

Changes in Korean EFL Teachers' Beliefs and Classroom Practices

Hyun Hee Kim

Hanyang University, Seoul Korea

E-mail : hyunhee99@hotmail.com

(Received 4 May 2007 ; accepted 27 May 2007)

Abstract

This study examines Korean EFL teachers' beliefs and classroom practices in foreign-language teaching and the relationships between their beliefs and classroom practices. This examination aims to move beyond a concern for teachers' beliefs and classroom practices alone and identifies whether there are changes occurring in Korean EFL teachers' beliefs and classroom practices, and whether teachers' beliefs influences behavior in the classroom. The study, thus, provides a clear picture of changes occurring within the Korean EFL school context. This study used both quantitative and qualitative methods, including survey questionnaire and interviews. The results are organized in three sections. The first section presents changes emerging in Korean EFL teachers' beliefs about foreign-language teaching and learning. The second section presents changes emerging in Korean EFL teachers' classroom teaching practices. The third section summarizes the relationship between the teachers' theoretical beliefs and classroom teaching practices. It is argued that Korean EFL teachers' theoretical beliefs about foreign-language teaching and learning make up an important part of the prior knowledge through which they perceive, process, and act upon information in the classroom.

Key Words : Korean EFL, Teachers' Beliefs, Classroom Practice.

I. Introduction

Korea's Ministry of Education published new policies concerning English education in order to introduce a more communicative approach into English as a Foreign Language (EFL) instruction at the primary and secondary school

level. Effective 2001, the Seventh National Curriculum provides a national guideline for teaching at Korean middle schools (grades 7-9) and high schools (grades 10-12) (Korean Ministry of Education, 1997).

The new curricula highlight the goal of communicative competence. The new curricula are also meant to reflect the belief that communicative language teaching (CLT) is characterized by learner-centredness, the focus being on the learning process as an essential feature of the language classroom. The new programme requires that the objectives of learning should reflect the needs of the learner, that learning activities and experiences should involve real communication, and that learning tasks be meaningful to the learner.

This government-initiated change in English language curriculum has encouraged Korean EFL teachers to reorient their teaching practices for the purpose of developing learners' communicative competence and to organize learning tasks and materials based on learners' needs. The intention of this study is therefore to investigate what Korean EFL teachers believe and do to meet the new curriculum requirements.

Teacher beliefs are acknowledged as significantly impacting teachers' professional lives in the classroom (Clark & Peterson, 1986; Freeman, 2002; Johnson, 1992; Richards, 1998; Verloop et al., 2001). However, there are few empirical studies that examine teacher beliefs in EFL teaching. While many different kinds of teaching theories and methods have been introduced and suggested in language education, limited research has been conducted about what

EFL teachers believe and to what extent they actually implement those theories and methods in their classroom teaching. In particular, little attempt has been made to study those who teach EFL in public schools. Yet, the need for investigations into the EFL context clearly exists.

This study explores and compares Korean public middle school EFL teachers' beliefs about teaching and learning and their practices as a way of understanding whether there are changes in the Korean EFL context and how beliefs and practices are connected. As a preliminary step toward developing Korean English education, this study discusses current classroom EFL teaching and learning in Korea. The findings help map out the broad scope of Korean EFL teaching and learning in terms of teacher beliefs and teaching practices. It is hoped that a new understanding of the system will stimulate new discussion and further explorations in teacher cognition in language education and teacher development.

II. Purpose of the study

This study is an investigation of the theoretical beliefs and classroom practices of Korean middle school EFL teachers in this current (since 2001) period of curriculum change. Teachers' theoretical beliefs refer to "the philosophical principles, or belief systems, that guide teachers' expectations about student behavior and the decisions they make during lessons" (Harste &

Burke, 1977; Johnson, 1992:84) and accordingly “pervade their classroom actions” (Williams & Burden, 1997:57).

