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Abstract

In Korea, education policies focusing on English have long invited challenge and raised major social issues in many ways. Teaching English in English (TEE) is one of the government-driven policies to improve students’ communicative competence. The main thrust of TEE is to have most or all English language teaching done in the target language to improve students’ communicative competence. The extent to which the L2 is used in the TEE classroom is considered to be the key factor in the success or failure of TEE. Research points out that the use of L2 only in the EFL classroom is a good practice since teachers are the students’ primary source of linguistic input (Turnbull, 2002). However, many English teachers in Korea are themselves somewhat limited in their fluency, and there are few opportunities for students to practice English in natural settings in Korea. Moreover, studies of L1 use in the learning of an L2 show that use of the L1 can play a positive role in the activities (Cook, 2001), and can be a useful cognitive learning tool in SLA (Anton and Dicamilla, 1998). Thus, there are questions as to how feasible TEE is as a policy at this time.

This study investigates the conception of and attitudes towards TEE of the major policy practitioners, i.e. English teachers. 43 Korean English teachers were surveyed by means of a questionnaire asking about their experience of and attitudes toward TEE. 67% of them had taught a TEE class. In general, the result shows that the overall understanding level of the TEE remains in low in spite of its 10-year history of implementation. Teachers have the positive attitude that TEE is helpful for students to
improve their communicative competence. However, in terms of its role in decreasing private education expenditures, most of the teachers are still doubtful. The most salient feature is that teachers’ confidence level appears to have increased. In particular, teachers who have experienced a TEE class showed quite a high confidence level in using English. Nevertheless, there is a discrepancy between the actual use of English in the classroom and its ideal use. Other issues such as class size, textbooks, assessment methods, and conflicts with the existing education system are ongoing problems. Thus, the teachers generally expressed negative attitudes to two of TEE’s fundamental goals – strengthening the private education sector and decreasing the private education expenditures.
CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

1.1 The Purpose of the Study and Research Questions

English education in Korea is always placed in the center of social issues. Since English has become a world language, the government’s English policy has focused on establishing two strategies, strengthening of the public education and decreasing in private education expenditures. The national newspaper, Hankyoreh in Korea reported in August, 2010 that, according to the statistics of the National Statistics Office, 87.4% of elementary students now have a supplementary private education and the average tuition fee per student is 245,000 won per month, or approximately 200 dollars at the current exchange rate. In the same month, DongA newspaper ran a story under the headline ‘Korea, Toward Coexistence: ‘English Divide.’’ It reported that learning English in Korea depends too much on the private educational sector. The gap between the rich and the poor is thus a factor in children’s differences in English proficiency, which will ultimately affect their future social status. This phenomenon has led to the term ‘English Divide’ and this trend is said to be intensifying. English proficiency serves to divide social classes. What kind of private English education a person has presents one’s ability of social and financial power. The level of English proficiency becomes a yardstick of measuring one’s class in the society.

TEE (Teaching English in English) is a policy that the government launched in order to strengthen and expand public education and reduce spending on private
education. It was designed to improve communicative competence in the classroom. It involves teaching English primarily or exclusively in the target language, with minimal use of Korean, the L2. According to the plan, TEE (previously called TETE, Teaching English through English) was implemented for students in the 1st year of middle school in 2001. It was gradually extended to students in the 5th and 6th grades in primary school, the 2nd year of middle school, and the 1st year of high school in 2002. Students in the 3rd year of middle school and the 2nd year of high school started TEE classes in 2003, and students in the 3rd year of high school in 2004 (Moon & Lee, 2002; Kim, 2001; Kim, S-A. 2002; Kim, S-Y. 2002; Cho & Lee, 2009).

In 2003, a joint research team of the Ministry of Education and Korea University of Education announced that of the total number of 67,464 English teachers from elementary to high schools in Korea, 7.5% (approximately 5,074 teachers) were able to conduct a TEE (called TETE at that time) class in 1997 (Son & Lee, 2003).

However, the scope of TEE has been debated, because it makes stringent educational demands on teachers: Non-native English teachers must conduct classes using the target language in an EFL context. Indeed, how much English is used in a TEE class has been a major issue. Many researchers have cited the view of Willis (1981) that the target language should be used exclusively in English classes as far as possible, and taking into consideration the level of students (Cho & Lee, 2009). According to the SMILE (School Managed Innovation of Learning English) Project in 2001, the Seoul Metropolitan Office of Education stated that TEE calls for English to be used between teacher and students, and among students in the English classroom. It should give maximum opportunities to the students to speak English, and the teacher would use
English alone except when a difficult grammar point needed to be explained. However, the rate of English use in a class would be applied flexibly considering the level of students and their understanding, and the level of difficulty of class lessons.

It has been 10 years since the TEE policy was implemented. In the mean time, there has been considerable research on varied aspects of the TEE policy, such as attitudes, curriculum, classroom English, and the like. In particular, some studies have looked at teachers’ view of TEE, and others the views of students or parents. Research subjects have included teachers from different regions of Korea, and elementary to college students. Since in-service teachers are the major practitioners of the TEE policy, investigating their perceptions is an important way to evaluate the TEE policy. However, not many researchers have studied the perceptions of teachers who have experienced a TEE class, from the elementary to high school levels. Moreover, individual teachers’ attitudes toward TEE’s assessment methods, and the question of whether teachers who have high English proficiency but no teaching license should be hired have received less attention. The questionnaire, with its open-ended question style, was designed to elicit more in-depth thoughts about these and other issues.

Especially after its 10-year history, reviewing the major issues of TEE and opinions from the teachers is meaningful. Investigating issues and examining the change that have risen from TEE classes is one useful way to assess the TEE policy. The following research questions were developed for this purpose:

Research Questions

1. To what extent are Korean English teachers knowledgeable about the provisions of the TEE policy?
2. How does teacher proficiency play a role in the evaluation of TEE?
   a. How do the teachers evaluate their own English?
   b. Do they evaluate their own English proficiency as adequate to teach a TEE class?
   c. Has there been a change in their confidence level in using English?
3. How much do the teachers use English in class?
4. What attitudes do teachers have about TEE?
5. Has there been a change in attitudes about the effectiveness of TEE among teachers since it was first introduced?
6. What are their opinions about other TEE issues such as the existing education system and the proficiency gaps among students, teachers, and schools?
7. Would the teachers approve of hiring English teachers who are fluent and experienced, but not licensed?

1.2 Outline of the Study

This study is composed of five chapters: (i) Chapter One deals with the purpose and research questions of the study: (ii) Chapter Two consists of a literature review, giving general background on the motivation for the TEE policy such as Korea’s globalization, or Segyewha, communicative language teaching as it relates to TEE issues, the use of L1 in the L2 classroom, and previous investigations into TEE. (iii) Chapter Three describes the research methodology. In this chapter, information about the participants, the data collection procedures, and questionnaire is included along with an overview of how the data was analyzed. (iv) Chapter Four presents and discusses the findings. This chapter is divided into three sections, following the order of the questionnaire, and tables are provided. (v) Chapter Five offers conclusions. Limitations of the study are mentioned and suggestions for further study provided.
CHAPTER II
LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Segyewha (‘globalization’ in Korean)

In November 1994, President Youngsam Kim of the Republic of Korea advocated Segyewha, ‘globalization’ as one of the leading government policies, and organized a special committee, Segyewha Chujin Wiwonhoe, ‘the committee for a globalization drive.’ In the Korean Education Ministry at that time, the Seghywha policy played a major role, where good knowledge of English, since it is a world language, was (and still is) regarded as a fundamental tool that Koreans should have for the future of Korea. The government’s anticipation that there would be a time when international commerce and trade as well as culture could be rapidly interchanged and increased between nations brought about a greater focus on English in education. As a result, in the education field, the concept of Segyewha has accelerated the study of English in and out of the classroom. This has caused English to be a primary focus of education in Korea.

The Segyewha policy introduced six major reforms, one of which was to innovate the educational system to cultivate future leaders for the nation (Kim, Woosung, 2008). Under this ideology, the Korean government introduced a new curriculum in 1997 in which TETE (Teaching English through English) was one of the implemented education policies. In December 2005, the Ministry of Education and Human Resources Development announced a blueprint for the Second National Human Resources Development Plan (2006~10): Creative Korea. The most prominent feature of this plan
was to expand English education into the first or second grades of elementary school. English was thus to be gradually introduced into the elementary schools. The first such English classes started in 2008. The Korean government clearly stated that offering English education to elementary students was a national priority. This was the start of government-driven early-childhood English education and was considered a sign of strength in public education, since the private education sector had previously dominated English education for some time. Thus the policy was considered to be one of normalization in the public education sector, whereby all students, not just the well-off, would have access to sustained English education. It was also expected that this policy would relieve some of the pressure of private education expenditures on family budgets.

However, the intensified, government-driven English education policy has had some adverse effects. For example, ‘The Early Childhood English Education’ policy has caused many parents to send young children to private English institutes. In reality, a larger number of kindergarten students in cities study English than ever before, and thus expanding rather than diminishing private expenditure. Park (2005) claims that the plan to expand early-childhood English education in elementary schools led to a situation where 74% of elementary students in the first and second grades, and 90% in the fourth to sixth grades in Seoul were enrolled in private English classes or had private tutoring in their homes. The total expenditure on private English instruction, including study abroad, has greatly increased from $1,070,000 in 1997 to about $2,487,000 in 2003 (Park, 2005). Ironically, the introduction of English into elementary schools appears to have exacerbated social and educational inequality between the rural areas and the cities, and even between cities. As a result, students may have a feeling of relative deprivation if
their families cannot afford supplementary private English education. Thus, to a great extent, the Korean government was the initiator of a boom in private English education, contrary to its initial goal, and it has conferred great power on the role of English in Korean society. This is one reason why many educators, teachers, and school parents have reservations about the TEE policy.

2.2 Change of National Curriculum

TEE’s implementation was largely influenced by the change of the national curriculum. The Sixth National Curriculum (1992-1997) introduced communicative language teaching and tried to eschew grammar-centered instruction and the grammar-translation approach in the classroom. The biggest turning point in the national curriculum was the Seventh National Curriculum (1997- to present). The 7th National Curriculum was based on the concept of globalization, so it even more heavily focuses on improving communicative competence. All five major goals for English education are related to issues with which communicative language teaching is concerned. They are: (i) to focus on daily and practical English; (ii) to enhance English proficiency; (iii) to create an activity- and task-oriented learning environment; (iv) to clarify the achievement standards; and (v) to provide appropriate English learning conditions (Ministry of Education and Human Resources Development, 1998; Kang, 2007).

It became necessary for teachers to have high proficiency to teach an English class following the 7th National Curriculum, whether they were high school teachers specializing in English, or grade school teachers covering all subjects.
The following statement was one of the backgrounds to revise English curriculum that the Ministry of Education presented under the theme of “plan for human resources development for survival in the age of globalization”:

The ultimate goal of learning English is contributing to the development of Korean culture by accepting world cultures, in which English is used as a medium since it is a universal language in the world. Learning English is not only for national interest but also for the world peace because English is a way of communicating with people in other countries. More than ever, language can create an affinity between people.

2.3 Communicative Approach

Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) was introduced in the second/foreign language teaching profession in the early 1970’s, the same period during which Selinker (1972) introduced the notion of interlanguage and Hymes (1967), the concept of communicative competence (henceforth CC), as contrasted to the earlier behavioristic language mastery model focusing on linguistic competence (Nazari, 2007). CC is “an aspect of our competence that enables us to convey and interpret messages and to negotiate meanings interpersonally within specific contexts” (Brown, 2007, p. 219). According to Brown (2007, p. 219), CC “distinguishes between linguistic and communicative competence to highlight the difference between knowledge about language forms and knowledge that enables a person to communicate functionally and interactively.” The concept of CC was further refined in the early 80’s and into the 90’s. New forms of syllabus organization (such as the Notional-Functional syllabus in England) appeared so that language teaching incorporated communicative functions and language tasks in addition to grammatical forms (Brown, 2007; Nazari, 2007).
Brown (2007, p. 378) defines CC as “the cluster of abilities that enable humans to convey and interpret messages and to negotiate meanings interpersonally within specific contexts.” Thus, Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) emphasizes oral communication as the basis of language development, which in turn demands the target language use most of the time (Ellis, 1984; Littlewood, 1981; Li, 1998; Kim, Young Sook, 2003). In short, using the target language for classroom management and as a teaching medium provides the maximum context for communication and authentic target language input necessary for language acquisition (Li, 1998; Brown, 2007; Nazari, 2007; Kang, 2008). The classroom goals of CLT stress the use of the target language in different social contexts and functions. In the ideal TEE classroom, students interact with teachers who provide comprehensible input while using only English, with the ultimate goal of the TEE classroom being that students are able to use the target language productively and receptively in any contexts.

However, Nazari (2007) presents a very interesting practical insight in this regard based on interviews with three EFL high school teachers in Iran. He found that his Iranian EFL subjects could not discern between broader and narrower views of communicative competence: the former includes socio-cultural practices of the L2 while the latter deals with linguistic practices of language. They stick to the narrower views of communicative competence. “Institutional constraints such as limited class time, big class size, prescribed syllabus might cause the EFL teachers to feel more comfortable with applying a narrower view to their teaching” in class (Nazari, 2007, p.209).

