their beliefs about what the others believe. It includes the physical environment, the subject of conversation, the time of day, and so on, ad infinitum. Almost any imaginable extralinguistic factor may, under appropriate circumstances, influence the way language is interpreted" (sic) (Fromkin & Rodman, 1998, p. 191). Generally, this statement asks us to interpret the phrase 'participate in' because agreeing with the statement suggests a very weak understanding of the phrase, whereas to disagree would be to understand

that the pragmatic sense of a conversation; the interpretation and use of language in context (Fromkin & Rodman, 1998), is critical to 'participate in' understanding.

Intelligence:	Instructors	School 1	School 2	School 3
9. Once learners know roughly 1000 words and the basic structure of a language, they can participate in conversation with native speakers	2.8	2.6	2.6	3.1

The instructors, School 1 and School 2, all disagreed, whereas School 3 agreed with the statement having an average score of 77.5% (3.1). The difference of 12.5% (.5) between School average scores may be attributed to a misunderstanding or misinterpretation of the statement. Some students may believe that they are accurately communicating with native speakers with their limited vocabulary, as may be the case with School 3. This, of course, remains to be seen. Likewise, other students from School 1 & 2 may believe that they are communicating but not in such a way as to be considered fluent or being able to detail precise meaning to a native speaker. The instructors, like the students from school 1 & 2, believe that communication with a native speaker is not necessarily possible with only a limited vocabulary.

Research Question 3: In what ways do the perceptions of the students correspond with the English curriculum authorized by the college or university?

From the interviews, we know that neither the college nor the universities had an official curriculum for their English second language programs. Two of the instructors interviewed mentioned 'a textbook' they had to teach from but were told by their respective administrations that they could add to it if they liked. Generally, the textbooks were structural or grammatically developed around pronoun use and different verb tenses; one sample textbook included was 'Side by Side 1' (Molinsky, S J. & Bliss, B. (2001).

Essentially, the instructors develop their own curriculum for their individual classes, as they are authorized by the administrations of their schools to do so; as one instructor said: the 'curriculum is me'. Therefore, to answer this research question in any viable way, we must question the instructor knowledge of second language education since we must gauge student

perceptions of the 'authorized curriculum'. Peacock (2009, p.265) for example, uses 'pedagogic competence' to 'refer to both teaching theory and teaching practices', whereby he defines 'theory' as involving "teaching skills plus the essential knowledge of language and language acquisition" (Peacock, 2009, p.265), and 'practice' as "teaching, planning for teaching, and reflecting on it afterwards" (Peacock, 2009, p.265). Based on these criteria, only about three of the six instructors may be able to create thoughtful lesson plans; of the six instructors, only 2 of the instructors had TESOL certificates and only one had an MA in the field of education. Therefore, if we credit these 3 instructors as having 'pedagogical competence' we must assume that student perceptions might be reflective of their instructor's curriculum. On the other hand, if we consider the other 3 instructors with not second language training as being weak or lacking 'pedagogical competence', likewise, the student perceptions toward their instructor's curriculum may be based upon their own knowledge of second language acquisition to that point in time. Instructor knowledge is one of the limits to this project. Only one instructor though they were hired because 'I knew what I was doing' in a language classroom whereas one of the other 2 interviewed said they had a B.A., suggesting that was enough for the job, and the other suggested, because the level of English ability in his classroom was so low, the only the fact that mattered was that he spoke English and was born in an English speaking country.

Through these interview discussions (Fig.S5: Transcripts of the foreign instructor interviews) it became apparent that there is no 'official curriculum' offered by the individual school administrations, rather it was left up to the instructor to decide how to proceed in the classroom. The quantitative data concerning group 4, 'teaching method and pedagogy', statements had mixed results, but several of the responses are indicative of the students not corresponding with the curriculum. One of the most apparent disparities between instructor and student responses was to the statement 15 - 'students learn what they are taught'. The instructors 'disagreed' at 55% percentage whereas the students agreed at an average 80% rating (School 87% but School 2 & 3 at 72.5%). This shows a significant difference in beliefs as the students tended to believe that they learned what they were taught but; by comparison, the teachers were less convinced students learned the content of the curriculum. The instructors developed their own curriculum and, we may concur, that they would prefer that their students learn and understand their lessons. The perceptions of the students, on the other hand, suggest that they indeed 'know' what they are

being taught. This disparity may be accounted for in several ways. The instructors may not be skilled enough to create lessons with enough comprehensible input in an EFL context, though they have a job that employs them to do so. The students, coming from a typical educational background of rote memorization, believe they learn what the teacher instructs them to learn because this is what they have continually done at school from elementary through to high school.

From the same group, the responses to statement 8, 'it is essential for learners to be able to pronounce all the individual sounds in the second language' are one sided, with the students all believing it is necessary (an average of 92.5%) and the instructors disagreeing (70%). Such a wide margin of difference between the two groups suggests that the instructors do not believe pronunciation of all the sounds of great importance, whereas the students believe they are. The instructors may simply know better than the students what it takes to sound out the language because they are fluent speakers of L1 themselves. The students may be banking on how they learned their L1 as well, Korean language being almost entirely phonetic (i.e. one letter of their alphabet corresponding to only one sound).

From group 6, the disparity over the statement of motivation where the instructors believe at an average of 87.5% that (student average 72.5%), 'the most important predictor of success in second language acquisition is motivation', whereas the students average response was 72.5%. motivational concerns may be another reason why there is a disparity of perception between instructors and students over what is to be learned. Here the instructors believe that motivation is critical to learning, where the students, on average, are less likely to 'agree'. Thus, the teachers may believe that the students do not try as hard as they should and the students, on the other hand, believe they put in enough effort to succeed.

Finally, statement 3, highly intelligent people are good language learners, is an example where all respondents agreed together, whereas statements 11, teachers should teach simple language structures before complex ones, and 13, teachers should use materials that expose students to only those language structures they have already been taught, are examples were all respondents disagreed together. These examples provide hope which inspires the idea that students can engage in parts of the curriculum being presented.

In conclusion, these kinds of differences, as mentioned above, are derivative of the Korean context, in which the instructors teach and the students study, and are products of differences in educational styles of learning. These are typical problems in classrooms that cross cultures and languages, and lead to similar and differing perceptions about 'how' and 'what' should be taught in language classrooms.

Chapter 6

Conclusion and Recommendations

_____

Conclusion

Only 2 survey items provided great disparity between the beliefs of the students and their instructors, but only item, that of teachers using the didactic method of moving from simple to complex language structures, found all groups in agreement. The students believed that they have to produce all the sounds of L2 to be able to speak that language whereas their instructors, and most SLA findings, are in disagreement. 'Recasts' also pitted the instructors against the students. The instructors want their students to reproduce an utterance correctly; and perhaps they misunderstand, but for the students this is a form of language reinforcement that carries a sense of embarrassment with it, especially if the utterance is reproduced in front of an entire class.

However, for the greater part of the survey responses, the results of this project match the results of the ongoing research in second language acquisition: all being somewhat inconclusive. The purpose of thesis project was to explore the language learning beliefs of students and instructors, at different schools, to gain insight into some of the differences and similarities between these two groups. It was an interesting project, and successful to some extent, uncovering the reasons why the instructors and students believe what they do about second language learning. However, like second language acquisition theory itself, not having one unifying theory to explicitly show how second languages are learned, inevitably leading to a series of hypothesis under different approaches to language learning, the student and instructor beliefs have too many mitigating outside pressures to conclude whether their beliefs are inhibitive or facilitative. For example, all students strongly agreed that learning every sound of a second language is important, whereas the instructors disagreed. Obviously, these differences would clash in the classroom, students wanting to hear every phoneme of every word spoken to them while instructors carry on talking, perhaps knowing that the research is on their side, as

suprasegmental or patterns of rhythm are more important in English language learning. And this where the project breaks down: everything is dependent on the individual learner's needs at that time. It might be more important to a Korean learner to hear the sounds of the L2 clearer since in this EFL environment they very rarely have a chance to hear a native English speaker. His or her belief is facilitative and is partially based on their context but more importantly on their individual need. Therefore, all beliefs are inhibitive and facilitative, at the same time, because they are dependent on the individual's needs.