Conceptualization of this study is derived from the teacher-as-thinker metaphor in teacher cognition research and ideas about interaction between teacher cognition and teaching behavior. Teacher cognition refers to “the unobservable cognitive dimension of teaching—what teachers know, believe, and think” (Borg, 2003:81). In language teacher cognition research, teacher cognition underlies teachers’ actions in practice, and the main focus of attention is on the complex totality of teacher cognition, the ways in which this develops, and the way this interacts with teacher behavior in the classroom.

This study adopts the central assumption that the teacher is the central factor in educational innovations and that the understanding of teacher cognition and practices must come from awareness of the teacher and the context where the teachers’ professional lives exist. This study then seeks to reveal Korean EFL teachers’ beliefs and practices in periods of curriculum change.

III. Conducting the study

Approaches to this study were developed through both quantitative and qualitative methods using survey questionnaire and interviews. In the first place, data were collected from a population of Korean middle school EFL teach-

ers, who were sampled through a survey to explore the nature of teachers’ theoretical beliefs about foreign-language teaching and learning and classroom teaching practices and to identify relationships between beliefs and practices.

The second phase of acquiring deep understanding of the teacher-in-action involved the collection of data, which gathered the teachers’ views on who/what influences whom, and why and what happens in the classroom. For observing, describing, interpreting and understanding, the researcher attempted to stand in the place of the teachers under investigation.

Through mixed research design, the researcher found that “blending quantitative and qualitative methods of research can provide a final product which can highlight the significant contributions of both, where qualitative data can support and explicate the meaning of quantitative research” (Jones, 2000). The combination of the two approaches allowed the researcher to develop a clear “picture” of the Korean EFL context under investigation and subsequently, to make more substantial conclusions.

1. The survey

Survey data were collected from a population of Korean EFL teachers sampled through a survey questionnaire (see Appendix A). These survey data were collected to provide generalized descriptive data concerning underlying theoretical principles of Korean middle school EFL teachers and the classroom practices from which

they are derived. The survey not only helped explain teachers' theoretical beliefs about foreign-language teaching and learning and classroom teaching practices at the design and instructional level in Korean schools. The quantitative data involves descriptive and correlational statistics.

A group of 224 Korean EFL teachers, from public middle schools in Seoul, Korea participated in this study. For the systemic organization of the survey items, the researcher categorized the classified themes by distinguishing the relationship between teachers' underlying principles and classroom practices derived from them and in terms of the features of approach, design, and procedure termed in the Richards & Rodgers model (2001:20). In language teaching, approach is treated at the level of design, where objectives, syllabus, and content are determined. It also relates to the roles of teachers, learners, and instructional materials. Procedure is reflected to as the implementation phase. Such categorization allowed the researcher to form a picture of the Korean EFL teachers' general approach to EFL teaching and to examine in detail classroom practices.

2. Interviews

Qualitative data from interviews were collected to provide substantial insight that could not be obtained through the survey method. While the outcome of teachers' beliefs and prac-

tices with the questionnaire was measured, the qualitative approach allowed for detailed descriptions of situations and teachers; direct quotations from teachers about their experiences and beliefs.

Semi-structured format was used for the interviews. Each interview was conducted directly between the individual teacher and the researcher. The interviews allowed teachers to describe their general opinions about the New National Curriculum and change requirements and lesson planning, tasks and activities they selected for classroom use as well as procedures and materials they used.

Thirty teachers who were among the survey respondents, agreed to participate in subsequent interviews. All the interviews began with an explanation of the purpose of the study and casual conversations to build up rapport. During the interviews, interviewees took up most of the time. The interview transcripts were analyzed, which were systemically categorized in terms of approach, design, and procedure (Richards & Rodgers, 2001), and in the same way design and analyse the first and second part of the survey instrument in regard to classroom practices. Such categorization allowed the researcher to relate the teachers' understanding of language and language learning and teaching and the teachers' planning and design to actual classroom practices.