CLT and the development of CC are not without their problems in Korea, as well, despite the good intentions of the TEE policy. In a foreign language teaching setting such
as in Korea, nonnative English speaking teachers naturally predominate, and among the Korean EFL teachers, there are many who lack the language mastery that they are supposed to promote. CLT stresses the use of the target language in different social contexts and functions. In the TEE classroom, students are supposed to interact with teachers who provide comprehensible input while using only English. The ultimate goal of the TEE classroom is that students will be able to use the target language productively and receptively in any context, but this may not be true of the teachers themselves at this time.

Li (1998) concludes that Korean teachers have six major constraints to keep them from using CLT. The two major deficiencies in spoken English and strategic and sociolinguistic competence in English have led them to feel insecure about introducing the communicative approach in the classroom. The preexisting educational culture, the mainly “form-focused university entrance exam,” and the conflict between what CLT demands and what the EFL situation allows have created major impediments to educational innovation and potential change (Li, 1998; Gorsuch, 2000, p. 675).

Although the TEE policy was introduced about 10 years ago, many teachers appear not to be prepared to carry it out in the classroom. For example, classes may still focus on linguistic features without taking into consideration the socio-cultural contexts of language use. TEE classes tend to be regarded as English conversation classes, since as Brown (2007, p.228) states, “conversations are excellent examples of the interactive and interpersonal nature of communication” in second language acquisition.”
2.4 Teachers’ L1 (Korean) Use in the L2 (English) Classroom

Few doubt that extensive exposure to the target language will be helpful for enhancing learners’ second language acquisition. However, in the situation of learning the target language in an exclusively homogeneous population, the use of the L1 by teachers in certain situations may be beneficial for students. Although a teacher’s use of the L1 regularly in classroom interaction could deprive students of sufficient experience with the L2, the relevance of the L1 to student learning can also not be denied (Anton and Dicamilla, 1998; Cook, 2001; Turnbull, 2001; Turnbull & Arnett, 2002).

Turnbull & Arnett (2002, p. 207) suggest that a teacher’s L1 is usually “context in which students spend only short periods of time in class on a daily basis, and when they have little contact with the target language outside of class”. They came to this conclusion on the basis of studying core French programs in Canada and Spanish programs on the northeastern coast of the U.S. (Turnbull, 2001b; Turnbull & Arnett, 2002). Turnbull (2002) defines core French as a basic program where French, which is not the students’ native language, is “the subject being studied and the language is taught in periods that vary between 20 and 50 minutes a day” (Turnbull, 1990: Turnbull & Arnett, 2002, p. 207).

Another difficulty that researchers have with the target language-only movement is the vagueness of the latter’s use of the terms ‘exclusive’, ‘maximum’, and ‘only.’ In the L2 ‘exclusively’ and ‘only’ classroom, L1 is often used to increase learners’ internalization of input in the target language (Marco, 2001; Polio & Duff 1994; Duff & Polio 1990; Turnbull & Arnett, 2002). Duff and Polio (1990) found in a study of
ESL/EFL students at UCLA that low level students needed to be allowed to use their L1 in order to reduce the level of anxiety in classrooms, as well as decreasing the concerns about understanding input information such as the vocabulary that teachers use in the classroom. (The L1 use of the teachers who participated in this study varied from 0% to 90%, with 32.1% being the cross-class average (Duff & Polio, 1990).

Rolin-Ianziti & Brownlie (2002) conducted a study of the use of learners’ native language, English, by four teachers of French while conducting classroom activities at the University of Queensland in Australia. They observed that the amount of L1 used during grammar activities was higher in listening activities. They concluded that teachers’ L1 use in context actively promotes learners’ acquisition in an immersion foreign language course. This study supports Duff & Polio’s two studies (1990, 1994), both of which show that L1 is mostly used in commenting on language forms, managing the class, and in communicative situations such as having a talk with students to negotiate meaning and interact with others in the classroom. The communicative uses show teacher-student interaction, “particularly students’ participation in the teaching process [by] switching to Native Language in teacher speech” which indicates that teachers’ L1 use is desired not only by the teacher, but also by the students who are actively involved in classroom participation by using of the L1 (Duff & Polio, 1990; Rolin-Ianziti & Brownlie, 2002, p. 422).

The teachers’ L1 use also plays a cognitive role in negotiating meanings during collaborative tasks (Anton and Dicamilla, 1998; Turnbull & Arnett, 2002). This study of the L1 use in the collaborative interaction of English speaking adult learners of Spanish shows that L1 is best used when it enhances language input to help students understand.
This type of use includes: checking comprehension, highlighting important points or salient vocabulary, and drawing students’ attention to what they already know (Castellotiti, 1997; Turnbull & Arnett, 2002). Research by Liu, Ahn, Baek, and Han (2004) on teachers’ code switching in South Korean High schools using the maximal English approach showed that the average L1 use was 32%, although it varied from 10% to 60%. The research reported that the students understood an average of 49% of their teachers’ English in class.

The previous research supports the belief that teachers’ L1 use in the EFL classroom facilitates students’ second language learning. The use of L1 is effective in enhancing language input and helps to increase understanding during collaborative learning and classroom interaction. The use of L1 by the teacher also triggers the students’ cognitive abilities to comprehend more of the L2 used in the classroom. The L1 is a useful tool for learners’ ongoing language development even though it is still controversial. L1 use in the TEE classes in Korea is still contentious, but its role cannot be overlooked in learners’ language acquisition.

2.5 Previous Studies

Much research has been carried out on TEE since its implementation. Students and in-service or future teachers have been surveyed about their understanding of and attitudes towards TEE from various perspectives. The major topic of study has been TEE’s effectiveness.

For example, research by Moon & Lee in 2002 (cited in Cho & Lee, 2009) showed that 56% of the teachers in middle schools in Seoul and Gyeonggi province had
negative attitudes toward TEE, even though the majority of the teachers (95.3%) felt its implementation was understandable and necessary. Pae (2002) also reported that subjects in his study responded that TEE was not consistent with the existing form-based national entrance exam. Teachers claimed that the introduction of TEE was inappropriate and did not meet the educational objectives which form the backbone of the national entrance exam. They felt that TEE’s goal of improving communicative competence was too different from what the form-based national entrance requires. No questions dealing with communicative competence can be found in the national entrance exam. It is comprised of listening and reading comprehension. If the national entrance exam does not include any concrete association with TEE, there is strong likelihood that TEE will be an unproductive and ineffective policy.

Moon & Lee (2002) and Son & Lee (2003) conducted research on the reasons for TEE’s failure in the secondary schools. They concluded that the main reason was the teachers’ lack of English proficiency, especially their inability to provide comprehensible input to students. The teachers realized that they lacked the English communicative competency, experience, and self-efficacy to carry out TEE. Secondary English teachers in Seoul had a tendency not to trust the government-driven TEE policy. The teachers’ attitudes about TEE’s effectiveness were mostly negative unless TEE policy allowed for the assessments of students’ communicative ability (Son & Lee, 2003). In terms of English use in the classroom, its positive influence was limited to the group of students who have high academic achievements, not to those at lower academic achievement levels. The use of English in the classroom does affect students’ attitudes in English class, but the influence on academic achievement level and English speaking and listening is
very minuscule (Lee, Myungsook, 1992; Lee, Kyujin, 2002; Son & Lee, 2003). According to Moon & Lee (2002), the range of differences in English proficiency among students varies vastly. Apparently, only a small number of Korean students are successful under TEE. In terms of the TETE (previous name of TEE) policy success, the classroom teachers are allowed to reset the goals to fit the students’ needs and levels, with the oral proficiency upgraded by all means (Kim, Duk-ki, 2001).

Regarding teachers’ perception of English use in the secondary English classroom, the notion of TEE shouldn’t be understood as using English 100% of the time. Many English teachers in the secondary level are reluctant to use English as a medium of instruction since they think they are not well prepared or trained to implement this new approach (Kim, Young Sook, 2003). Kim & Kim’s study (2003) explained that the level of the teachers’ English proficiency (91%) was at the intermediate level, which caused the students not to pay attention to the teachers in primary schools. The students they studied preferred to use both English and Korean in their English classes, regardless of the sex and grade of the students and school locations. The majority of the teachers displayed negative attitudes toward the exclusive use of English in class.

Nonetheless, in 2006, many researchers reported that teachers in general have positive attitudes toward the need for TEE (Ko, 2008; Min, 2008; Kim, S-Y 2008; Lee, 2007; Cho & Lee, 2009). Lee (2007) found that 152 middle school teachers had positive recognition of TEE’s educational advantages and Min (2007) reported the same result based on a survey of 54 elementary and 63 middle school teachers. They all understood TEE’s importance and necessity. In addition, some teachers are ready to carry out a TEE class at some extent. However, in her qualitative study, Kim (2007) found that there were
very few instances of real communication in such classes, and that the interaction patterns observed were different from those in natural communication. For example, there were only few teacher questions forming multiple IRF (Initiation-Response-Feedback) sequences. What is needed in the TEE classes is not only the teacher’s use of English but also the students’ active participation in meaningful interaction and negotiation. What this seems to indicate is that the exclusive use of English by teachers in TEE classes is not sufficient to achieve TEE goals for students’ proficiency. TEE as currently understood may not be sufficient to help students to participate in meaningful interaction, and therefore may not adequately assist the learners in improving their communicative skills. In fact, Kim (2007) found that students participated more actively in TETK (Teaching English through Korean) classes than in the TEE class (Kim, 2007).

Cho & Lee (2009) conducted research on secondary teachers’ and students’ perceptions of TEE in Busan. Both groups showed positive attitudes toward the necessity of TEE; however they expressed lack of confidence in their English ability to implement TEE. They mostly agreed that TEE is suitable for listening and speaking skills and its biggest obstacles are large class size and the need to pass the Korean Scholastic Aptitude Test ((KSAT), the national entrance exam in Korea).

Park (2007) did a unique study. In a comparison of students’ perceptions and evaluations towards between native and non-native English language teachers in the English-only class in college, 67 college students showed positive attitudes toward the non-native English teachers. They even showed slightly higher preference to studying with non-native English teachers over natives. College students indicated that the teachers’ nativeness was not a crucial factor in studying English even in an English-only
class. Although the students had high expectations regarding the non-native teachers fluency, including a good command of pronunciation, factors other than native proficiency were deemed more important. These included sharing the feeling that the teacher was once a learner of English as well, so that the teacher served as a motivating a role model, and that the class lessons needed to be interesting. This result shows that students can be happy with non-native English teachers in a TEE classroom. In particular, college students generally agreed that using English during most of the class hours is desirable, but that the use of the L1 (Korean) is still necessary to some extent in a TEE class.

From this review of previous studies, it can be seen that teachers have gradually developed positive attitudes to TEE implementation, but still have a lack of confidence in it. It is thus crucial for Korean English teachers to get rid of this sense of inferiority. Park’s research (2007) raises this possibility. Thus, teachers should take into greater consideration which elements contribute to greater student satisfaction and which components they should develop as non-native speaker teachers in order to give maximum benefits to their students.
CHAPTER III
METHODOLOGY

3.1 Subjects

A survey was carried out with 43 Korean English teachers in Seoul and its neighboring province, Gyeonggi. The participants are English teachers working in K-12 schools: 13 elementary, 8 middle and 22 high school English teachers. Thirty three work in Seoul. Of these, 7 are elementary school teachers, 8 middle school teachers, and 18 high school teachers. Of the ten teachers working in Gyeonggi province, 6 are elementary school teachers and four are high school teachers. All of the participants have taught or are currently teaching a TEE class. IRB approval was obtained through Ball State University.

3.2 Data Collection Procedures

The survey was distributed in two ways: 1. a school supervisor in Korea randomly distributed the questionnaire to colleagues working in other education districts in Seoul via email and asked them to randomly distribute it to K-12 English teachers in their district; I was not able to learn how many K-12 teachers in Seoul and Gyeonggi province received the questionnaire. 2. I sent it to four teachers with whom I am personally acquainted.

Most of the responses emailed their completed questionnaires directly to my email account. Some teachers did the questionnaire on paper. In this case, one of the
cooperating teachers collected the completed questionnaires, input their answers into the computer, and sent them to me via email.

3.3 Questionnaire

The questionnaire consists of three sections with two patterns of questions: multiple-choice and open-ended. The first section is devoted to demographic information and general features of the participants, Sections two and three survey the respondents’ perceptions toward TEE policy and related issues. The questions in section two were designed to elicit the teachers’ general understanding about the TEE policy. Section 3 is divided into two parts: One asks questions that only teachers who have experienced a TEE class could answer; the other asks all questions to which all participants could respond. Section 3 consists of several categories of questions: teachers’ individual language abilities, such as linguistic proficiency level and confidence level, teachers’ preparation time, teachers’ L1 or L2 use in a TEE class, textbook use, employment of specific teachers for TEE, etc.

3.4 Data Analysis

All the data except qualitative questions (open-ended) were compiled statistically. For this, SPSS 18, i.e. PASW (Predictive Analytics Software) Statistics, was used to analyze the data. Descriptive statistics was used in order to obtain frequencies and percentages. Some results were analyzed using Bivariate statistics to get means and standard deviations. In order to analyze the responses to multiple-choice questions such as in Table 9 and 10, Multiple Response Analysis was used. In this case, weights were
assigned to the responses according to their importance. Thus, all multiple-choice questions were analyzed through weight analysis.