As the context widens, from the individual to the group, the context becomes more important to the results because it influences all individuals of the group at the same time. 2nd year English learners are products of their administrations and their instructors since they set the curriculum for their English language program. The administrations we know are under no pressure by the federal government to implement any kind of English program, and from the interviews we have learned that the class sizes are often to large, the students are not level tested for proficiency, and there is a lack of authentic teaching material outside a structurally based textbook. To this the instructors are thrown, with the leverage to design their own class lesson plans and/or curriculum. However, nearly 50% of all instructors donor have any kind of second language background or knowledge and, over time, have build up an attitude towards their students needs. All of this is the setting a 2nd year South Korean student enters into, wittingly or unwittingly, on his or her path towards learning English as a second language. Of course, they bring with them some general knowledge of English from behavioral educational past, and some knowledge of communicative language techniques, being mostly schooled by Korean speaking English teachers.

It is within this context that this researcher acquired all data for this project.

The results of the different groups showed the individual responses, as no item was a perfect set of the same responses. There were no total disagreements, scored as a perfect 1 on the Likert scale, nor were there any total agreements, scored as a perfect 4. The group's results did always show a 'leaning' toward one pole of agreement or disagreement. The instructors and the students only agreed on one survey item, and they disagreed on 2 other items together. This left 14 other survey items which were split decisions, and only 2 of these left the instructors on one side

facing the 3 groups of Schools; #8 (know every sound of L2) and #16 (recasts). When the students groups were at odds, on the other hand, this may be attributed differences in their school's administration and/ differences in instructor methods.

Recommendations

It is recommended that the colleges and universities in S. Korea attempt to hire more qualified instructors if they continue to have a 'hands –off' approach with regards to their curriculum development in their English second language programs. It is suggested that they hire educators that are knowledgeable in the field of second language acquisition, having the ability and flexibility to reinforce and expand learner potential, through the use of different methods and procedures, in a communicative language learning class.

References

A Journal of Developmental Linguistics (1990 -). Retrieved May 24th, 2009, from http://languageacquisition.org/

Abraham, R. (1983). Relationships between use of the strategy of monitoring and cognitive style. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 6(1), 17-32.

Abraham, R. (1985). Field independence-dependence and the teaching of grammar. *TESOL Quarterly*, 19(4), 689-702.

Ahn, S.H. (2003). A case study of a Korean learner. Retrieved Sept 19th, 2008 from http://asian-efl-journal.com/dec_03_sub.K1.php

American Educational Research Journal (1964 -) Retrieved May 17th, 2009, from http://www.aera.net/publications/?id=315

Annual Review of Applied Linguistics (1999 -). Retrieved May 18th, 2009, from http://journals.cambridge.org/action/displayJournal?jid=APL

Annual Review of Language Acquisition. Retrieved May 27th, 2009, from http://www.benjamins.com/cgi-bin/t_seriesview.cgi?series=arla

Anthony, E.M. (1963). Approach, method, and technique. *English Language Teaching*, 17(2), 63-137.

Applied Linguistics (*Oxford Journals)* (1979-). Retrieved May 22nd, 2009, fromhttp://applij.oxfordjournals.org/

Asian EFL Journal. Retrieved May 18th, 2009, from http://www.asian-efl-journal.com/

Australian Journal of Linguistics (1980 –). Retrieved May 17th, 2009, from http://www.tandf.co.uk/journals/titles/07268602.asp

Australian Review of Applied Linguistics (ARAL). Retrieved May 22nd, 2009, from http://www.epress.monash.edu/aral/about.html

Baker, C. (2001). Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism (3rd ed.).Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.

Behavioural Neuroscience (American Psychological Association) (1983 -). Retrieved May 27th, 2009, from http://www.apa.org/journals/bne/

Beglar, D. & Hunt, A. (2005) A framework for developing EFL reading vocabulary. In *Reading in a Foreign Language* 17, 1–31.

Best, J.W., & Kahn, J.V. (1998). Research in education (8th ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Benson, P. & Lor, W. (1999). Conceptions of Language and Language Learning. *System, 27*(4), Special Issue, 459-472.

Bernat, E., & Gvozdenko, I. (2005, June). Beliefs about language learning: Current knowledge, pedagogical implications and new research directions, *TESL-EJ, 9*(1), A1. Retrieved 29th June, 2008. http://tesl-ej.org/ej33/a1.html

Bialystok, E. (Ed). (1991). Metalinguistic dimension of bilingual language proficiency. *Language processing bilingual children*. (pp.113-140). Cambridge: Cambridge University.

Bialystok, E. (1997). 'The structure of age: in search of barriers to second language acquisition ', *Second Language Research*, 13, 116-137.

Bilingual Research Journal (1992 -). Retrieved May 24th, 2009, from http://brj.asu.edu/

Breen, M. (2004). The Koreans: Who They Are, What They Want, Where Their Future Lies. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Brown, H.D. (2000). First language acquisition. In *Principles of language learning and teaching* (4th ed.) (pp. 20-48). New York: Pearson Education.

Brown, J.D. (2001). Using Surveys in Language Programs. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Brown, J.D., & Rodgers, T.S. (2002). Doing Second Language Research. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Cognitive Processing (Journal) (2004 -). Retrieved May 25th, 2009, from http://www.springer.com/biomed/neuroscience/journal/10339

Carroll, J.B. (1981). Twenty five years of research on foreign language aptitude. In K.C. Diller (Ed.), *Individual differences and universals in language learning aptitude* (pp. 83-118) Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.

Carroll, S. (1996). The irrelevance of verbal feedback to language learning. In L. Eubank, L. Celce-Murcia, M. & Olshtain, E. (2000). Discourse Context in Language Teaching. A Guide for Language Teachers. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Chapelle, C. & Roberts, C. (1986). Ambiguity Tolerance and Field Independence as Predictors of Proficiency in English as a Second Language. *Language Learning*, 36(1), 27-45.

Chaudron, C. (1988), *Second Language Classrooms: Research on Teaching and Learning,* CUP

Cook, V.J. (1991). *Second language learning and language teaching*. London: Edward Arnold.

Chomsky, N. (1966). Linguistic theory. In R.G. Mead, Jr. (ED.). *Language Teaching: Broader Contexts. Northeast Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Languages: Reports of the Working Committees*. New York: MLA Materials Center. 43-49. Reprinted also in J.P.B. Allen & P. van Buren (Eds.). (1971). Chomsky: *Selected Readings*. London: Oxford University press. 152-9.

Chomsky, N. (1966), Topics in the Theory of Generative Grammar. The Hague: Mouton.

Clark, C. (1988). 'Asking the right questions about teacher preparation: Contributions of research on teaching thinking'. *Education Researcher*, 17(2), 5-12.

Cotterall, S. (1995). "Developing a Course Strategy for Learner Autonomy". *ELT Journal,* 49/3.

Crookes, G. & Schmidt, R. (1991). Motivation: reopening the research agenda. Language Learning, 41, 469 – 512.

Cummins, J. (1984). Bilingualism in Special Education: Issues in Assessment and Pedagogy. Clevedon, Avon: Multilingual Matters

Cummins, J. (2006). Language, Power and Pedagogy: Bilingual Children in the Crossfire. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.

Denzin, N.K. & Lincoln,Y.S. (Eds.). (1998). Collecting and interpreting qualitative materials. Thousand Oaks, Calif: Sage Publications.