For the open-ended questions, the responses were categorized according to similarity of answers. Responses given in Korean are translated relatively literally into English when cited in the text.
CHAPTER IV
FINDINGS

4.1 Section 1: Demographic Information

4.1.1 General Background of the Participants

Tables 1, 2, and 3 show the demographic information and characteristics of the subjects. The female participants outnumbered the males: 36 females to 7 males. Most of the male participants worked in high schools. There were no male participants from middle schools. In case of the females, slightly over half of them were from high schools, and the next most frequent were from elementary and middle schools, in that order. Overall, 22 teachers, or just over half, were working in high schools, 13 in elementary, and 8 in middle schools.

The majority of the participants (23) were in their forties. The second largest group (10) was in the thirties. The third largest group (6) was in their twenties. The smallest group (4) comprised those in their fifties and over. The age groups are very important because they related to the type of language and pedagogical training received. Those over 35 years old learned English in the period of grammar-centered training. This could be expected to influence their current teaching practices. The length of teaching experience also varied among the teachers, ranging from 3 months to 35 years.

The average length of stay in English speaking countries is 11 months (See Table 3). This figure, however, is somewhat misleading. Although some teachers received a degree or certificate in TESOL in an English speaking country, two teachers had exceptionally long stay (i.e., nine and sixteen years) in English speaking countries, which
skewed the average. Given the latter’s relatively short teaching experience in schools, these teachers were probably specially hired for TEE classes. Disregarding these two outliers, the average stay overseas was only 2 months, most of which was spent visiting schools and observing classes. Generally, they had English classes in an English-speaking country for only 4 weeks. Thus, even though their average length of training abroad was about 2 months, their actual time spent studying English abroad was very limited.

Most of the participants trained in English speaking countries studied in England, the United States, and Canada. The programs were usually offered by local universities, such as Cambridge, Swansea, and Leeds Metropolitan University in England, the University of California at Irvine and the University of Hawaii in the US, Simon Fraser University, University of British Columbia, Canada Brock University and Chinook College in Canada, etc. The programs focused on learning English teaching skills and methodologies, visiting local schools, and taking intensive language classes. Some training programs were sponsored by the Seoul Education Office. Every program was a short-term training session for teachers to learn principles and strategies of how to conduct English classes. However, 18 teachers said that they had not had any overseas training. In particular, 11 answered that they had spent some time in an English speaking country without participating in any English training programs. Of these, four answered that they had spent over a year in an English speaking country.

The teachers had participated in a variety of domestic English programs, such as one or two month training camps, e-learning programs, English immersion programs, in-service training, etc. The programs included English conversation, other language
learning activities and games, principles and strategies for teaching EFL, and so on. The training was mostly conducted during vacations. Many of the teachers attended programs hosted by Korean universities with the Ministry of Education providing financial support.

Interestingly, some teachers counted the length of training by the hour instead of by the month or year.

Table 1: Overview of demographic information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>School Level</th>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Total No. of Teachers</th>
<th>No. of Years for Teaching</th>
<th>Length of Training</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Domestic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Elementary School</td>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10 yrs</td>
<td>2 mos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Over 19 yrs</td>
<td>1 mo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50 and over</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>total</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td></td>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Over 1 yr</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9-17 yrs</td>
<td>1-6 mos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50 and over</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>total</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total number of male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Elementary School</td>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3 mos-4 yrs</td>
<td>None-9 mos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5-12 yrs</td>
<td>None-7 mos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14-22 yrs</td>
<td>None-1 yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50 and over</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>total</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Middle School</td>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10-18 yrs</td>
<td>6-7 mos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20-25 yrs</td>
<td>None-6 mos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50 and over</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Over 30 yrs</td>
<td>60 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>total</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>High School</td>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12 mos-4 yrs</td>
<td>None-1yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4 mos-2 yrs</td>
<td>None-1yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8-25 yrs</td>
<td>None-8 mos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50 and over</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30-35 yrs</td>
<td>6 mos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>total</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total number of female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2: General features of the subjects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>83.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>53.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 and over</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Location</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seoul</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>76.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gyeonggi Province</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary School</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>30.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle School</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>51.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Background information about teaching and training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean (Month)</th>
<th>Std. Derivation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Experience</td>
<td>169.67</td>
<td>114.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of time spent in English speaking countries</td>
<td>11.62</td>
<td>33.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of domestic teacher training</td>
<td>4.98</td>
<td>7.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2 Section 2: Teachers’ Understanding of the TEE Policy

4.2.1 Understanding of the TEE policy

The second part of the questionnaire deals with how deeply the English teachers understand the TEE policy. Table 4 shows the teachers’ general understanding of TEE. 46% of the teachers answered ‘yes’ in answer to the question, “Do you feel you understand the TEE education policy?”

Table 4: Teachers’ understanding level of the TEE policy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>46.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>48.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Almost 49% of the participants chose ‘somewhat.’ This means that almost half reported only partial understanding of the TEE policy. This result is consistent with the
responses, shown in Table 5, to the question of whether the teachers had received a detailed oral or written explanation of the TEE policy from the Ministry of Education.

Table 5: Education Office’s TEE explanation to teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>58.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>41.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Slightly more than half (58%) had received such oral or written information, but 42% had not. Thus quite a few respondents lacked important information, even though the TEE policy has been in effect since 2001. It seems that the TEE policy still needs to be explained and promoted more actively by the Ministry of Education. This indicates that there is a considerable gap between the policy and its actual practice.

4.2.2 What TEE is

Table 6 shows how the teachers understand the TEE requirements.

Table 6: Teachers’ understanding of the TEE requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The class is conducted exclusively in English</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>27.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The class is conducted primarily in English, but some use of Korean is allowed if necessary</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>67.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The class is conducted mostly in Korean with some use of English</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English teachers decide how much English and how much Korean to use in the classroom</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

About 67% of them understand that TEE is teaching English classes using the medium of English as the primary language of communication, but that occasional use of Korean is allowed as necessary. They believe that the TEE policy does not require that English be used exclusively, but rather most of the time.
This result makes clear that many teachers may use L1 (Korean) in an L2 (English) class at any time as they personally feel necessary. The level of use of L1 thus depends on their arbitrary interpretation, even though a major goal of TEE is improving communicative competence. 29 teachers understood the TEE policy in this way.

The responses to questions 4 to 7 in Section 3 shed further light on this understanding. When the participants were asked how much English they usually use in class, more than one-third (15) or 37.2% answered that they use English less than 25% of the time in a TEE class. Most of the teachers (almost 60%) reported using English less than 50% of the time in class. Nevertheless, 37.2% expressed the belief that teachers should use English at least 50-74% of the time in the classroom in order to provide maximum benefit to students, and 30.2% reported that it should be 75-100% of the time.

Thus, it is clear that there is a gap between the reality of implementation and the ideals of the TEE policy. The difference between the teachers’ actual use of English and the ideal use is rather big. This suggests that there is considerable variation in the amount of L1 (Korean) used in TEE classes across teachers. In short, for the subjects surveyed, the TEE class is defined as one conducted primarily in English, but some use of Korean is allowed if necessary; however, the range of Korean use cannot be predicted.

4.2.3 TEE Implementation

Questions 4 to 6 in section 2 ask the TEE implementation. The teacher’s overall understanding of the TEE implementation (see Table 7) is positive.
Table 7: Rate of pros and cons about TEE implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>51.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing Value</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

55.9% of the teachers who chose ‘strongly agree’ and ‘agree’ showed a positive attitude to TEE’s implementation, while 18.5% selected ‘disagree’ or ‘strongly disagree,’ thus displaying a negative attitude. Approximately 21% of the teachers chose ‘neutral.’ This seems to indicate that some of the teachers have no set opinion about its implementation. However, it is possible to interpret the word ‘neutral’ in two ways: either positively or negatively, which would imply different viewpoints about TEE implementation. Thus, this outcome can be compared to the results for question 3-8 (see Table 8), which asks whether the teacher has had experience teaching a TEE class.

Table 8: Correlation between teachers’ TEE experience and approval rating of the TEE implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEE experience</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Missing value</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes = 29</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No = 13</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teachers with such experience had a higher tendency to agree with TEE implementation than those who did not. Interestingly, the teachers who did not have TEE experience chose ‘neutral’ more often than the others. Although somewhat of an oversimplification, it does appear that the more the teachers have experienced a TEE
class, the more positive attitudes they hold towards it. Since the TEE policy is still in the initial stages of implementation, and not all English teachers have been exposed to a TEE class, this suggests that the frequency of positive attitudes toward TEE may increase in the future with the expansion of TEE in public schools.

4.2.4 Reasons for agreeing or disagreeing with the TEE policy

Tables 9 and 10 show the results for question 2-4. Table 9 gives the results for those who answered ‘strongly agree’ or ‘agree’ to question 2-4. The weight in each answer tells the importance in order.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Weight/score</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English education policy is set by the government</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The TEE policy will improve students’ communicative competence</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The TEE policy will reduce private educational expenses</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The TEE policy will lead to improving teachers’ language proficiency</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The TEE policy will improve students’ motivation for learning English</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The major reason given for agreement with the TEE policy is that it will improve students’ communicative competence. Enhancement of teachers’ language proficiency and promotion of students’ motivation for learning English are ranked second and third, respectively. These reasons are, of course, interrelated, and the teachers’ responses concerning increasing communicative competence are consistent with the major goal of TEE to improve students’ English proficiency level. This result is associated with the third reason in which increased communicative competence will lead to improvement of students’ motivation to learn English. For a teacher who will carry out a TEE class,
enhanced language proficiency is natural because it is a consequential result of conducting English class in English.

Regarding disagreeing with the TEE policy (See Table 10), teachers reported that TEE would ultimately increase private educational expenditures because parents wanted their children to catch up with the TEE class lessons.

Table 10: Main reasons for disagreement with TEE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Weight/score</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers’ English communicative competence is not good enough to teach primarily in English.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEE will not help improve students’ English proficiency</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEE makes it difficult to explain content in depth</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEE will make students more aware of individual gaps between those students who have studied English at private institutes and those who have not</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEE will increase private educational expenditure, so students can catch up with the TEE class lessons</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The second and third reasons are related to teachers’ proficiency because they think that TEE makes it difficult to explain class lessons in depth. This is based on their insufficient communicative competence. Thus some teachers are not yet ready to teach English primarily in English. They also believe that in the classroom, students would be more aware of the gaps between those who have had private language lessons and those who have not.

These results show a discrepancy with the goals of TEE. TEE was designed to reduce private education expenditures and regain public educational power that is considered to have been lost to the private education sector, especially in terms of English instruction. However, instead of reducing expenses, some respondents believe that the TEE policy will cause an increase in private education expenditures and inflict a
greater financial burden on families in order for students to catch up in the TEE classes. Moreover, TEE classes may cause students’ differing proficiency levels due to the availability of private instruction to some but not others to become more apparent in the classroom. These two situations are closely related.

As another negative, some respondents believed that teachers’ own insufficient communicative competence ability would lead them to having hard time explaining classroom lessons in depth.

4.2.5 Only English in the classroom

When the teachers were asked to answer whether all English classes in the public schools should someday be conducted 100% in English, most answered this question negatively. They gave two fundamental reasons: The existence of different proficiency levels among students and teachers’ own insufficient production ability in English. The teachers believed that conducting a class entirely in English was an ideal but not a practical possibility. For example, the current English assessment methods in the Korean education system are a major deterrent to carrying out the TEE policy. Additionally, Korean teachers generally find it more efficient to explain difficult vocabulary and grammar in Korean. Moreover, teachers are hesitant to use only English in classes where students differ in their English proficiency. Students at an advanced level may understand what teachers say, but those at lower levels may have trouble understanding. This causes teachers to resort to Korean explanations in order to help those at the lower levels.

Another negative factor is that many teachers doubt their own ability to communicate in class only in English. They feel unnatural, since their students know that
the teacher can communicate with them in Korean. One teacher answered that he doubts his English accuracy when explaining grammar rules and discussing various topics. For some Korean English teachers, using English only can thus be a great burden.

Moreover, the pressure to communicate only in English in class results in greater emphasis on augmenting English study in school with private instruction. Ironically, the result is that a policy designed in part to strengthen the public education sector actually has the opposite effect of encouraging greater use of private tutelage in English to help students keep up with the class. Over the short-term, a class in English only is believed to be effective for students at the advanced level, but not for those at lower levels.

The following two quotations represent the opinions of two teachers about how helpful the use of English in class 100% of the time is:

Under Korea’s public English education curriculum, students in the first year of middle school start to learn tenses and personal pronouns. When they are in the third year of middle school, they learn the conditional mood. (The contents of textbooks are written in this order.) Students in the first year of high school do not have enough grammar knowledge for this curriculum, so they need quite a long time to hone their reading comprehension and writing skills. Without knowing how much they digest from the classroom lessons, the idea – if there is input, production will take place – is absurd. I believe that the public educational system does not teach students to SPEAK English.

If possible, it is ideal to conduct an English class in English, but I believe it is not necessarily required. Oral production of English is not the only goal of English learning. Getting accurate concepts and understanding the meanings of words are more important. It is recommendable to use Korean in English classrooms.

Some teachers responded “neutral” to this question. They suggest that time for TEE training be allowed before assigning teachers to an English-only class. Promoting students’ communicative abilities through use of the target language is a worthy goal for the future; however, the teachers should have an appropriate time to prepare for the class
and be given opportunities to learn relevant new teaching methods through various training programs.