Denzin, N.K. & Lincoln,Y.S. (Eds). (2000). Handbook of Qualitative Research (2nd edition ed.).Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Deutsch, N. (2007). An Analysis of English Curriculum. EtniRag, 2007(4). Retrived 27 July, 2008. http://www.etni.org.il/etnirag/issue4.htm

Diem, R., Levy, T., & VanSickle, R. (2001). *South Korean Education: Focusing on the Future. Retrieved Feb 27th, 2009 from http://askasia.org/teachers/essays/essay.php?no=68*

Doughty, C. & Williams, J. (eds.) (1998) *Focus on Form in Classroom Second Language Acquisition,* CUP

Dornyei, Z. (1998). Motivation in second and foreign language learning. *Language Teaching*, 31, 117-135.

Dunn, R., & Dunn, K. (1978). Teaching students through their individual learning styles. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

English Language and Linguistics (Cambridge Journals) (1997 Retrieved May 17th, 2009, from http://journals.cambridge.org/action/displayJournal?jid=ELL

Ellis, R, (ed.). (1991). *Second language acquisition and language pedagogy.* Multilingual Matters

Ellis, R. (1994). Learning Strategies. In *The study of second language acquisition* (pp.529-560). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ellis, R. (2008). Learner Beliefs and Language Learning. Retrieved Feb 28th, 2009 from http://www.asian-efl-journal.com/December_08_re.php.

European Journal of Cognitive Psychology (1996 -). Retrieved May 25th, 2009, from http://www.informaworld.com/smpp/title~content=t713734596

Falk, J. (1978). Linguistics and language: A survey of basic concepts and implications (2nd ed.). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley and Sons.

Fanselow, J. 1977. The treatment of error in oral work. In *Foreign Language Annals* 10:583-93.

Ferris. D. (1999). The Influence of Teacher Commentary on Student Revision. In TESOL Quarterly 31, ii (1997):315-39.

Fromkin, V., & Rodman, R. (1998). *An Introduction to Language* (Sixth Edition). Boston: Thomson & Heinle.

Garakapati, R. (2008) Shaky Plans. *Infomag: The European Union Chamber of Commerce in Korea*. March, 2008. Retrieved Dec 20th, 2008 from http://infomag.eucck.org/site/view/view.htm?num=4792

Gardner, R. & Lambert, W. (1972). Attitudes in motivation in second language learning. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Gardner, H. (1983). Frames of Mind: The Theory of Multiple Intelligences. NY, Basic Books.

Gardner, R. (1985), *Social Psychology and Second Language Learnin.,* London: Edward Arnold.

Gass, S. & Varonis, E. (1994). 'Input, interaction, and second language acquisition'. In *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 16, 283-302.

Gass, S. (1991). *'Grammar instruction, selective attention, and learning'.* In Phillipson et al. (eds.).

Geneese, F and Hamayan,, E. 1980. "Individual Differences in Second Language Learning". In *Applied Psycholinguistics*, Vol..1:95-110.

Goh, C. (1997). Metacognative awareness and second language listeners. *ETL Journal*, 51(4), 361-369.

Grasha, A.F. & Riechmann, S. (1982). The Grasha- Riechmann student learning style scales. In J. Keefe (Ed.), *Student learning styles and brain behavior* (pp.81-86). Reston, VA: National Association of Secondary School Principles.

Gregorc, A.F. (1984). Style as a symptom: A phenomenological perspective. *Theory in Practice*, 23(1), 51-55.

Gunter, M. A., Estes, T. H., & Schwab, J. (2003). Instruction: A models approach (4th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.

Hatch, E. (ed.) (1978), Second Language Acquisition: A Book of Readings, Newbury House.

Johnson, J.S. & Newport, E.L. (1989), 'Critical period effects in second language acquisition: the influence of maturational stage on the acquisition of ESL', *Cognitive Psychology,* 21, 60-99.

Hadley, A.O. (2001). Teaching Language in context (3rd ed.). Heinle & Heinle, Boston.Harley, B. & Hart, D. (1997). Language aptitude and second language proficiency in classroom learners fo different starting ages. Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 19(3), 379-385.

Hilgard, E.R. & Bower, G.H. (1961) (1975). Theories of Learning (4th Ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Hirsh, D. and P. Nation. 1992. What vocabulary size is needed to read unsimplified texts for pleasure? Reading in a Foreign Language 8, 2: 689-696.

Horwitz, E.K. (1985). Using student beliefs about language learning and teaching in the foreign language methods course. *Foreign Language Annals* 18/4, 333-340.

Horwitz, E.K. (1987) Surveying student beliefs about language learning. In A. Wenden & J. Rubin (Eds.). *Learner Strategies in Language Learning.* Cambridge: Prentice-Hall. 119-129.

Horwitz, E.K. (1988). 'The Beliefs about Language Learning of Beginning University Foreign Language'. *The Modern Language Journal*, 72 (3), 283-294.

Hosenfeld, C. (1978). Learning about learning: Discovering out student strategies'. Foreign Language Annuls, 9, 117-129.

Hudson, G. (2000). Essential??introductory??linguistics. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

Hu, M., & Nation, P. (2000). Unknown vocabulary density and reading comprehension. Reading in Foreign Language, 13(1), 403–430.

Hubbard, M., Ross, Lee, Lepper, Mark R. (1975). "Perseverance in Self-Perception and Social Perception: Biased Attributional Processes in the Debriefing Paradigm."*Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 32, 880–892.

Huer, J. (2009). Cultural understanding, open mind key to upgrading English. Retrieved May20th, 2009 from http://www.koreatimes.co.kr/www/news/opinon/2009/06/272_45029.html.

Hughes, Arthur. (2003). Testing??for??Language??Teachers (Second Edition)*.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

International Journal of Bilingualism. Retrieved May 24th, 2009, from http://www.uk.sagepub.com/journalsProdDesc.nav?prodId=Journal201922

Jonassen, D. H. & Grabowski, B. L. (1993). Handbook of Individual differences, learning, and instruction. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Journal of African Language and Linguistics (1979 -). Retrieved May 22nd, 2009, from http://www.degruyter.de/journals/jall/

Journal of Asian Pacific Communication (1989 – Retrieved May 22nd, 2009, from http://www.benjamins.com/cgi-bin/t_seriesview.cgi?series=japc

Journal of Cognition and Development (1999-) Retrieved May 18th, 2009, from http://www.tandf.co.uk/journals/titles/15248372.asp

Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience (1992 -). Retrieved May 27th, 2009, from http://www.mitpressjournals.org/loi/jocn?cookieSet=1

Jung, M N. (2005). Perceptions of Korean College students and teachers about Communication-Based English Instruction: Evaluation of a College EFL Curriculum in South Korea. Retrieved Dec 20th, 2008 from http://www.ohiolink.edu/etd/send-pdf.cgi/Nam%20Jung%20Mi.pdf?acc_num=osu1110161814

Kern, R. (1995). Restructuring classroom interaction with networked computers: Effects on quantity and quality of language production. *Modern Language Journal*, 79, 457-476

Kim, S.J. (2004). *Coping with cultural obstacles to Speaking English in the Korean Secondary School Context*. Retrieved Sept 19th, 2008 from http://asian-efl-journal.com/september_04_ksj.php

Kim, S.J. (2007). *Does Korea Gain from Being a "Republic of English?"*. Retrieved Jan 24, 2009 from the Chosun

Ilbo: http://english.chosun.com/w21data/html/news/200705/200705020009.html

Kindsvatter, R., Wilen, W. & Ishler, M. (1988). Dynamics of effective teaching. *NY:* Longman.

journal.com/september_04_ksj.php

Koh,Y.K. (2007). Understanding Korean Education; Korean Education Series: *School Curriculum in Korea*. Korean Educational Development Institute. Vol. 1. Retrived on Jan 14th, 2009 from http://eng.kedi.re.kr/

Kolb, David A. (1979). Learning style inventory technical manual. Boston, Mass.: McBer.