The other teachers who agreed said both that an ultimate goal of learning English is to communicate with others in English and that enhancing communicative competence is the prime goal of learning English. This result favors giving maximum language input to the students to the extent possible under EFL conditions. Exposure to English extensively in class should help students to improve their communicative competence. Thus, using English 100% of the time in any English class would be desirable. In fact, one teacher stated that “language ability is speaking ability.”

The following is an example of an interesting opinion expressed by one of the respondents:

In order to improve English ability, English should be introduced as early as possible, like in the first grade. In addition, the class hours per week should be gradually increased. However, before carrying out the idea or the policy - using English 100% of the time in any English class, we all must think about or ask ourselves “Do all Koreans have to use English?” and there must be a fundamental agreement among Koreans before implementing any of these ideas.

4.3 Section 3: TEE Issues

4.3.1 Results for questions 3-16 to 3-18

4.3.1.1 Self-evaluation of English proficiency and class preparation

Since a TEE class emphasizes language production, excellent English speaking and writing ability are demanded of the teacher. Tables 11 and 12 describe the participants’ self evaluation of their English pronunciation in speaking and writing, respectively. In Table 11, 26 teachers, or nearly 60%, rated their English pronunciation as
either ‘fair’ or ‘good.’ Seven teachers (16.3%) reported that their English pronunciation is excellent. Moreover, six (14%) said that their pronunciation is near native, which displays a very positive self-image. Nonetheless, the fact that 14 teachers (32.6%) evaluated themselves as ‘fair’ indicates that there is room for the teachers to hone their English pronunciation.

Table 11: Teachers’ self evaluation of pronunciation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>32.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>27.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near native</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing Value</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the question asking about their written ability, more than half of the teachers (58.1%) said that they are able to use varied sentence structures with occasional grammar problems’ (See Table 12). 9 teachers (20.9%) answered they are able to produce complex sentences, but frequent grammar errors occur. These two groups total nearly 80%, which seems to indicate that teachers considered themselves to be strong in writing to some extent. Thus, the teachers’ self-evaluation of written English is quite high.

Table 12: Teachers’ self evaluation of written English

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am hesitant/afraid to write in English</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Able to write simple sentences</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Able to write complex sentences, but with frequent grammar errors</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Able to use varied sentence structures with occasional grammar problems such as tense, articles, etc.</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>58.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>near-native with virtually no errors</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing Value</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3.1.2 The teachers’ classroom English

The teachers gave themselves fairly good evaluations on their classroom English, as shown in Table 13. The biggest group of teachers (14, or 32.6%) said that they are able to engage in fairly spontaneous production with somewhat intermittent hesitation. They can paraphrase when they have hard time finding the right vocabulary. The second largest group (30.2%) said that they need some time to look up vocabulary and grammar points before conducting a class.

18.6% of the teachers reported that they need fairly extensive preparation for vocabulary and/or grammar, but no memorization of exact phrasing. About 5% answered that in order to conduct an English class well, it is necessary for them to have time for preparation, rehearsal, and memorization. Thus about 25% claim that they need quite a bit of preparation. However, this result seems to indicate that the majority of the respondents have relatively little difficulty in being prepared to speak English in class.

Table 13: Teachers’ self evaluation of classroom English

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preparation, rehearsal, and memorization of exact phrasing is necessary</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairly extensive preparation of vocabulary and/or grammar is required, but no need to memorize all phrasing exactly. Delivery is hesitant.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need to look up only a few vocabulary words and/or grammar points to feel prepared; speaking may be somewhat hesitant.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>30.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Able to engage in fairly spontaneous production with occasional hesitation; can paraphrase if don’t know some vocabulary.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>32.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can express self spontaneously without preparation or hesitation.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing Value</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3.1.3 Teachers’ L1 use in the L2 classroom

Questions 4 to 7 in Section 3 asked about the teachers’ L1 (Korean) use in the L2 (English) classroom. Since a TEE class uses English maximally, how much the L1 or the L2 is used by the teachers is significant. According to the responses, the L1 is basically a tool to maximize students’ understanding. Since the majority of the teachers answered that students’ differences in English proficiency are the major reason not to use English only in the classroom, their L1 use is natural and practical. Table 14 shows their use of the L1. Fifteen out of 43 teachers use English less than 25% of the time. Ten teachers use English less than 50 and up to 74% of the time, respectively. Only six use English widely in the classroom.

Since there are teachers who have not experienced a TEE class, Table 15 shows the correlation between teachers’ TEE experience and the rate of English use. Teachers who have experience with TEE show a relatively even distribution. 10 teachers said they use English 50-74% of the time; 6 claim to use English 75 to 100% of the time; and 7 25-49% in class. However, 6 teachers reported that they use English less than 25%.

On the other hand, teachers (13) who had no TEE experience reported that they use English less than 50% of the time; 8 teachers answered they use English less than 25%. When compared the two groups between those who have had TEE experience and those who have not, teachers who had TEE experience use more English in the classroom than those who did not.
Table 14: Rate of English use by a teacher in the classroom

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>less than 25%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>37.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-49%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-74%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75-100%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing Value</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>43</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 15: Correlation between teachers’ TEE experience and the rate of English use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEE Experience</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Less than 25 %</th>
<th>25-49%</th>
<th>50-74%</th>
<th>75-100%</th>
<th>Missing Value</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes= 29/Q. 3-4</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No= 13/Q. 3-4</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing = 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 16 shows the teachers’ ideals for how much English they should speak in class to give maximum benefit to the students.

Table 16: How much time teachers think English should be used in class

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>less than 25%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-49%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>25.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-74%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>37.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75-100%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>30.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing Value</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>43</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Many teachers said using English 50-74% or 75-100% of class time as their ideal.

This is a total of nearly 70%. Comparing the results in Table 16 with those in Table 14, differences can be seen. In reality, the teacher use English less than they believe they should. This result can be seen in Table 17.

Table 17: Correlation between teachers’ TEE experience and expected use of English

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEE Experience</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Less than 25%</th>
<th>25-49%</th>
<th>50-74%</th>
<th>75-100%</th>
<th>Missing Value</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes/Q. 3-5</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No/Q. 3-5</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 17 shows the correlation between teachers’ TEE experience and their expected use of English. Teachers with TEE experience also reported greater use of English in the classroom than those who have not had such experience. Teachers who have had TEE experience generally use English more than 50% of the class time. 12 out of 29 teachers, or 41.4%, use English 50 to 74%, and 11 use it 75-100% of the time. Only 4 use it less than 50% of a class hour. On the other hand, of 13 teachers with no TEE experience, 6 teachers, or 46%, use English 25-49% of the time. Table 17 is a simple comparison and may not have statistical significance. Nevertheless, it is suggestive that the frequency is different between the teachers who have TEE experience and those who do not. This issue merits further research in the future. One plausible assumption is that the teachers who have already conducted a TEE class expect to be more comfortable teaching such a class in the future than those without TEE experience.

The teachers were also asked when they thought Korean should be used in the classroom and when it is most effective to use English. The following two questions, 3-6 and 3-7, were open-ended.

When the teachers were asked to answer when they think using English is most effective, 8 different answers were given. The first and second most frequent answers are when giving class instructions and as much as teachers can. They said that English use is effective during small talk, conversations, and when asking and answering questions about routines. During listening comprehension activities and while explaining textbook lessons were other occasions when English use is most effective. As minor examples, English is considered to be effective when it is used to explain classroom games and when establishing rapport with students.
Interestingly, most teachers use English when a class starts. This is usually a routine or an oral direction about what students need to do in class. The English is short and simple, and sometimes they paraphrase the contents for greater comprehension. If they think the contents are complex and difficult to understand, they are hesitant to use English. Only three of the teachers answered that they use English in most of their teaching hours. One teacher offered the very interesting answer that “English should be used when students attain a certain level of understanding in English.” This suggests that teachers should prioritize their students’ understanding, not their overall English proficiency. In contrast, another teacher stated that “English should be used when a teacher is called an English teacher.” Five teachers thought that using English would be fine to teach the contents in a textbook, but that it would take a long time to reach the stage where a teacher could give detailed explanations, present an appropriate example, and lead a discussion in English.

In response to the question ‘When do you usually use Korean in class?’ the teachers claim that L1 (Korean) use mainly occurs while they are explaining grammar. Various grammar terms and rules are the hardest items to explain in English. They are not even easy to understand when explained in Korean. Almost every teacher (40) proposed that Korean be considered a tool or mediator in order to increase the level of understanding.

The second most common context suggested for use of Korean is in reading comprehension and vocabulary lessons. Understanding solely through English in these contexts is challenging for students. In this case, Korean can be useful.
It is no wonder that almost all of the teachers stated that the use of Korean should be based on the students’ level of comprehension in English class. Whenever the teachers think that students cannot understand, they use Korean. A few teachers (5) answered that they use Korean extensively. Two even said that students want their teacher to use Korean and to translate English into Korean. Nevertheless, one teacher said that “the judgment that students cannot understand class lessons in English would be an arbitrary interpretation by teachers.” However, she admits that “It is hard for me to explain grammar in English.” Other responses were that Korean is used in explaining rules of games and activities and motivating students.

What language - English or Korean – should be used the most in the English classroom is thus a controversial question in Korea, but the choice of language could have a big impact on students’ English proficiency. The responses to questions 3-6 and 3-7 are closely related to the respondents’ teaching style. It seems that their use of English or Korean in class is partly based upon the level of student proficiency, but it is also true that the amount of English used depends upon teachers’ proficiency, because they find it difficult to explain the hardest grammar terms and rules in English. This situation seems to suggest that in the long run, teachers need to develop their proficiency in order to be able to explain lessons in English easily. In this way, they can meet students’ needs, no matter what level of English proficiency students have.

4.3.2 Questions for Teachers Who Have Experienced a TEE Class

Tables 18 to 25 show the results for questions to the teachers who have experienced a TEE class. Table 18 indicates how many teachers have had TEE
experience. Of 43 teachers, 29 (67.4%) have conducted a TEE class. They answered questions 3-9 to 3-15.

Table 18: Teachers’ TEE experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>67.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>30.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing Value</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>43</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3.2.1 Confidence Level

In terms of confidence level, a relatively high number of teachers (19) have quite good confidence level. Table 19 shows the results.

Table 19: Teachers’ confidence about conducting a TEE class

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have no confidence, to the extent that I would like to voluntarily resign from the TEE class.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am uneasy and have little confidence.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel neither confident nor uneasy.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have some confidence.</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>65.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am very confident about conducting a TEE class.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>29</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

More than 65% of them have ‘some’ confidence. Some of the teachers (20.6%) described themselves as having a good command of English, and they likewise show high confidence in their ability to conduct a TEE class.

When the results are compared with time spent in English speaking countries, there is no clear relationship between the time spent abroad and their confidence level. The range of their stay varied from 1 month to 3 years. For example, of 6 teachers who showed high confidence level, one teacher had stayed 1 month in an English speaking country, but showed high confidence about conducting a TEE class. It seems that
teachers who chose the response ‘I have some confidence’ understood the meaning of ‘some’ as ‘a little’, which may be due to the Korean translation of the questionnaire.

4.3.2.2 Preparation Time

With regard to preparation time for a TEE class, 55% of the teachers said they need 50-74% more time as compared to a regular English class (See Table 20).

Table 20: Preparation time for a TEE class in comparison with a regular class

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>the same</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25% more time</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50% more time</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>55.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75% more time</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% or more time</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17.2% reported that they need the same preparation time as they do for their regular English classes. However, as shown in Table 20, 21 teachers (72.4%) said they spent 50% or more time to prepare for a TEE class. This implies that for many, TEE classes are more work than regular classes. One teacher who responded 100% or more time gave a very detailed reason, as follows:

Due to alteration of class lessons or class plans (since it is not a regular English class), in my case, I need 100 percent or more time to prepare for the TEE class. If I carry out the lessons in a regular English class, I do not need much time; however, if I prepare for the TEE class using the same textbook, I need a lot of time to make and develop teaching lesson plans for that TEE class. A TEE class is not just an English class that I am used to doing. It is another class to be carried out in English.

4.3.2.3 Stress level

Table 21 describes how much extra stress the respondents experience with a TEE class.
Table 21: Level of extra stress with a TEE class

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A little</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>27.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A moderate amount</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>41.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extreme</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since their confidence level is generally high, it seems that the stress level is reasonable. Twelve teachers (41.4%) reported a moderate amount of stress and 12 teachers, little (27.6%) or no (13.8%) stress. Five (17.2%) reported extreme stress. Of these 29 teachers, none has had significant participation in overseas training programs. When compared with the outcomes in Table 3, it can be seen that gender, age, and length of teaching experience are not relevant factors here. The only critical difference is the period of time spent abroad. Nevertheless, generally their stress level is quite moderate.

4.3.2.4 Students’ responses to a TEE class

Table 22 shows the evaluation of the students’ responses to a TEE class.

Table 22: Students’ responses to TEE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students understand well and are interested.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students have trouble understanding at first, but catch on with exposure.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>51.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students have much trouble understanding, but they are willing to try.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students appear to suffer stress and participation is low.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students show that they dislike the class.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing Value</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

More than half of the teachers (51.7%) answered negatively. They chose trouble understanding, suffering, and even disliking the class as responses. These outcomes may be related to students’ proficiency. Since proficiency differences exist among students in
a single class, the responses may believe that this variation is related to what they perceived as their students’ reactions to the TEE class in general. Notably, one teacher responded that “it seems that students try catch up on class lessons by guessing, not by understanding.”

4.3.2.5 Reasons for TEE’s perceived ineffectiveness

Table 23 presents the reasons for TEE’s ineffectiveness as perceived by the respondents in order of weight, as defined earlier.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Weight/score</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The students’ listening comprehension is low.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My own oral proficiency is insufficient</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are big differences in English proficiency among students</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The methods of evaluation and teaching are mismatched</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The textbook is inappropriate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are too many students in one class</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The major reason given is differences in English proficiency among students. This outcome is paradoxical when compared with the responses in Table 22, because Table 22 seems to show that students have relatively good understanding of their lessons in a TEE class. A mismatching of methods of teaching and evaluation, and having too many students in one class, are tied for second place. Students’ low listening comprehension and teachers’ insufficient oral proficiency follow, in that order. In this question, low proficiency on the part of the teachers does not appear to be a significant factor in perceptions of TEE ineffectiveness. The teachers seem to attribute any ineffectiveness to the students’ differences in proficiency, not their own. Making teaching and evaluation
consistent and working with a smaller number of students are key factors necessary for TEE success in the respondents’ perceptions.

4.3.2.6 Factors in TEE success

Table 24 shows which factors make TEE successful.

Table 24: Reasons for TEE’s success

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Weight/score</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fluent oral proficiency on the part of the teachers</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in teaching methods and attitudes</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rearrangement of the textbooks and teaching materials</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student placement based on proficiency level</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in the number of students in one class</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the figures in Table 24, the primary factor which would lead to TEE success is considered to be a change in teaching methods and attitudes. Since a goal of TEE is enhancing communicative competence, altering teaching methods and attitudes is a crucial point. New ways of conducting TEE classes should be a key element. The next factor is reduction in the number of students in a single class, closely followed by fluent oral proficiency on the part of the teachers.

The most interesting point is that this outcome is somewhat different from the results for question 3-13. In Table 23, teachers’ insufficient oral proficiency ranked fifth out of six answers; however, Table 24 shows that teachers’ fluent oral proficiency is ranked third as a factor in TEE success. In addition, differences in students’ English proficiency is ranked fourth, while the same factor is ranked first as a reason for why TEE might fail to be effective, as shown in Table 23. These two results appear to be inconsistent, perhaps
indicating subjective judgments and arbitrary interpretations about TEE’s effectiveness on the part of the respondents. Regarding textbooks, Tables 23 and 24 show that the teachers gave consistent responses, ranking textbooks last in both.

4.3.2.7 How to improve the teachers’ communicative competence

Table 25 shows the responses to the question about what would help teachers improve their communicative competence for a TEE class.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 25: Elements for improvement in teachers’ communicative competence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Factor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide a financial incentive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide workshops in TEE strategies and language training programs in domestic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offer the opportunities for language training abroad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion of the communicative competence assessment in the teacher certification exam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular English proficiency assessments for teachers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With regard to the factors which would enhance teachers’ communicative competence, most of the teachers selected having an opportunity for language training abroad. This result cannot be separable from the EFL condition in Korea. For teachers, exposure to English speaking environment is necessary to improve their communicate abilities. The second element is provisions of workshops about TEE strategies and language training in domestic. Enhanced communicative competence does not offer how to deal with a TEE class. Providing appropriate strategies in domestic language training programs would make teachers cope with a TEE class. The third element is inclusion of the communicative assessment in the teacher certification exam. Since teachers’ resistance is high to hire high proficient English teachers with no teacher certification,
most of the teachers have an idea that the future teachers who will graduate from the teachers’ college take a test of communicative competence when they get a teacher license. According to the table, the answer of financial incentive unexpectedly ranks in the last. For teachers, improvement of communicative competence has less relationship with the financial supports, while the weight in regular English proficiency assessments for teachers shows a little higher figure.

4.3.3 Outcomes for all participants (questions 16 to 29)

4.3.3.1 Potential preparation time to feel confidence in conducting TEE

Tables 26 and 27 show the results associated with confidence.

Table 26: Expected preparation time before conducting a TEE class

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preparation time</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am already confident</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 6 months</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 months to 1 year</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>37.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>about 2 years</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 years or more</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not anticipate ever feeling confident</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing Value</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 27: Approximate length of teacher training to carry out TEE with confidence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean (month)</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overseas Training</td>
<td>11.83</td>
<td>7.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Training</td>
<td>7.43</td>
<td>8.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

37% of the teachers responded that the appropriate period in order to carry out TEE is about 6 months to one year. Psychologically, about one year preparation period is required before conducting a TEE class. About 20 percents of them show they already have quite high confidence to handle a TEE class. Since many teachers have participated
in various training programs, their expected length of training time seems not to exceed more than one year. This result can be found the next question 3-17, which asks the teachers how many months they need to be trained before carrying out TEE. In terms of the length of domestic training programs, the average month they need is about 12 month, while that of overseas training is approximately 7 months. Nevertheless, the opinions vary because the standard deviation in Table 27 tells us that its distribution is quite wide, so individual teachers’ expecting period of having a training program varies.

4.3.3.2 Classroom textbooks & Materials desired for a TEE class

In terms of the current textbooks published under the 7th curriculum, most of the teachers chose that the textbooks either are inappropriate or neutral, as shown in Table 28.

Table 28: Appropriateness of the 7th curriculum textbook

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very inappropriate</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inappropriate</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>30.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>30.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very appropriate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing Value</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The total percentage combined the figures ‘very inappropriate’ and ‘inappropriate’ exceeds more than half of them. If the figure of ‘neutral’ is combined, negative proportion would increase. This negative attitude can be seen in the results of question 3-19 where the teacher choose what materials they would like to receive for a TEE class, as shown in Table 29.
Table 29: Materials desired for TEE classes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Materials for a TEE class</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percent of Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Textbook with videos to demonstrate</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>31.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom English materials</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workbook with textbook</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference books and teaching tools including games and activities</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>81.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any teachers’ guide book written in English, which is beneficial for TEE classes</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>96</strong></td>
<td><strong>228.6</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total number of responses = 42
Missing number of responses = 1

The most preference materials are reference books and teaching tools including games and activities. The next is teachers’ guide books which are written in English. Those two categories show high percentage, which indicates that the current textbooks are quite inappropriate to deal with a TEE class. Teachers need more materials or references to help conduct a TEE class.

4.3.3.3 Number of students in a TEE class

Considering the appropriate number of the students in a TEE class, 51% of the teachers answered that 15 students are a good number to form a TEE class. About 30% responded that up to twenty students are a fine number for them to carry out a TEE class. As minor opinions, two respondents answered that 12 students in a class is the number that they can best handle in a TEE class. The results are shown in Table 30.

Table 30: Appropriate maximum number of students in a TEE class

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>51.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>30.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing Value</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>43</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3.3.4 TEE vs. current education system

Questions 3-21 to 3-28 are dealing with the issues between TEE and current education system. Since the national college entrance examination, Suneung, plays the most significant role in Korean education, TEE cannot be separable from the national educational system.

• Assessment method

When the respondents were asked to answer whether the assessment methods need to be changed under the TEE program, 30 teachers responded positively.

The Suneung system mostly tests English in two skills: Reading comprehension and Listening comprehension. In the reading comprehension section, two or three grammar questions and three to five vocabulary question are included. There are 17 listening questions. No speaking test is conducted. The test is highly focused on reading comprehension. On the other hand, TEE was developed in order to improve communicative competence, and thus, speaking is significant. Basically, TEE emphasizes speaking and listening rather than reading and writing. To date, speaking is not included in any government-driven tests.

Since the two tests have different goals, it is reasonable to ask what the assessment method the teachers think about. About 30 teachers answered to this question. Most of the teachers expressed that a new assessment tool will have to be developed. Under the Suneung system, TEE cannot be assessed because no speaking test is carried out. Since TEE’s goal is enhancing communicative competence, speaking will be added and evaluated. Many teachers said that without developing practical assessment tools and methods for TEE, the TEE policy cannot be successful. The teachers described that the current situations that a TEE class is conducted as an extracurricular class, has no
assessment tools, is not reflected in the national entrance exam, and is relatively limited class lessons, which make TEE a less important class when it is compared with regular English classes. Suneung’s paper based English test cannot manage a speaking and listening test that a TEE class covers. Thus, a new test and assessment method will be designed and developed, as well as an appropriate evaluation criteria for a TEE test will be also established. Especially, a method to assess ability of communicative competence will be provided. These will be reflected in the nation-wide entrance exam; otherwise TEE is hardly established in the current education system.

Nevertheless, some of the teachers (5) opposed changing the current assessment method. It is mainly because altering the assessment method will produce more financial burden for school parents. To get a good grade in a TEE class, special private institutes will flourish, which ultimately presses family budgets. It will be another way of spending family income learning English outside the schools. Some of the teachers suggested alternative assessment method tools, some of which are to assess students’ performances, degree of participation in tasks or activities in the classroom, face-to-face interviews in conversation, etc.

The teachers clearly insist that there should be a change in assessing a TEE class, as well as its standardization will be established, so that, in the long run, it will influence on a change of the current assessment method in the national college entrance exam.

• Relationship with the national entrance exam

When the teachers were asked whether the national entrance exam would need to change in order for the TEE policy to succeed in the classroom, many of the respondents
responded that it would be impossible to change it. They understood that the national entrance exam will undergo change, but thought that this would create chaos. The possible outcomes are immoderate expansion in the private education sector, indiscrete employment of unqualified native speakers, change in teaching methodologies and ways of assessment, textbook revisions, so on. Conducting a TEE class in the classroom creates high social expenditures in education. Discarding the *Suneung* assessment method and taking a new assessment for a TEE is a great educational upheaval. Without considerable preparation and back-up plans, making a change is impossible. It is no doubt that the assessment method of *Suneung* cannot meet a goal of TEE. Unless speaking test is added to *Suneung*, it is certain that TEE is ineffective. *Suneung* has an absolute power, and thus, a cynical answer from the teachers is natural: “The TEE policy will be abolished as it does not fit any of current education system.” In this respect, many of them answered ‘impossible’ instead of saying ‘yes’ or ‘no.’

4.3.3.5 Employment of new English teachers

To a question about whether they would support the hiring of highly proficient English speakers without certification if there is a shortage of certified teachers with high proficiency, the teachers offered some interesting responses. This question has been a controversial issue in Korean education.

Since the current government announced a plan that people who have high English proficiency levels with a TESOL certificate or overseas English studying background would be hired as English teachers in K-12 schools, it has met resistance from English teachers and teachers in any school subject widely and severely.
The results for this question strongly reflected the same attitude of resistance. The majority of the participants (30 teachers out of 43, with 6 missing values) would not support the idea of hiring of highly proficient English speakers without certification. The main reason is that high English proficiency does not mean that they have the qualifications that a teacher must have. Skill in classroom management and guidance, specialized teaching methods, and understanding the curriculum, etc. are required. Good English proficiency is one of the tools needed to teach English. In addition to this, teachers’ personalities or characters, professionalism, educational knowledge about how to teach, and knowledge of differences between Korean and English are other qualifications that school teachers must have. Having a teaching license implies that one is equipped with this background. Just having a high proficiency in English does not offer those qualifications automatically. Given the shortage of certified teachers with high English proficiency, it would make sense to offer further English training to current English teachers.

Following are some of the teachers’ opinions:

I do not support it. The teaching quality of current native speakers and English instructors taking part in conversation class is very low as well as there are inequalities in various areas, such as a term of service, wages, and school workload. I strongly believe that it is the best direction to train the ‘real’ teachers who are graduated from teachers’ college and employ them for a TEE class.

Do you think that all Koreans can teach Korean language well? It is the same application to people speaking English fluently.

Three respondents support this possibility conditionally. If teachers have a TESOL certificate and knowledge of how to teach and how to deliver class lessons with
sufficient teaching methods and skills, then they are qualified teachers even without a license. If native speakers have some education or in-service training in how to teach in EFL before or after being hired, they should be able to manage a TEE class. Other teachers (4) who support this idea said that a teacher’s license does not mean they have a good command of English or English teaching. Hiring people with high English proficiency without a license would be possible in some cases. Hiring them would allow for cooperation between teachers and benefit current English teachers, and the teachers who take in charge of a TEE class. Thus, it is recommendable in the current program having native English speaking unlicensed teachers in charge of conversation exclusively is a comparable example. If this conversation program is successful, it will expand to more schools. Opinions expressed include: A few respondents (3) said that classroom environment and current education system are major problem elements. One teacher explained that “The current education system would never make TEE succeed, so it is questionable to hire such teachers who have high English proficiency,” i.e. but lacking a license

4.3.3.6 Possibility of increasing students’ English proficiency level

Question 24 in Section 3 asked the teachers about whether TEE would increase students’ English proficiency level in general. Most teachers (32) gave positive responses to this question. They believe that since a TEE class would offer students extended exposure to English, students’ English proficiency would improve. However, 5 out of 32 teachers who conditionally agreed answered that the degree of anticipated increased proficiency might be small. The reasons they offered are important, but controversial: (i)
the EFL environment: (ii) lack of exposure to English outside the classroom: (iii) differences in proficiency level among students: (iv) other conditions such as differences in teachers’ qualifications. These four conditions can be either positive or negative factors, and are interrelated.