Korean Educational Development Institute's Journal of Educational Policy (KEDI). Retrieved May 28th, 2009, from http://eng.kedi.re.kr/06_inter/journal.php

Korean Journal of Applied Linguistics (1978 -). Retrieved May 17th, 2009, from http://www.alak.or.kr/main/pub_journal.htm

Korean Studies (1977-) (Journal). Retrieved May 27th, 2009, from http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/ks/

Krashen, S.D. (1982). Second language acquisition theory. In *Principles and practice in second language* (pp.9-37). New York: Pergamon Press.

Krashen, S. (1985). The input hypothesis: issues and implications. California: Laredo Publishing Co Inc.

Kuniński, M. (2000), **Language and National Identity. Philosophical and Sociological** Aspect, In: Bobrownicka, M. (ed), *Language and National Identity*. Slavica, UNIVERSITAS, Kraków (in Polish). Retrieved on Jan 17th, 2009 from http://bibliotecavirtual.clacso.org.ar/ar/libros/raec/ethicomp5/docs/htm_papers/48Mroz,%20Agata.htm

Kuntz, P.S. (1996), Students of "easy" languages: Their beliefs about language learning. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service, No.ED397658).

Language and Social Psychology (1982-). Retrieved May 27th, 2009, from http://jls.sagepub.com/

Lambert, W. E. (1980). Cognitive, attitudinal, and social consequences of bilingualism. In E. A. Afendras (Ed.), *Patterns of bilingualism* (pp. 3-25). Singapore: University Press. Regional English Language Centre.

Lambert, W.E. (1990). Persistent issues in bilingualism. In B.Harley et al (Eds.), *The development of second language proficiency* (pp. 201-218). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Larsen-Freeman, D., & Long, M.H. (1991). An introduction to second language acquisition research. New York: Longman.

Lee, J K. (2002). The Role of Religion in Korean Higher Education. In *Religion Education*, 29 (1). Retrieved Feb 27th, 2009 from http://www.uni.edu/coe/jrae/spring2002/LeeSpring2002.htm

Lenneberg, E.H. (1967). Biological foundations of language. New York: Wiley.

Lincoln, Y., & Guba, E. (1985). Naturalistic inquiry. New York: Sage Publications.

Lightbown, P.M., & Spada, N. (2006). How Languages are Learned. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lyster, R. & Ranta, L. (1997). Corrective feedback and learner uptake: Negotiation of form in communicative classrooms. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition,* 19(1), 37-66

MacNamara, M. (1973). "Attitudes and learning a second language". In R. Shuy and R Fasold (eds) *Language Attitudes, Current Trends and Prospects*. Washington, D.C: Georgetown University Press.

MacDonald, M., Badger, R, & White, G. (November, 2001). 'Changing values: what use are theories of language learning and teaching?'. *Teacher and Education*, 17 (8).

MacIntyre, P.D. & Gardner, R.C. (1989). Anxiety and second language learning: toward a theoretical clarification. *Language Learning*, 39, 251-275.

Mangubhai, Francis. (2006). Lin 8001 Study book. Toowoomba: University of Southern Queensland Press.

McDonough, S. (1981). *Psychology in foreign language teaching*. London : George Allen & Unwin.

McLaughlin, B. (1990). 'The relationship between first and second languages: language proficiency and language aptitude' in Harley et al. (eds.) 1990.

Met, M. & Lorenz, E. B. (1997). Lessons from U.S. immersion programs: Two decades of experience. In R. K. Johnson & M.Swain (Eds.), *Immersion Education: International Perspectives* (pp. 243-264). New York: Cambridge.

Modern Language Journal (MLJ) (1906 –). Retrieved May 25th, 2009, from http://mlj.miis.edu/
 (Molinsky, S J. & Bliss, B. (2001). *Side by Side 1* (3rd ed.), *Student Book 1*. White Plains, N.Y: Longman.

Mori, Y. (September, 1999). Epistemological Beliefs and Language Learning Beliefs: What do Language Learners Believe About Their Learning? *Language Learner*, 49(3).

Naiman, N., Frohlich, M., Stern, H.H., & Todesco, A. (1978). *The good language learner*. Toronto: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education. Reprinted 1996 by Multilingual Matters.

Neufeld, G. (1978), On the acquisition of prosodic and articulatory features in adult language learning. *Canadian Modern Language Review 34* (2): 163-74

Nunan, David (editor). 1992. Collaborative language learning and teaching. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 253pp

Oh, M.T. (1996). Beliefs about language learning and foreign language anxiety: A study of American university students learning Japanese. *Dissertations Abstracts International*, 57(9), 3858A. (UMI No. 9705927).

Omaggio, A.C. (1978). Successful language learners: What do we know about them? ERIC/CCL *New Bulletin*, May, 2-3.

O'Malley, J. M., & Chamot, A.U. (1990). Learning Strategies in second language acquisition. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Oxford, R. (1990). Language learning strategies: what every teacher should know. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.

Pajares, M.F. (Autumn, 1992). 'Teacher's Beliefs and Educational Research: Cleaning up a Messy Construct'. *Review of Educational Research*, 62(3), 307-332.

Park, G. (1995). Language learning strategies and beliefs about language learning of university students learning English in Korea. Unpublished PhD dissertation, University of Texas at Austin.

Park, Nahm-Sheik (1989) "Language Purism in Korea Today": *The Politics of Language Purism*.Patkowski, M., 1980 The sensitive period for the acquisition of syntax in a second language. *Language Learning* 30: 449-72. Reprinted in Krashen, S., Scarcella

Peacock, Mattew. (2009). 'The evaluation of foreign-language-teacher education programmes'. Language Teaching Research 13,3 (2009); pp. 259-278.

Piaget, J. (1955). The Child's Construction of Reality. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
Pienemann, M. (1998).

 Language processing and second language development: Processability theory. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Co. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter. p. 119-140.

Regional Language Center Journal (RELC) (1970 -). Retrieved May 22nd, 2009, from http://rel.sagepub.com/

Richards, J.C. (1985). The context of language teaching. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Richards, J.C. & Lockhart, C. (1994). Reflective Teaching in Second Language Classrooms. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Richards, J.C. & Rodgers, T. S. (2001). The nature of approaches and methods in language teaching. In *Approaches and methods in language teaching* (2nd ed., pp. 18-35). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Riley, P. (1980). Mud and stars: Personal constructs sensitization and learning. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service, No. ED20198).

Rogers, T. T., & McClelland, J. L. (2004). Semantic cognition. Cambridge,MA: MIT Press.
Rust, F. (1994). 'The year of teaching. It's not what they expected'. *Teaching and Teaching Education*, 10, 205-217.Schmidt, R. (1990). The role of consciousness in second language learning. In *Applied Linguistics* 11(2)129-58.

Schmit & Frota, 1998 Schmidt, R., & Frota, S. (1986). Developing basic conversational ability in a second language. A case study of an adult learner of Portuguese. In R. Day (Ed.), *Talking to learn: Conversation in second language acquisition*, (pp. 237-326) Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Schumann, J. (1978), The acculturation model for second language acquisition. In Gingras, R (ed.) *Second language acquisition and foreign' language teaching,* pp.27-5O. Center for Applied Linguistics, Arlington, Va.

Schwartz, B. (1993). On explicit and negative data effecting and affecting competence and linguistic behavior. In *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 15, 147-163.

Scrivener, J. (2005). Learning Teaching: A guidebook for English language teachers (2nd ed.). Oxford: Macmillian.