The core reason given is that English is being taught in a non-English speaking environment. This means students have virtually no opportunities to practice English outside the classroom. Many teachers believe that two to four hours of a TEE class per week is not sufficient for students to improve their proficiency level. This is because the English used in a TEE class is simply the classroom English used to conduct class lessons, and because total exposure time to English each week is short. Nevertheless, at the same time, some of the teachers (18) said TEE creates room for students to practice English to a certain degree. One teacher reported that currently students in a TEE class study English for 3-4 hours a week in elementary schools, which is very encouraging, but still not sufficient. Expanded exposure time should influence students’ listening and speaking abilities in particular. Considering the small number of hours overall, however, whether TEE can significantly improve students speaking ability is questionable.

Differences in English levels among students are an important variable. One teacher stated that “a TEE class offers students who attend a private language institute an opportunity to review English lessons.” A TEE class would improve English abilities in students who already have advanced English; on the other hand, for the students who do not, it could cause discouragement and take away their motivation. In the worst case, students might give up learning English. Thus, a TEE class must be very carefully conducted.
Other conditions, such as a decrease in the number of students in a classroom, teachers’ qualifications, improvement of teaching skills, and development of practical assessment tools and textbooks would be needed. Without these, the goal of increasing proficiency might not be realized.

In spite of all these issues, the teachers generally agree that TEE would increase the level of proficiency by providing increased English input. Even if the degree of improvement is small, it should still increase to some extent. Thus, there is at least some positive anticipation of success for TEE.

4.3.3.7 Students’ desire for English use in a classroom

Table 31 shows whether the teachers think their students want them to use more English in class.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>27.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>30.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>30.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing Value</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regarding English use in a classroom, the teachers have no firm idea. As can be seen in Table 31 shows, the numbers for each response choice are nearly equal. Nevertheless, they explained that it depends on students’ English abilities. Students at the advanced level want teachers to use English more, while those at lower levels prefer for teachers to use English less or not at all for communication in the classroom. Examples of two different opinions on the same issue are given below:
After a native speaker explains an important lesson, students ask a Korean English teacher to explain it one more time. The students try to confirm the lesson because of low understanding.

When a Korean English teacher has a good command of English, students get understood and motivated, and even feel pleasure. It is a matter of a teacher’s ability of how freely they can use English. Teachers who utter English without restraint do not care about students’ proficiency differences in class. The teachers can meet students’ level of proficiency, not vice versa.

4.3.3.8 Gap between teachers

Table 32 gives the results for the question of whether the teachers think that TEE will create a gap between English teachers who have studied English in an English speaking country and those who have not.

Table 32: Gap between English teachers who have studied English abroad and those who have not

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>55.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>27.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing Value</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

More than half of them agreed that there is a great gap between English teachers who have studied English abroad and those who have not. The gap mostly occurs in their confidence in their own proficiency, which is higher in teachers having studied abroad. This fact could work a positive attitude when they handle a TEE class. However, the teachers who disagreed that with the idea that implementing TEE would create a greater gap between teachers with and without experience abroad explained that having studied English abroad does not guarantee that a teacher will be able to manage a TEE class well. Having the appropriate teaching skills and methods is also a prerequisite. These
respondents claimed that one’s teaching success is not directly proportional to one’s degree of content knowledge.

4.3.3.9 Gaps between students

Table 33 shows the teachers’ opinions on whether TEE will lead to a greater gap between students who have access to supplementary private English education and those who do not.

Table 33: Gap between students who have had private education and those who have not

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>67.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing Value</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In terms of whether there is a gap between students, 29 out of 43 teachers answered ‘yes.’ They said this reflects the current reality in education. The common tendency for instruction outside of the public school system in any given school subject is a factor here. It is common for students from elementary to high school to study school subjects in advance at a private school. It is thus natural that students who have access to supplementary private English education would have more confidence than those who do not. The teachers who agreed about the gap seem to have a common idea that students who have had prior English instruction have high confidence, which would foster a positive attitude toward TEE. Moreover, they reasoned that prior study at a private institute provides increased exposure to English, so it is only to be expected that the gap would increase. They thought that students who do not have the opportunity for prior private study would have low confidence, possibly resulting in a feeling of relative
deprivation, which would impact their performance in a TEE class. One teacher mentioned that “usually students with low confidence are depressed easily in class, and this will ultimately lead them to lose their taste for learning English.” Another teacher somewhat cynically remarked, “a TEE class is a place where students who have had private English education can practice [their English].”

On the other hand, one teacher responding negatively to student gap question said that “two or three hours of studying English in a TEE class would not make a big difference to students because of TEE’s weak position in the current educational system.”

Two teachers stated that one of the purposes of TEE is to reduce the gap. They believe that success comes from students’ motivation and concentration, not from prior private education.

4.3.3.10 Gaps between schools

Table 34 shows the teachers’ opinions about whether all schools in Korea have equal resources for carrying out TEE.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>67.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing Value</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

More than 65% of the teachers answered ‘no.’ Inequality exists among schools. The teachers interpreted the word ‘resources’ in several ways: (i) differences in human resources, such as the number of Korean English teachers and their teaching experience, the presence of native speakers, and the presence of special instructors for conversation
classes: (ii) differences in the physical environment, such as possession of a language laboratory and appropriate English references and equipment: (iii) differences in communities, such as school location, be it urban or rural, along with differences in enthusiasm for English or “English fever,” and the attitudes of parents and students. Such possible differences could create inequality of resources for implementing TEE across schools.
CHAPTER V
CONCLUSION

English fever has become a social trend in Korea. In fact, a government official in education said in a personal communication to the author that the debate about whether or not every Korean should learn English was an outdated argument.

Agreement about learning English already exists in Korean society. Learning English is a must-do even without considering globalization. The demand from the industrial sector in Korea is part of the reason for the English-oriented education policy. English proficiency is a powerful tool for movement between social classes and gaining wealth. Woosung Kim (2008) claims that Korea’s globalization is a national effort to meet the global standard in changing political, economical, and cultural world environments. Under the power of globalization, it is hard to find critical views about learning English.

This study has examined teachers’ perceptions of the TEE policy from various perspectives. It was motivated by the fact that improving communicative competence is the first priority in education. The responses by Korean K-12 English teachers in Seoul and Gyeonggi province to the survey indicated the following perceptions about the TEE policy.

First, the overall level of understanding of the TEE policy among the teachers is still low. Many of the teachers have not received adequate information about TEE policy. It is recommended that the government or the Ministry of Education make an effort to
continue to promote TEE. However, many teachers do believe that TEE implementation will eventually improve students’ communicative competence to some extent, even though many are worried about expansion of the private English education sector. This is based on the idea that English fever and the desire of students to get good grades in TEE classes might lead to increased demand for private instruction. In addition, conducting all English classes 100% in English is not feasible at this time according to the teachers, because it seems not to allow for the fact that English cannot be practiced outside of the classroom without paying for private lessons, given that it is an EFL context. Thus, it is not surprising that the teachers would describe a TEE class as ‘a class conducted primarily in English, but with some use of Korean allowed if necessary.’

Second, in reference to their own English proficiency, the teachers claim relatively fair to good pronunciation and written English. They have a rather positive attitude toward their own English regardless of whether they have taught a TEE class or not. They feel comfortable about engaging in spontaneous production and paraphrasing utterances in the classroom even though they occasionally hesitate and make grammar mistakes. Thus they have quite a good sense of confidence in their English ability. Nevertheless, their actual rate of use of English in the classroom and estimation of the ideal proportion of use of English vs. Korean is rather different. In reality, many teachers use English less than 25% of the time, while their ideal use is more than 50%. This discrepancy appears to result from their views about differences in English proficiency among students. Many teachers point out that their students’ differing language proficiencies are a major factor in causing them to use Korean in the classroom. In addition, some teachers do have concerns about their own English delivery ability when
conducting a class. Thus, their answer that the most effective time to speak in English is during a conversation class is not meant ironically. They feel that using Korean is more beneficial when explaining difficult grammar terminology, rules, and word meanings. They claim that L1 (Korean) use is necessary for the students, not for the teachers. They assert that the first priority is to have students understand, although it must be acknowledged that teachers may have a very arbitrary interpretation of what counts as necessary.

Third, the confidence level of the teachers who have taught a TEE class is quite high. They state that they do not feel increased stress when teaching a TEE class, but they generally spend 50% more time to prepare for such a class than for a regular English class. They also have positive observations on students’ response to TEE. They claim that students initially have some trouble understanding, but later get used to the increased use of English in the classroom. However, in order for TEE to succeed, a change in teaching methods is necessary. Fluent oral proficiency on the part of the teachers is also required. To bring this about, overseas and domestic language training is a necessity, as well as student placement based on similar proficiency level.

Fourth, with regard to the details of how best to prepare and select teachers for TEE and to plan aspects of the curriculum and classroom setting, the participants expressed varied opinions, but there was a certain amount of agreement as well. In terms of the length of time before respondents could be ready to undertake a TEE class, they anticipated an average of 6 months to 1 year. The question of whether or not current textbooks are appropriate was responded to negatively. A number of the respondents said that they would want a variety of reference books and teaching tools to help them manage
a TEE class. Regarding the maximum number of students in a TEE class, 15 was considered by half the participants to be a good number. In order for the TEE policy to succeed, assessment methods should be changed to accommodate TEE’s goal of enhancing communicative competence. Nonetheless, the respondents offered seemingly contradictory thoughts about changing the current national entrance exam. They believe that the success of TEE will depend on change in the current educational system, but at the same time, they believe that change is almost impossible and would produce a chaotic educational environment. The employment of highly proficient English teachers without teaching licenses was considered by the majority to be inappropriate. This is based on the idea that teaching English involves many elements, only one of which is English proficiency. Thus English proficiency cannot be the sole criterion. Rather, the teachers believe that the teaching qualifications are far more important than English proficiency.

The teachers generally think that students will increase their English proficiency level through TEE instruction, but they do not generally agree on how much English should be used in class. Without actual research, teachers cannot assume that they know how much English their students want their teachers to use in a TEE class.

There also appeared to be a difference in confidence level between teachers who have studied in English speaking countries and those who have not. Many teachers also believe that TEE will widen gaps between students who have had supplementary private English education and those who have not, due to lack of equivalent personal resources.
Limitations and Suggestions

This study has some limitations. First, the number of subjects is relatively small. In particular, the total number of teachers who had already conducted a TEE class was relatively low. Generalization from the findings can only be suggestive. Thus, a future study with a larger number of teachers, and especially teachers currently teaching a TEE class, is warranted. Secondly, the questionnaire should be revised for future study, since there were some unexpected outcomes to some questions, which seem to have been brought about by the phrasing of the questions. For example, the question regarding hiring a highly English proficient teacher was not intended to mean a teacher who just has a high speaking proficiency, disregarding other qualifications that a teacher must have. The intention was to ask whether or not in-service teachers are open to accepting a new path to becoming a teacher. In Korea, it seems that there is only one way to become a teacher: a student enters a teachers’ college, takes the national test to get a teaching license, and becomes a teacher. In the case of teaching English, there have been several paths to becoming a teacher, but it seems that there is some invisible tension between traditional teachers and those following the new paths.

Lastly, the mixed patterns of questions (open-ended and multiple choice questions) may have created confusion for the teachers.

Nevertheless, the survey produced meaningful results. The findings suggest the need for some institutional improvements. First, there needs to be more critical discussion about the optimal time scale for implementing TEE in the light of the current national assessment system, and about what methods will be used in TEE settings. In theory, TEE
is designed to improve students’ communicative competence; however, in reality, it is currently working as an extracurricular class. This needs to be changed.

In addition, a more innovative approach to assessment is a key factor in positioning TEE for success. If educational policy promotes communicative competence, then the current *Suneung* system must be revised. This should motivate teachers to view TEE more positively by removing a mismatch between teaching goals and assessment methods.

It is also necessary to define the level of communicative competence desirable, given that English is a foreign language in Korea. A number of respondents interpreted TEE as focusing just on speaking, with insufficient attention to reading and writing. It is therefore necessary to develop a clear, nation-wide curriculum manual. Clear goals in each grade from elementary to high school must be developed. Given TEE’s emphasis on socio-cultural practices, new textbooks will also be needed.

Given that many of the respondents have quite high confidence in their language skills and in their ability to teach a TEE class, it would appear that various current training programs should be adequate. However, since many teachers also would like to participate in overseas training programs in order to improve both their English proficiency and learn new teaching skills, opportunities to take part in long-term overseas training programs rather than simply short-term overseas training programs should be provided.

Finally, a highly controversial issue is the proposal to hire very proficient English-speaking teachers who have no teaching license. Many respondents agree that there is a lack of resources, both human and material, in schools, and this would argue for
hiring anyone with the potential to teach English, licensed or not. As some of the participants explained, there are many people in Korea with excellent English and a TESOL background without having followed the traditional teacher training path. Bringing such people in to teach would be making good use of human resources at the national level. But the qualifications for such positions would need to be clearly specified and special regulations proposed in order to avert potential problems between regular, licensed teachers and unlicensed teachers in a TEE or conversation class.

In conclusion, TEE has the potential for being successful if the issues discussed here are taken into careful consideration and appropriate support for teachers provided.
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Appendix A: Questionnaire in English

SECTION 1

1. Gender: Male ( ) Female ( )

2. Age group: 20-29 ( ) 30-39 ( ) 40-49 ( ) 50 and over ( )

3. School location: ________________________

4. Current School: Elementary School ( ) Middle School ( ) High School ( )

5. Teaching Experience: _________ Years or ________ Months

6. Length of time spent in English speaking countries: _____ Years _____ Months

   Please briefly describe any overseas teacher training program(s) that you have attended.

   ________________________________________________________________

7. Length of domestic teacher training: _________ Years ________ Months

   Please briefly explain your domestic teacher training program(s)

   ________________________________________________________________

SECTION 2

The following questions concern the TEE policy and issues related to it. Please mark (V) next to the letter of your answer.

1. Do you feel you understand the TEE education policy?
   _____a) Yes  _____ b) No  _____ c) somewhat

2. Have you had either a detailed oral or written explanation of the TEE policy from the Education Office?
   _____a) Yes  _____b) No

3. How do you understand the Ministry of Education’s TEE requirements?
   _____ a) The class is conducted exclusively in English.
   _____ b) The class is conducted primarily in English, but some use of Korean is allowed if necessary.
c) The class is conducted mostly in Korean with some use of English.
d) English teachers decide how much English and how much Korean to use in the classroom.
e) Other

4. What do you think about the implementation of the TEE policy?
a) Strongly agree
b) Agree
c) Neutral
d) Disagree
e) Strongly disagree

5. If your answer to Question 4 is (a) or (b), what are your main reasons for agreeing with the TEE policy? Please rank all your reasons by number, with number 1 being the most important.
a) English education policy is set by the government
b) The TEE policy will improve students’ communicative competence
c) The TEE policy will reduce private educational expenses
d) The TEE policy will lead to improving teachers’ language proficiency
e) The TEE policy will improve students’ motivation for learning English
f) Other

6. If your answer to Question 4 is (d) or (e), what are the main reasons for your disagreement with TEE? Please rank all your reasons by number, with number 1 being the most important.
a) Teachers’ English communicative competence is not good enough to teach primarily in English.
b) TEE will not help improve students’ English proficiency.
c) TEE makes it difficult to explain content in depth.
d) TEE will make students more aware of individual gaps between those students who have studied English at private institutes and those who have not.
e) TEE will increase private educational expenditure, so students can catch up with the TEE class lessons.
f) Other

7. Do you think that all English classes in schools should someday be conducted 100% in English? If so, why? If not, why not?

SECTION 3

1. How would you rate your English pronunciation?
a) Weak  b) fair  c) good  d) excellent  e) near native

2. How would you rate your written English?
3. How would you rate your classroom English in general?
   _____ a) Preparation, rehearsal, and memorization of exact phrasing is necessary
   _____ b) Fairly extensive preparation of vocabulary and/or grammar is required, but no need to memorize all phrasing exactly. Delivery is hesitant.
   _____ c) Need to look up only a few vocabulary words and/or grammar points to feel prepared; speaking may be somewhat hesitant.
   _____ d) Able to engaging in fairly spontaneous production with occasional hesitation; can paraphrase if don’t know some vocabulary.
   _____ e) Can express self spontaneously without preparation or hesitation.

4. How much English do you usually use in class?
   _____ a) less than 25%  _____ b) 25-49%  _____ c) 50-74%  _____ d) 75-100%

5. To provide the greatest benefit to students, how much English do you think teachers should speak in class?
   _____ a) less than 25%  _____ b) 25-49%  _____ c) 50-74%  _____ d) 75-100%

6. When do you think using English is most effective?

7. When do you usually use Korean in class? Why?

8. Do you have TEE experience? (Teaching the TEE class even once is included in this question.)
   _____ a) Yes  _____ b) No

Please answer 9-15 only if you answered ‘yes’ to 8. If you answer ‘no’, please go to question 16 and continue to answer the questions.

9. What is your confidence level in conducting TEE classes?
   _____ a) I have no confidence, to the extent that I would like to voluntarily resign from the TEE class.
   _____ b) I am uneasy and have little confidence.
   _____ c) I feel neither confident nor uneasy.
   _____ d) I have some confidence.
   _____ e) I am very confident about conducting a TEE class.
10. How much time does it take you to prepare for a TEE class compared to a regular class?
   ___ a) the same       ___ d) 75% more time
   ___ b) 25% more time   ___ e) 100% or more time
   ___ c) 50% more time

11. How much extra stress does TEE cause you?
   ___ a) None   ___ b) A little   ___ c) A moderate amount   ___ d) Extreme

12. How do your students respond to TEE?
   ___ a) Students understand well and are interested.
   ___ b) Students have trouble understanding at first, but catch on with exposure.
   ___ c) Students have much trouble understanding, but they are willing to try.
   ___ d) Students appear to suffer stress and participation is low.
   ___ e) Students show that they dislike the class.

13. If you think that TEE has not worked well, what are the reasons? Please rank the answers from the greatest to the least problematic, with 1 representing the greatest problem.
   ___ a) The students’ listening comprehension is low.
   ___ b) My own oral proficiency is insufficient.
   ___ c) There are big differences in English proficiency among students.
   ___ d) The methods of evaluation and teaching are mismatched.
   ___ e) The textbook is inappropriate.
   ___ f) There are too many students in one class.
   ___ g) Other ______________________________________________________

14. What is necessary for making TEE successful? Please rank the answers from the greatest to the least need, with 1 representing the greatest need.
   ___ a) Fluent oral proficiency on the part of the teachers
   ___ b) Change in teaching methods and attitudes
   ___ c) Rearrangement of the textbooks and teaching materials
   ___ d) Student placement based on proficiency level
   ___ e) Reduction in the number of students in one class

15. What do you think is needed to improve the teachers’ communicative competence to carry out TEE? Please rank the answers from the greatest to the least need, with 1 representing the greatest need.
   ___ a) Provide a financial incentive
   ___ b) Provide workshops in TEE strategies and language training programs in domestic
   ___ c) Offer the opportunities for language training abroad
   ___ d) Inclusion of the communicative competence assessment in the teacher
   ___ e) Regular English proficiency assessments for teachers
   ___ f) Other ______________________________________________________
Outcomes for all participants (questions 16 to 29)

16. How long might it take before you can carry out TEE with confidence?
   ____ a) I am already confident
   ____ b) Less than 6 months
   ____ c) 6 months to 1 year
   ____ d) about 2 years
   ____ e) 3 years or more
   ____ f) I do not anticipate ever feeling confident

17. Approximately how much teacher training do you think is needed to carry out TEE with confidence?
   a) Overseas Training: ________ months
   b) Domestic Training: ________ months
   c) Overseas Training: ________ months + Domestic Training: ________ months

18. Is the 7th curriculum textbook appropriate for TEE?
   ____ a) Very inappropriate
   ____ b) Inappropriate
   ____ c) Neutral
   ____ d) Appropriate
   ____ e) Very appropriate

19. What kind of materials would you like to receive for TEE classes? Mark (V) all that apply.
   ____ a) Textbook with videos to demonstrate
   ____ b) Classroom English materials
   ____ c) Workbook with textbook
   ____ d) Reference books and teaching tools including games and activities
   ____ e) Any teachers’ guide book written in English, which is beneficial for TEE classes

20. What do you think is the appropriate maximum number of students in a class for effective TEE?
    ____ a) 15    ____ b) 20    ____ c) 25    ____ d) 30    ____ e) other_____

21. Do you think that you will need to change your assessment methods under the TEE program? Why or why not?

22. Do you think that in the current educational system, the national entrance exam will need to be changed in order for the TEE policy to succeed in the classroom? Why or why not?

23. Would you support the hiring of highly proficient English speakers without certification if there is a shortage of certified teachers with high proficiency? Why or Why not?
24. Do you think that TEE will increase students’ English proficiency level in general? If so, why? If not, why not?

25. Do you think your students want you to use more English in class? Why or why not?
   ___ a) Yes       ___ b) No       ___ c) Don’t know

26. Do you think that TEE will create a greater gap between English teachers who have studied English abroad and those who have not? Why or why not?
   ___ a) Yes       ___ b) No       ___ c) Don’t know

27. Do you think that TEE will lead to a greater gap between students who have access to supplementary private English education and those who do not? Why or why not?
   ___ a) Yes       ___ b) No       ___ c) Don’t know

28. Do you think that all schools in Korea will have equal resources to carry out TEE? Why or why not?
   ___ a) Yes       ___ b) No       ___ c) Don’t know

Some of the questions were adopted from the research paper. (Kim, 2009)
Appendix B: Questionnaire in Korean

SECTION 1

1. 성별: 남 ( ) 여 ( )

2. 연령: 20-29 ( ) 30-39 ( ) 40-49 ( ) 50 and over ( )

3. 현재 재직중인 학교 소재지: ________________________________

4. 현재 재직중인 학교: 초등학교 ( ) 중학교 ( ) 고등학교 ( )

5. 교직경력: _______ 년 또는 _______ 개월

6. 영어를 사용하는 나라에서 지낸 기간: _____ 년 _____ 개월

참석한 해외교사연수프로그램(들)이 있다면 이에 대해 간단히 설명해 주십시오

______________________________________________________________

7. 국내 교사 연수 참여 기간: _______ 년 _______ 개월

참석한 국내 교사 연수 프로그램(들)이 있다면 이에 대해 간단히 설명해 주십시오

______________________________________________________________

SECTION 2

다음 질문들은 TEE 정책과 그것에 연관된 관련문제들에 대한 조사입니다. 답안에 표시 (V)를 해 주시기 바랍니다.

1. 선생님은 TEE 교육정책에 대해 이해하시고 계신다고 생각하십니까?
     _____a) 네  _____ b) 아니요  _____ c) 어느정도

2. 선생님은 교육부로부터 TEE 정책에 관한 상세한 구두 또는 서면으로 된 설명을 받으신 적이 있습니까?
     _____a) 네   _____b) 아니오

3. 선생님은 교육부의 TEE 를 어떻게 이해하고 계십니까?
     _____ a) 수업은 영어로만 진행된다
___ b) 수업은 주로 영어로 진행하되 필요시 약간의 한국어 사용이 허락된다
___ c) 수업은 주로 한국어로 진행되고 약간의 영어가 사용된다.
___ d) 교실에서의 영어와 한국어 사용은 영어교사가 결정한다.
___ e) 기타 ____________________________________________________

4. TEE 정책 실행에 대한 선생님 개인의 생각은 어떠합니다?
   ___ a) 강한 긍정/매우 그렇다
   ___ b) 긍정/ 그렇다
   ___ c) 중립
   ___ d) 부정/ 그렇지 않다
   ___ e) 강한 부정/ 매우 그렇지 않다

5. 만일 4번 문항에 대한 선생님의 답변이 (a) 강한긍정 또는 (b) 긍정이면, TEE 정책을 지지하는 선생님의 주된 이유가 무엇일까요? 선생님의 이유를 답안에 쓰고 실수록 정확하게 기재해 주십시오. 1번이 가장 중요한 것입니다. 다른 이유는 기타란에 기재해 주십시오.
   ___ a) 영어교육 정책은 정부에 의해 마련되기 때문이다
   ___ b) TEE 정책은 학생들의 의사소통 능력을 향상시킬 것이다.
   ___ c) TEE 정책은 사교육비 감소를 가져올 것이다.
   ___ d) TEE 정책은 교사들의 언어 실력 향상을 이끌 것이다.
   ___ e) TEE 정책은 학생들의 영어 공부에 대한 동기를 증진시킬 것이다.
   ___ f) 기타 ____________________________________________________

6. 만일 4번 문항에 대한 선생님의 답변이 (d) 부정 또는 (e) 강한부정이면, TEE 정책을 지지하지 않는 선생님의 주된 이유가 무엇일까요? 선생님의 이유를 순번에 따라 답안에 실수록 정확하게 기재해 주십시오. 1번이 가장 중요한 이유이고, 다른 이유는 기타란에 기재해 주십시오.
   ___ a) 교사들의 영어 의사소통 능력이 영어로 수업을 이끄는데 충분하지 않다.
   ___ b) TEE는 학생들의 영어실력 향상에 도움이 되지 않을 것이다.
   ___ c) TEE로 교과내용을 심도있게 설명하기 어렵다.
   ___ d) TEE는 사교육을 받은 학생과 사교육을 받지 않은 학생간의 개인차를 인식하게 할 것이다.
   ___ e) TEE는 학생들의 TEE 수업 교과 내용을 따라잡기 위해서 사교육비 지출을 증진시킬 것이다.
   ___ f) 기타 ____________________________________________________

7. 선생님은 학교에서 행하는 모든 영어수업이 연간가능 100% 영어로만 진행되어야 한다고 생각합니까? 만일 그렇다고 생각하시면, 그 이유는 무엇입니까? 만일 그렇지 않다면, 그 이유는 무엇입니까?
SECTION 3

1. 선생님은 본인의 영어 발음을 어떻게 평가하십니까?
   ___ a) 보통 이하 ___ b) 보통 ___ c) 보통 이상 ___ d) 잘함 ___ e) 거의 원어민 수준

2. 선생님은 본인의 영어작문 실력이 어떠하다고 생각하십니까?
   ___ a) 나는 영어작문을 하는데 망설이고 걱정이 된다
   ___ b) 간단한 문장(단문)을 쓸 수 있다.
   ___ c) 복잡한 문장(복문)을 쓸 수 있지만 빈번하게 문법적 오류가 있다.
   ___ d) 다양한 문장을 쓸 수 있지만 가끔마다 시제나 관사같은 문법적 실수를 한다.
   ___ e) 거의 오류가 없이 원어민 수준과 가깝다

3. 일반적으로 선생님의 교실 영어(수업시 사용하는 영어)는 어떠하다고 생각하십니까?
   ___ a) 준비, 예행연습, 그리고 정확한 구문에 대한 암기가 필요하다.
   ___ b) 어휘그리고/또는 문법에 상당히 광범위한 준비가 필요하지만, 정확한 구문에 대한 암기는 하지 않는다. 전달하는데 맡설임이 있다.
   ___ c) 준비를 위해 몇개의 어휘그리고/또는 문법 요점을 찾아볼 필요가 있다; 말하기에 약간의 맡설임이 있다.
   ___ d) 가끔 맡설임이 있지만 상당히 자연스럽게 이끌어갈 수 있다. 만일 어휘를 모를 경우에는 다른 말로 바꾸어 표현하는 것이 가능하다.
   ___ e) 준비나 맡설임없이 자연스럽게 표현하는 것이 가능하다.