Second Language Research (1985 -) (Journal). Retrieved May 25th, 2009, from http://www.uk.sagepub.com/journalsProdDesc.nav?prodId=Journal201828

Selinker, & M. Sharwood Smith (Eds.), *The current state of interlanguage* (pp. 73—88). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Selinker, L. 1972. Interlanguage. *International Review of Applied Linguistics.* X(3), 209-231. Reprinted in Richards (1974).

Skehan, P. (1989). Language aptitude. In *Individual differences in second –language learning* (pp. 25-48). United Kingdom: Hodder Headline PLC.

Skinner, B.F. (1957). Verbal Behavior. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.

Song, S-H. (2007). 'Foreign Teacher Visas in S. Korea'. *Herald Media Network*. Retrived 12th December 2007. Http://www.koreaherald.co.kr/archives/result_contents.asp

Sternberg, R. J. (1998). Abilities are forms of developing expertise. In *Educational Researcher*, 27(3), 11-20.

Stern, H.H. (1983). Fundamental concepts of language teaching. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Stevens, R. (2009**)**. Korea Is Strange Indeed. Retrieved May 20th, 2009 from http://www.koreatimes.co.kr/www/news/opinon/2009/05/162_42954.html

Swain, M. (1995). Three functions of output in second language learning. In G. Cook & B. Seidlhofer (Eds.). *Principle and Practice in Applied Linguistics.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Swain, M. (1995). Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development. In S. Gass and C. Madden (Eds.), *Input in second language acquisition*. Rowley, Mass: Newbury House.

The American Behavioral Scientist (1960 -) Retrieved May 19th, 2009, from http://abs.sagepub.com/

The Applied Linguistics Association of Korea (ALAK). Retrieved May 19th, 2009, from http://www.alak.or.kr/main/

The Asian Studies Network Center. Retrieved May 19th, 2009, from http://asnic.utexas.edu/

The Canadian Modern Language Review (1961 -). Retrieved May 22nd, 2009, from http://www.utpjournals.com/cmlr/cmlr.html

The Center for Korean Studies at the University of Hawaii (Manoa). Retrieved May 17th, 2009, from http://www.hawaii.edu/korea/

The European Journal of Cognitive Psychology (1989 –). Retrieved May 24th, 2009, from http://www.tandf.co.uk/journals/pp/09541446.html

The Journal of Bilingualism: *Language and Cognition* (1998 -). Retrieved May 18th, 2009, from http://journals.cambridge.org/action/displayJournal?jid=BIL

The Journal of Cognitive Development (1986 -). Retrieved May 18th, 2009, from http://www.tandf.co.uk/journals/titles/15248372.as

The Journal of Chomskyan Studies. Retrieved May 27th, 2009, from http://linguistlist.org/pubs/journals/get-journals.cfm?JournalID=6177

The Journals of Constructionist Psychology (1988-). Retrieved May 27th, 2009, from http://www.tandf.co.uk/journals/authors/upcyauth.asp

The Korean Institute of Curriculum and Evaluation (1998 -) (KICE) Retrieved May 18th, 2009, from http://www.kice.re.kr/en/index.do

The Linguistic Review (TLR). Retrieved May 25th, 2009, from http://www.degruyter.de/journals/tlr/

The Seoul Metropolitan Office of Education, 'Seoul English Education' (SEE). Retrieved May 19th, 2009, from see.sen.go.kr

Truitt, S. (1995). 'Anxiety and beliefs about language learning: A study of Korean university students learning English'. Dissertation Abstracts International, 56, (6), 2155A (UMI No.9534977).

Truscott, J. (1998), 'Noticing in second language acquisition: a critical review', *SLR*, 14, 2, 1203-135.

Understanding Korean Education; Korean Education Series: *School Curriculum in Korea*. Korean Educational Development Institute. Vol. 1. Pp. 74-161. Retrived on Jan 14th, 2009 from http://eng.kedi.re.kr/

Van Patten, B. (1984), 'Processing strategies and morpheme acquisition', in Eckman, F.R., Bell, L.H., & Nelson, D. (eds.), *Universals of Language Acquisition*, Newbury House; Rowley, Mass., 88-98.

Vygotsky, L.S. (1962, 1986). *Thought and Language* Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Weinstein, C., & Mayer, R. (1986). The teaching of learning strategies. In M.C. Wittrock (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching* (3rd ed.). New York: MacMillian.

Wenden, A. (2001). 'Metacognative knowledge'. In Breen, M.P. (Ed), Learner contributions to language learning. *New Directions in Research* (pp. 44-64). Harlow, Essex: Pearson Education Limited.

Appendices

Appendix 1: Fig.S1. Lightbown & Spada's Survey: <u>Popular opinions about language learning and teaching</u> (2006).

1. Languages are learned mainly through imitation

   strongly agree ….../….../….../….../….../…..   strongly disagree

2. Parents usually correct young children when they make grammatical errors.

   strongly agree ….../….../….../….../….../…..   strongly disagree

3. Highly intelligent people are good language learners.

   strongly agree ….../….../….../….../….../…..   strongly disagree

4. The most important predictor of success in second language acquisition is motivation.

    strongly agree ….../….../….../….../….../…..   strongly disagree

5. The earlier a second language is introduced in school programs, the greater the likelihood of success in learning.

   strongly agree ….../….../….../….../….../…..   strongly disagree

6. Most of the mistakes that second language learners make are due to interference from the first language.

   strongly agree ….../….../….../….../….../…..   strongly disagree

7. The best way to learn new vocabulary is through reading.

   strongly agree ….../….../….../….../….../…..   strongly disagree

8. It is essential for learners to be able to pronounce all the individual sounds in the second language.

   strongly agree ….../….../….../….../….../…..   strongly disagree

9. Once learners know roughly 1000 words and the basic structure of a language, they can participate in conversation with native speakers.

   strongly agree ….../….../….../….../….../…..   strongly disagree

10. Teachers should present familiar rules one at a time and learners should practice examples of each one before going on to another.

strongly agree …../…../…../…../…../…..   strongly disagree

11. Teachers should teach simple language structures before complex ones.

    strongly agree …../…../…../…../…../…..   strongly disagree

12. Learner's errors should be corrected as soon as they are made in order to prevent the formation of bad habits.

    strongly agree …../…../…../…../…../…..   strongly disagree

13. Teachers should use materials that expose students to only those language structures they have already been taught.

    strongly agree …../…../…../…../…../…..   strongly disagree

14. When learners are allowed to interact freely (for example, in group or pair activities), they copy each other's mistakes.

15. Students learn what they are taught.

    strongly agree …../…../…../…../…../…..   strongly disagree

16. Teachers should respond to students by correctly rephrasing what they have said rather than by explicitly pointing out the error.

    strongly agree …../…../…../…../…../…..   strongly disagree

17. Students can learn both language and academic content (for example, science and history) simultaneously in classes where the subject matter is taught in their second language.

    strongly agree …../…../…../…../…../…..   strongly disagree

Appendix 2: Fig.S2. Instructor Survey Beliefs about Foreign Language Learning

Step 1**: Read the following statements about language learning.**

Step 2**: Circle the answer that most closely resembles your belief.**

Step 3**: Answer, as best you can, the final question.**

Step 4**: Hand in your completed survey when finished.**

1. Languages are learned mainly through imitation

   Strongly Disagree   Disagree   Agree   Strongly Agree

2. Parents usually correct young children when they make grammatical errors.

   Strongly Disagree   Disagree   Agree   Strongly Agree

3. Highly intelligent people are good language learners.

   Strongly Disagree   Disagree   Agree   Strongly Agree

4. The most important predictor of success in second language acquisition is motivation.

   Strongly Disagree   Disagree   Agree   Strongly Agree

5. The earlier a second language is introduced in school programs, the greater the likelihood of success in learning.

   Strongly Disagree   Disagree   Agree   Strongly Agree

6. Most of the mistakes that second language learners make are due to interference from the first language.

   Strongly Disagree   Disagree   Agree   Strongly Agree

7. The best way to learn new vocabulary is through reading.

   Strongly Disagree   Disagree   Agree   Strongly Agree

8. It is essential for learners to be able to pronounce all the individual sounds in the second language.

   Strongly Disagree   Disagree   Agree   Strongly Agree

9. Once learners know roughly 1000 words and the basic structure of a language, they can participate in conversation with native speakers.

Strongly Disagree   Disagree   Agree   Strongly Agree

10. Teachers should present familiar rules one at a time and learners should practice examples of each one before going on to another.

Strongly Disagree   Disagree   Agree   Strongly Agree

11. Teachers should teach simple language structures before complex ones.

Strongly Disagree   Disagree   Agree   Strongly Agree

12. Learner's errors should be corrected as soon as they are made in order to prevent the formation of bad habits.

Strongly Disagree   Disagree   Agree   Strongly Agree

13. Teachers should use materials that expose students to only those language structures they have already been taught.

Strongly Disagree   Disagree   Agree   Strongly Agree

14. When learners are allowed to interact freely (for example, in group or pair activities), they copy each other's mistakes.

Strongly Disagree   Disagree   Agree   Strongly Agree

15. Students learn what they are taught.

Strongly Disagree   Disagree   Agree   Strongly Agree

16. Teachers should respond to students by correctly rephrasing what they have said rather than by explicitly pointing out the error.

Strongly Disagree   Disagree   Agree   Strongly Agree

17. Students can learn both language and academic content (for example, science and history) simultaneously in classes where the subject matter is taught in their second language.

Strongly Agree   Disagree   Agree   Strongly Agree

18. Do you have any other belief(s) about second language learning that have not been suggested within this survey?

_____

_____

_____

Appendix 3: Fig.S3. Student Survey (Korean)

제제 2 외국어 학습에 있어서 학생들의 간략한 의견에 대한 조사

제 1 단계 : 언어 학습에 대해 아래의 내용을 읽으시오.

제 2 단계 : 당신의 의견에 가장 근접한 답에 공표를 치시오.

제 3 단계 : 최종 질문에 영어 또는 한국어로 할 수 있는 최선을 다해서 답하시오.

제 4 단계 : 마치면 당신의 완성된 조사서를 제출하시오.

1. 언어를 주로 모사(모방)로서 배워진다.

   강하게 부동의   부동의   동의   강하게 동의

2. 부모들은 어린이들이 문법적 착오를 일으킬 때 어린 그들을 통상 고쳐준다.

   강하게 부동의   부동의   동의   강하게 동의

3. 매우 지능이 높은 사람들은 언어를 잘 배우는 사람이다.
   강하게 부동의   부동의   동의   강하게 동의

4. 제2외국어 습득에 있어서 성공의 가장 중요한 것은 동기부여이다.
   강하게 부동의   부동의   동의   강하게 동의

5. 제2외국어를 학교 프로그램에서 더 일찍 소개되면 될 수록 학습에서 성공의 전망이 더 크다.
   강하게 부동의   부동의   동의   강하게 동의

6. 제2외국어 학습자들의 하는 대부분의 실수는 첫언어(모국어)로부터의 방해(혼란) 때문이다.
   강하게 부동의   부동의   동의   강하게 동의

7. 새로운 용어를 배우는 가장 좋은 방법은 읽기를 통해서이다.
   강하게 부동의   부동의   동의   강하게 동의

8. 학습자에게 모든 개인이 소리내며 제2외국어를 발음할 수 있게 하는 것이 필수적이다.
   강하게 부동의   부동의   동의   강하게 동의

9. 학습자들이 일단 약 1000단어와 언어의 기본 구조를 알면 그들은 원어민 사람과 회화를 할 수 있다.
   강하게 부동의   부동의   동의   강하게 동의

10. 선생님들은 한번에 한 개씩의 익숙한 규칙을 제시해야 하며 그러면 학습자들은 다음으로 진행하기 전에 각 하나의 예문을 연습해야 한다.
    강하게 부동의   부동의   동의   강하게 동의

11. 선생님들은 복잡한 문장구조 이전에 간단한 언어구조를 가르쳐야 한다.
    강하게 부동의   부동의   동의   강하게 동의

12. 선생님들은 학습자들이 실수를 했을 때 (또는 습득에 있어서 착오를 일으켰을 때)그러한 착오가 버릇이 되는 것을 방지하기 위하여 실수를 하는 즉시 고쳐줘야 한다.
    강하게 부동의   부동의   동의   강하게 동의

13. 선생님들은 자료를 사용해야 하는데, 여기서 말하는 자료는 언어 구조적으로 이미 학습된 것에 한한다.
    강하게 부동의   부동의   동의   강하게 동의

14. 학습자들이 자유로이 서로 대화가 허용될 때 (예를 들어 단체 또는 쌍들의 활동에서) 그들은 이미 배운 것이다.
　　　강하게 부동의　　　　부동의　　　동의　　강하게 동의

15. 학생들은 그들이 가르침을 받고 있는 것을 배운다.
　　　강하게 부동의　　　　부동의　　　동의　　강하게 동의

16. 선생님들은 학생들의 실수를 명백하게 지적만 하는 것이 아니라　그들의 실수를 올바르게 고쳐 말하면서 학생들에게 가르쳐야 한다.
　　　강하게 부동의　　　　부동의　　　동의　　강하게 동의

17. 교과목을 학생들의 제2외국어를 배우고 있는 교실에서 언어와 학부내용 두 가지를 (예를 들어 과학과 역사) 동시에 배울 수 있어야 한다.
　　　강하게 부동의　　　　부동의　　　동의　　강하게 동의

18. 이 조사서에서 제의되지 않은 제2외국어 학습에 관하여 어떤 다른 의견이 있습니까?

_____

_____

Appendix 4: Results

Fig. Pre: Pre-Test Results

Instructors	Student Group 1	Students Group 2
3.0/ 3.1/ 2.9	3.2	3.3

Fig.1: Instructor & Student Results/ Popular opinions about language learning and teaching

Item #.	Statement	Instructors	School 1.	School 2.	School 3.
1.	Languages are learned mainly through imitation	2.7	3.4	2.9	3.5
2.	Parents usually correct young children when they make grammatical errors	3.0	3.0	2.3	3.0
3.	Highly intelligent people are good language learners	2.5	2.8	2.8	2.4
4.	The most important predictor of success in second language acquisition is motivation	3.5	2.8	2.9	3.0
5.	The earlier a second language is introduced in school programs, the greater the likelihood of success in learning	3.8	3.1	2.7	3.5
6.	Most of the mistakes that second language learners make are due to interference from the first language	2.8	3.0	2.8	3.3
7.	The best way to learn new vocabulary is through reading	2.7	3.2	2.8	2.7
8.	It is essential for learners to be able to pronounce all the individual sounds in the second language	2.8	3.7	3.6	3.9
9.	Once learners know roughly 1000 words and the basic structure of a language, they can participate in conversation with native speaker	2.8	2.6	2.6	3.1
10	Teachers should present familiar rules one at a time and learners should practice examples of each one before going on to	3.0	2.7	3.0	2.8

	another				
11.	Teachers should teach simple language structures before complex ones	3.3	3.0	3.2	3.3
12.	Learner's errors should be corrected as soon as they are made in order to prevent the formation of bad habits	3.5	3.3	2.7	3.4
13.	Teachers should use materials that expose students to only those language structures they have already been taught	2.5	2.0	2.0	2.4
14.	When learners are allowed to interact freely (for example, in group or pair activities), they copy each other's mistak	2.8	3.4	2.9	2.9
15.	Students learn what they are taught	2.2	3.5	2.9	2.9
16.	Teachers should respond to students by correctly rephrasing what they have said rather than by explicitly pointing out the error	2.8	3.4	3.2	3.3
17.	Students can learn both language and academic content (for example, science and history) simultaneously in classes where the subject matter is taught in their second language	3.0	3.2	2.4	2.9