4. 교실에서 주로 영어를 어느정도 사용하십니까?
   ___ a) 25%이하 ___ b) 25-49% ___ c) 50-74% ___ d) 75-100%

5. 학생들에게 최대한의 혜택을 주기 위해서, 선생님은 교실에서 교사가 어느정도 영어사용을 해야한다고 생각하십니까?
   ___ a) 25%이하 ___ b) 25-49% ___ c) 50-74% ___ d) 75-100%

6. 선생님은 언제 영어를 사용하는 것이 가장 효과적이라고 생각하십니까?

7. 선생님은 언제 한국어를 교실에서 사용하십니까? 그 이유는 무엇인가?

8. 선생님은 TEE 경험이 풍부하신가요? (1번이라도 해 보신 경험이도 포함됩니다)
   ___ a) 네 ___ b) 아니오

8 번 문항에 ‘네’라고 답하신 선생님만 9 번부터 15 번 문항에 답변해 주십시오. ‘아니오’라고 답하신 선생님은 16 번 문항으로 가서 답변해 주십시오.
9. 선생님의 TEE 수업에 대한 자신감은 어떠합니까?
___ a) TEE 수업을 자발적으로 사임하고 싶을 만큼 자신감이 없다.
___ b) 나는 어색하고(불편함) 거의의 자신감이 없다.
___ c) 나는 자신감도 없고 어색함(불편함)도 느낀다.
___ d) 나는 약간의 자신감이 있다.
___ e) 나는 TEE 수업을 합계있어 매우 자신감이 있다.

10. 다른 영어 정규 수업과 비교 했을 때, TEE 수업준비에 얼마나 많은 시갂이 필요합니까?
___ a) 똑같다
___ b) 25% 정도 시간이 더 필요하다
___ c) 50% 정도 시간이 더 필요하다
___ d) 75% 정도 시간이 더 필요하다
___ e) 100% 또는 그 이상의 시간이 더 필요하다

11. TEE 수업은 선생님에게 추가적으로 어느정도의 스트레스를 가져옵니까?
___ a) 없다 ___ b) 약간 있다 ___ c) 보통정도 ___ d) 아주 많음

12. TEE에 대한 학생들의 반응은 어떻습니까?
___ a) 학생들은 이해를 잘 하고 흥미로워 한다.
___ b) 학생들은 처음에는 이해하기 어려워하지만 시간이 지남수록 나아진다
___ c) 학생들이 상당히 이해하기 어려워하나 이해하려고 노력한다.
___ d) 학생들은 스트레스를 받고 참여도도 낮다.
___ e) 학생들은 TEE 수업을 좋아하지 않는 것처럼 보인다.

13. 만약 선생님 생각에 TEE가 별 효력이 없다면, 이유는 무엇이라고 생각하십니까? 번호로 그 순서를 나열해주십시오. 1번이 가장 중요한 이유 입니다.
___ a) 학생들의 듣기 능력이 낮기 때문이다.
___ b) 나 자신의 구두 표현 (말하기) 능력이 불충분하기 때문이다
___ c) 학생들간의 영어 능력에 큰 차이가 있기 때문이다.
___ d) 평가의 방식과 가르치는 방식이 어울리지 않기 때문이다.
___ e) 교재가 부적합하기 때문이다.
___ f) 한 교실에 너무 많은 학생이 있기 때문이다
___ g) 기타 __________________________________________________________

14. 무엇이 TEE를 성공하게 만든다고 생각하십니까? 번호로 그 순서를 나열해주십시오. 1번이 가장 중요한 이유 입니다.
___ a) 교사들의 유창한 구두 표현 (말하기)능력
___ b) 수업방식과 태도의 변화
c) 교과서와 교재의 재 정비

15. TEE 수업을 수행하기 위해서, 교사들의 의사소통 능력을 증진시키기 위해 무엇이 필요할까요?

변호로 그 순서를 나열해주십시오. 1 번이 가장 중요한 이유입니다.

a) 장려금의 제공
b) 국내에서의 TEE 전략 강습과 연어 연수 훈련의 제공
c) 해외에서의 연어 연수 기회의 제공
d) 영어 교사 자격증 시험에 의사소통 능력평가를 포함시키기
e) 교사를 위한 정기적인 영어 실력 평가
f) 기타 ________________________________

TEE 경험이 만의 상관없이 16 번부터 29 번의 모든 질문에 응답해 주세요.

16. 선생님은 TEE 수업을 자신감을 가지고 수행하는데 얼마나의 시간이 필요하다고 생각하십니까?

a) 나는 이미 자신감이 있다.
b) 6 개월 이하
c) 6 개월 이상 1 년 이하
d) 1 년 이상
e) 3 년 또는 그 이상
f) 나는 전혀 자신감을 갖지 못할 것이다.

17. 선생님은 대략적으로 TEE 수업에 자신감을 가지고 수행하는데 어느 정도의 교사 연수가 필요하다고 생각하십니까?

a) 해외연수: _______ 개월
b) 국내 연수: _______ 개월
c) 해외연수: _______ 개월 + 국내연수: _______ 개월

18. 7 차 교육과정 교과서는 TEE 에 어느 정도 적합하다고 생각하십니까?

a) 매우 부적합하다
b) 부적합하다
c) 적합하지도 부적합하지도 않다
d) 적합하다
e) 매우 적합하다
19. 어떤 교재를 TEE 수업으로 받고 싶으십니까? 필요하다고 생각하는 모든 항목에 표시를 해 주십시오.
   ___ a) 비디오테이프가 부록 된 교과서
   ___ b) 교실 영어 교재
   ___ c) 연습문제집이 부록으로 딸린 교과서
   ___ d) 게임과 활동을 포함한 수업도구와 참고서
   ___ e) TEE 수업에 도움이 되는 영어로 쓰여진 교사지침서

20. TEE 를 효과적으로 운영하기 위한 적절한 최대 학생수는 몇 명이라고 생각하십니까?
    ___ a) 15   ___ b) 20   ___ c) 25   ___ d) 30   ___ e) 기타____

21. 선생님은 TEE 프로그램 하에서는 평가방법이 달라져야 한다고 생각하십니까? 그렇다고 생각하시면, 왜 그렇게 생각하십니까? 그렇지 않다면, 왜 그렇지 않다고 생각하십니까?

22. 선생님은 현 교육체제 속에서, TEE 정책이 교실 안에서 성공하기 위해서는 대입수능제도가 변해야 한다고 생각하십니까? 그렇게 생각하시면, 왜 그렇게 생각하십니까? 그렇지 않다면, 왜 그렇지 않다고 생각하십니까?

23. 만일 영어에 상당히 능한 (high proficiency in English) 교사가 부족하다면, 교사자격증을 가지고 있지 않지만 높은 영어능력을 가진 사람을 영어 교사로 고용하는데 지지하시겠습니까? 그렇게 생각하시면, 왜 그렇게 생각하십니까? 그렇지 않다면, 왜 그렇지 않다고 생각하십니까?

24. TEE 는 일반적으로 학생들의 영어실력을 향상시킬 것으로 생각하십니까? 그렇게 생각하시면, 왜 그렇게 생각하십니까? 그렇지 않다면, 왜 그렇지 않다고 생각하십니까?

25. 학생들은 교실에서 선생님이 좀 더 영어를 사용하기를 원한다고 생각하십니까?
    ___ a) 네    ___ b) 아니오 ___ c) 잘 모르겠음
    이유가 무엇입니까?

26. TEE 는 해외에서 공부한 선생님과 그렇지 않은 선생님간의 좀 더 큰 (Gap) 격차를 만들 것이라고 생각하십니까?
    ___ a) 네    ___ b) 아니오 ___ c) 잘 모르겠음
    이유가 무엇입니까?

27. TEE 는 영어 사교육을 받은 학생과 그렇지 않은 학생간의 좀 더 많은 (Gap) 격차를 이끌 것으로 생각하십니까?
    ___ a) 네    ___ b) 아니오 ___ c) 잘 모르겠음
    이유가 무엇입니까?
28. 선생님은 한국에 있는 모든 학교가 TEE 수행함에 있어 동등한 재원을 가지고 있다고 생각하십니까?
   ⭕ a) 네  ⭕ b) 아니오  ⭕ c) 잘 모르겠음
   이유가 무엇입니까?
Appendix C: E-mail Message in English

Hello, Teachers.

My name is Kyung Og Lee and I am studying TESOL at Ball State University. I’m currently working on my research paper: ‘Korean English Teachers’ Perceptions of the “Teaching English in English” Policy. The purpose of the research paper is to investigate teachers’ personal opinions about the TEE policy. I think that teachers are practitioners who carry out educational policy in the classroom. Knowing your valuable views about the TEE policy is important for others to be able to evaluate it. The results of the research based on your opinions could influence the implementation of the TEE policy in the future.

The Korean translation of questionnaire and consent form is attached to this e-mail. I think it will take about 30 minutes to complete them. Before answering the questionnaire, I would ask you to read the consent form, print your name, and sign and date the consent form. After completing the questionnaire, I would ask you to return the questionnaire directly to me by July 15 or before. You can find my personal information below.

Your opinions will be used only for this research paper. All responses will be anonymous. Answering this questionnaire is voluntary, and if at any point you don’t wish to continue, you may stop. Your responses will be stored on my personal computer until I finish this research, which is expected to at the end of September, 2010. After completing the research, I will destroy all the data that I received from you. If you have any questions related to this research, please email me. I will reply to your questions as soon as possible. I’m looking forward to your candid opinions about the questions. Thank you for your cooperation.

Kyung Og Lee

Kyung Og Lee
TESOL, English Department
Ball State University
Muncie, IN 47306
Email: klee@bsu.edu
Telephone: (765) 273-0052
선생님 안녕하세요

Ball State 대학에서 TESOL 투고하고 있는 이경옥입니다. 최근에 저는 졸업연구논문으로 ‘Korean English Teachers’ Perceptions of the “Teaching English in English” Policy에 대해서 쓰고 있습니다. 연구목적은 TEE 정책에 대한 선생님들의 개별 인식도 조사를 통한 TEE 정책 평가입니다. 제 생각에 선생님들은 모든 교육정책을 현장에서 실질적으로 담당하는 역할을 하기 때문에 TEE 정책에 대한 선생님들의 의견을 아는 것이 TEE 정책을 평가하는데 중요하다고 여겨집니다. 선생님들의 의견에 근거한 연구 결과는 미래 TEE 정책 수정이나 실행에 조금의 영향을 미칠 수 있다고 생각하기 때문입니다.

이 메일에 한국어로 쓰여진 설문지와 동의서를 첨부합니다. 제 생각에 한 30분 정도의 시간이 걸릴 것으로 생각됩니다. 설문지를 작성하시기 전에 동의서를 읽어보시고 동의서에 이름과 서명, 날짜를 기입해 주시면 감사하겠습니다. 설문지 작성이 끝나시면 그 설문지를 제게 7월 15일까지 보내주시기를 부탁드립니다. 저의 개인 정보는 이 메일 하단에서 보실 수 있습니다.

여러분의 의견은 이 연구에만 쓰일 것을 약속드립니다. 모든 것은 익명으로 처리되며, 자발적 참여에 의존합니다. 만일 설문지를 작성하시다가 불편하시면 언제든지 그만두셔도 됩니다. 여러분의 응답은 제 개인 컴퓨터에 따로 저장되어 있다가 연구를 마치는 9월말에는 모든 자료가 삭제될 것임을 알려드립니다. 만일 이 연구에 관한 질문이 있으시면 저에게 이 메일을 주시면 가능한 한 빠른 시일 내로 답변을 드리겠습니다. 여러분의 솔직하고 정성 어린 답변을 부탁 드리겠습니다.

이 설문지에 참여해 주셔서 다시 한번 감사드립니다.

이경옥

이경옥(Kyung Og Lee)
TESOL, English Department
Ball State University
Muncie, IN 47306
Email: klee@bsu.edu
Telephone: (765) 273-0052