Fig 1-a: Student Mean Scores/ Popular opinions about language learning and teaching

Item #.	Statement	School 1.	School 2.	School 3.
1.	Languages are learned mainly through imitation	3.4	2.9	3.5
2.	Parents usually correct young children when they make grammatical errors	3.0	2.3	3.0
3.	Highly intelligent people are good language learners	2.8	2.8	2.4
4.	The most important predictor of success in second language acquisition is motivation	2.8	2.9	3.0

5.	The earlier a second language is introduced in school programs, the greater the likelihood of success in learning	3.1	2.7	3.5
6.	Most of the mistakes that second language learners make are due to interference from the first language	3.0	2.8	3.3
7.	The best way to learn new vocabulary is through reading	3.2	2.8	2.7
8.	It is essential for learners to be able to pronounce all the individual sounds in the second language	3.7	3.6	3.9
9.	Once learners know roughly 1000 words and the basic structure of a language, they can participate in conversation with native speaker	2.6	2.6	3.1
10	Teachers should present familiar rules one at a time and learners should practice examples of each one before going on to another	2.7	3.0	2.8
11.	Teachers should teach simple language structures before complex ones	3.0	3.2	3.3
12.	Learner's errors should be corrected as soon as they are made in order to prevent the formation of bad habits	3.3	2.7	3.4
13.	Teachers should use materials that expose students to only those language structures they have already been taught	2.0	2.0	2.4
14.	When learners are allowed to interact freely (for example, in group or pair activities), they copy each other's mistak	3.4	2.9	2.9
15.	Students learn what they are taught	3.5	2.9	2.9
16.	Teachers should respond to students by correctly rephrasing what they have said rather than by explicitly pointing out the error	3.4	3.2	3.3
17.	Students can learn both language and academic content (for example, science and history) simultaneously in classes where the subject matter is taught in their second languag	3.2	2.4	2.9

Figure 2-a: Instructor mean Scores/ Popular opinions about language learning and teaching.

Item #.	Statement	Instructors
1.	Languages are learned mainly through imitation	2.7
2.	Parents usually correct young children when they make grammatical errors	3.0
3.	Highly intelligent people are good language learners	2.5

4.	The most important predictor of success in second language acquisition is motivation	3.5
5.	The earlier a second language is introduced in school programs, the greater the likelihood of success in learning	3.8
6.	Most of the mistakes that second language learners make are due to interference from the first language	2.8
7.	The best way to learn new vocabulary is through reading	2.7
8.	It is essential for learners to be able to pronounce all the individual sounds in the second language	2.8
9.	Once learners know roughly 1000 words and the basic structure of a language, they can participate in conversation with native speaker	2.8
10	Teachers should present familiar rules one at a time and learners should practice examples of each one before going on to another	3.0
11.	Teachers should teach simple language structures before complex ones	3.3
12.	Learner's errors should be corrected as soon as they are made in order to prevent the formation of bad habits	3.5
13.	Teachers should use materials that expose students to only those language structures they have already been taught	2.5
14.	When learners are allowed to interact freely (for example, in group or pair activities), they copy each other's mistak	2.8
15.	Students learn what they are taught	2.2
16.	Teachers should respond to students by correctly rephrasing what they have said rather than by explicitly pointing out the error	2.8
17.	Students can learn both language and academic content (for example, science and history) simultaneously in classes where the subject matter is taught in their second languag	3.0

Fig 2-b: Native speaker data   Native Speakers (N=6)

Instructors   Years employed   Type of Education   Type of Visa

in S. Korea   degree (B.A, MA etc.)

Instructor 1	7	MA History + TESOL	F2
Instructor 2	5	B.A. Economics	F2
Instructor 3	6	B.A. Sociology	F2
Instructor 4	6	B.A. (Eng) Lit+ TESOL	E2

Instructor 5	9	B.A. Geography	E2
Instructor 6	8	MA Ed. MA(Eng)Lit	E1

Fig.2-c: Interview Questions

Question 1	Were you told what to teach or how to teach by your institute?
Question 2	Do you believe you are helping Korean students learn English as a second language? If so, what feedback, if any, do you receive?
Question 3	How does your knowledge of second language acquisition complement your school's second language curriculum?
Question 4	Do you have any specific examples from your past where you felt your instruction or lesson plan was correct for the class level but, when you attempted to teach the lesson, it just didn't work out or, subsequently, it became difficult or awkward to follow your plan?

Fig. 3-a: Mean and Standard Deviation

Instructors	School 1	School 2	School 3
Mean	2.9	3.1	2.8	3.1
SD	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4

Fig. 3-b: All item Mean/Instructor and Students

	Instructors	Students
Mean	2.9	3.0

Fig. 3-c: P values/instructors & schools

	Instructors and School 1	Instructors and School 2	Instructors and School 3
P value	0.38	0.31	0.35

Fig. 3-d: P values between schools

	School 1 & School 2	School 1 & School 3	School 2 & School 3
P value	0.051	0.97	0.05

Fig. 4-a: GR1: Behaviorist/ mean scores

	Instructors	School 1	School 2	School 3
2. Languages are learned mainly through imitation	2.7	3.4	2.9	3.5
12. Learner's errors should be corrected as soon as they are made in order to prevent the formation of bad habits	3.5	3.3	2.7	3.4

Fig. 4-b: GR2: Bilingualism/ mean scores

	Instructors	School 1	School 2	School 3
5. The earlier a second language is introduced in school programs, the greater the likelihood of success in learning	3.8	3.1	2.7	3.5
6. Most of the mistakes that second language learners make are due to interference from the first language	2.8	3.0	2.8	3.3
17. Students can learn both language and academic content (for example, science and history) simultaneously in classes where the subject matter is taught in their second language	3.0	3.2	2.4	2.9

Fig. 4-c: GR3: Grammar/ mean scores

	Instructors	School 1	School 2	School 3
10. Teachers should present familiar rules one at a time and learners should practice examples of each one before going on to another	3.00	2.7	3.0	2.8

	Instructors	School 1	School 2	School 3
11. Teachers should teach simple language structures before complex ones	3.3	3.0	3.2	3.3

Fig. 4-d: GR4: Teaching method and pedagogy/ mean scores

	Instructors	School 1	School 2	School 3
7. The best way to learn new vocabulary is through reading	2.7	3.2	2.8	2.7
8. It is essential for learners to be able to pronounce all the individual sounds in the second language	2.8	3.7	3.6	3.9
13. Teachers should use materials that expose students to only those language structures they have already been taught	2.5	2.0	2.0	2.4
15. Students learn what they are taught	2.2	3.5	2.9	2.9
16. Teachers should respond to students by correctly rephrasing what they have said rather than by explicitly pointing out the error	2.8	3.4	3.2	3.3

Fig. 4-e: GR5: Socio-cultural/ mean scores

	Instructors	School 1	School 2	School 3
2. Parents usually correct young children when they make grammatical errors	3.0	3.0	2.3	3.0
14. When learners are allowed to interact freely (for example, in group or pair activities), they copy each other's mistakes	2.8	3.4	2.9	2.9

Fig. 4-f: GR6: Motivation/ mean scores

	Instructors	School 1	School 2	School 3
4. The most important predictor of success in second language acquisition is motivation….	3.5	2.8	2.9	3.0

Fig. 4-g: GR7: Intelligence/ mean scores

	Instructors	School 1	School 2	School 3
3. Highly intelligent people are good language learners	2.5	2.8	2.8	2.4
9. Once learners know roughly 1000 words and the basic structure of a language, they can participate in conversation with native speakers	2.8	2.6	2.6	3.1

Fig. h: Statements of Agreement and Disagreement

	Agreement	Disagreement
GR 1		
1 s	School 1, School 3	Instructors, School 2
12	Instructors, School 1, School 3	School 2,
GR 2		
5	Instructors, School 1, School 3	School 2
6 s	School 1, School 3	Instructors, School 2
17 s	Instructors, School 1	School 2, School 3
GR 3		
10 s	Instructors, School 2	School 1, School 3
11	Instructors, School 1, School 2, School 3	
GR 4		
7	School 1	Instructors, School 2, School 3
8	School 1, School 2, School 3	Instructors,
13		Instructors, School 1, School 2, School 3
15	School 1	Instructors, School 2, School 3
16	School 1, School 2, School 3	Instructors
GR 5		

2	Instructors, School 1, School 3	School 2
14	School 1	Instructors, School 2, School 3
GR 6		
4	Instructors, School 1, School 3	School 2
GR 7		
3		Instructors, School 1, School 2, School 3
9	School 3	Instructors, School 1, School 2

Total Agreement: Statement 11

Agreement 3-1: Statements 2, 5, 8, 12, 16.

Split: 2-2: Statements: 1, 4, 6, 10, 17.

Disagreement: Statements 3-1: 7, 9, 14, 15.

Total Disagreement: Statements: 3, 13

Appendix 5:

Fig.S5: Transcripts of the foreign instructor interviews.

<div align="center">

Transcripts of the interviews

</div>

Researcher: Hi, thank you for doing this interview. You have the questions in front of you so I will just read them to you and then you can answer. Is that ok?

Teacher Alpha: Ok

Researcher Q1. Were you told what to teach or how to teach by your institute?

Alpha: Not really told by anyone but other teachers here. I never really spoke to my boss, other than saying 'hi' for about 4 months, I think – at a Christmas dinner. Generally, there is a textbook given to us but we are used to making up extra stuff when we want to.

Researcher: You have been teaching here for how many years?

Alpha: This is 5 semesters, so 2.5 years. We changed the textbook last year. We use Side-by-Side 1 now.

Researcher Q2. Do you believe you are helping Korean students learn English as a second language? What feedback do you receive that informs you so.

Alpha: That is a good question! They say things like 'good teacher' at the end of semester sometimes or, if I change a mark they say 'you are good teacher' but you know that I am sure they do not understand a lot what we give them.

Researcher: What do you mean?

Alpha: Well they memorize for all my tests, I think. I do have good students too but generally I see them two minutes before the test cramming away.

Researcher: After the test, do the students ever say anything to you?

Alpha: They always say it was hard but you know I tell them exactly what to study for the test. A lot of students still fail. I don't ever understand that.

Researcher Q3. How does your knowledge of second language acquisition compliment your school's second language curriculum?

Alpha: I don't have any knowledge other than following the book. I am not stupid and I didn't like the question but I have been teaching a long time in the country and even the administration doesn't seem to care – they hired me with my B.A..

Researcher Q4. Do you have any specific examples from your past where you felt your instruction or lesson plan was correct for the class level but, when you attempted to teach the lesson, it just didn't work out or, subsequently, it became difficult or awkward to follow your plan?

Alpha: No.

>>

Researcher: Hi, thank you for doing this interview. You have the questions in front of you so I will just read them to you and then you can answer. Is that ok?

Teacher Beta: ok, thanks.

Researcher Q1. Were you told what to teach or how to teach by your institute?

Beta: Not really. I think I was hired because I know what I am doing.

Researcher: So, the administration never said 'do this' or 'teach this'?

Beta: At my interview, after I was hired, they said I could do what I wanted as long as I had a mid-term, a final exam, and checked attendance. That was all.

Researcher Q2. Do you believe you are helping Korean students learn English as a second language? What feedback do you receive that informs you so.

Beta: The students here really respect their teachers so they only say nice things to me – like 'good job' after class with their thumbs up. May of them write to me on their test papers, saying things like 'I love you teacher' and 'A+ please' 'because you are good teacher'…stuff like that. Nobody around here takes it seriously.

I try to; to answer your question, give them a lesson every class – I use pictures a lot because they like them – and try to get them to talk about situations when I can.

Researcher: Do they all try to speak?

Beta: Some classes do others don't. Some classes are different from others.

Researcher: What do you mean?

Beta: Well, this semester I had 9 classes and 8 of them had 35 or more students, 3 had 47 to 50. I mean I do what I can but it is pointless sometimes.

Researcher: Why?

Beta: Because by the time I finish taking attendance I have about 25 minutes to teach them. It is too loud, it takes them time to settle down. Even then I think half of them are playing with their handphones!

Researcher Q3. How does your knowledge of second language acquisition compliment your school's second language curriculum?

Beta: I only have an education degree, so I use that knowledge when I can. The curriculum is me so I try to step them through verbs and pronouns and some vocabulary. That is about it.

Researcher Q4. Do you have any specific examples from your past where you felt your instruction or lesson plan was correct for the class level but, when you attempted to teach the lesson, it just didn't work out or, subsequently, it became difficult or awkward to follow your plan?

Beta: Sure, my first year here I worked out an entire syllabus for my classes – I had three different ones. But like I said I worked my lesson plans around verbs, you know like present continuous and future, you know…

Researcher: Yeah.

Beta: Anyways, I get in there and start teaching for a few weeks and I realized that they never leveled tested any of the students. I am teaching kids of a million different levels at the same time.

Researcher: Really.

Beta: Actually it was a class of about 30 students and I thought they were all just shy for a while, but when I really pushed them for a answer I could tell they didn't understand anything, some of them anyways.

>>>

Researcher: Hi, thank you for doing this interview. You have the questions in front of you so I will just read them to you and then you can answer. Is that ok?

Teacher Cappa: Yes

Researcher Q1. Were you told what to teach or how to teach by your institute?

Cappa: We all used the same textbook.

Researcher: Which one?

Cappa: It was made by the school, called E-ways.

Researcher: Did the school tell you how to teach it?

Cappa: Haha! They told us to use follow the book but we could add to it if we wanted to.

Researcher: Do you?

Cappa: yeah, all the time. The book reads like a 'decliner' of verbs and animated illustrations – it is terrible, the kids hate it.

Researcher: So what do you do?

Cappa: I just, I should say we, make our own textbook basically. I mean all the students are of a very low level of English, so we give them the basics of the language – pronouns and verbs with standard compliments. I tried using idioms once but they didn't understand them. I use them at the language institute sometimes.

Researcher Q2. Do you believe you are helping Korean students learn English as a second language? What feedback do you receive that informs you so.

Cappa: I speak a little Korean so I know when they say good things about me. I am helping them get the basics like I said. But they have to put in the work to do it. My classes are fairly docile groups. I do not think they like to learn English. My wife says they are under a lot of pressure to learn but not in my classes.

Researcher: What do you mean?

Cappa: I mean they do not care about learning the language, all they want is a mark for their tuition or bursary or something. If they did any of the homework I assigned, I could tell but not here. You can ask all these other teachers.

Researcher: How many are there working here.

Cappa: About 35. They will tell you the same thing.

Researcher Q3. How does your knowledge of second language acquisition compliment your school's second language curriculum?
Cappa: I speak English and I went to school in the US. That is all I need. Sometimes I work on pronunciation with them and read out loud for them. They usually try in the classroom but after it is over I doubt if any of them open an English book.

Researcher Q4. Do you have any specific examples from your past where you felt your instruction or lesson plan was correct for the class level but, when you attempted to teach the lesson, it just didn't work out or, subsequently, it became difficult or awkward to follow your plan?

Cappa: No. We don't have levels here. Everyone is the same level.

>>