IV. Results

1. Changes in Korean EFL teachers' beliefs

1). The nature of teachers' theoretical beliefs

As presented in Table 1 below, the majority of the survey respondents (64.3%) indicate agreement with function-based approaches, which focus on interactive communication and the ability to function in real situ-

ational contexts. Whereas, 35.7% of the respondents disagreed. Teachers' belief about function-based approaches represents a growing popularity of the approach among Korean EFL teachers and an increased level of changes in their cognition about foreign-language teaching and learning.

Table 1.

Teachers' Agreement or Otherwise with Methodological Approaches toward EFL Teaching

	Strongly Disagree or Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Rather Agree	Strongly Agree or Agree
Function-based approaches	9.8%	25.9%	57.2%	7.1%
Skill-based approaches	7.6%	15.6%	54.0%	22.8%
Rule-based approaches	9.8%	19.7%	43.7%	26.8%

The function-based approach, the most recent trend in second or foreign language teaching, derives from the communicative explanation (Halliday, 1973; Hymes, 1972; Littlewood, 1981; Widdowson, 1978; 2000) of how languages are learned. The focus is more on the use of authentic language within situational contexts, functional language use, and meaningful communication than correct structural form (Johnson, 1992).

The majority of the respondents (76.8% and 70.5%) also show their agreement with skill-based and rule-based approaches respectively, while 23.2% and 29.5% of them show their disagreement. These percentages indicate Korean EFL teachers' existing beliefs about skill-

based and rule-based approaches. That is, in general, teachers believe in the importance of studying grammatical structures and in the continuous practice, repetition, and drilling of native speakers' language patterns.

According to the data analysis, the extent to which teachers agree upon the approaches is indicative of the extent to which they agree or disagree with certain statements reflecting "function-based", "skill-based", and "rule-based" approaches toward foreign-language teaching. For some teachers this conviction is accompanied with partial denial of each of the methodological approaches. Others, however, agree with the statements.

Overall, the results indicate that the majority of Korean EFL teachers hold theoretical beliefs reflecting each of the function-based, skill-based, and rule-based approaches toward foreign-language teaching. The positive function-based theoretical beliefs of Korean EFL teachers suggest that at this time of curriculum change, changes are emerging in their beliefs about foreign-language teaching and learning.

2). The multifaceted nature of teachers' theoretical beliefs

A correlational analysis reveals that rather than a dominant theoretical orientation, Korean EFL teachers possess a multifaceted nature of theoretical beliefs about foreign-language teaching and learning. That is, they appear to hold dual or multiple theoretical orientations which reflect the presence of two or three methodological approaches. In particular, function-based and skill-based methodological approaches seem to co-exist more closely in teachers' multiple theoretical orientations, rather than skill-based/rule-based or rule-based/function-based combinations.

This multifaceted nature of teachers' theoretical beliefs is shown in descriptive data obtained from interviews with these teachers. In the response below one teacher describes the learning objectives she follows in her EFL classroom as reflective of function-based approaches :

Nowadays it is becoming more impor-

tant to speak English... so I plan to ask students to speak loudly with their peers. For example, there is "Let's talk" in every unit in the textbooks; this is designed for conversation lesson. Using this type of communicative situation, students can have a chance to learn to communicate in English...

However, this teacher makes a separate comment that suggests her instructional procedures reflecting both rule-based and skill-based approaches :

Before I start teaching a new unit, I let students study new words, and grammatical points ... to help them understand new texts more easily. I also use a tape-recorder to let them learn the exact pronunciation of those new items and sentences presented in the textbook... they repeat after the tape or me...

There are also cases, one in particular, where the teacher practices a multiple skill-based/rule-based/function-based theoretical orientation, which is reflected in the syllabus model, materials, and techniques :

Students need to focus on the way to use English... because English is totally different from Korean, so they need to learn how to organize subject, verb, object, and so on... Then they are able to create new sentences again and again. I use audiovisual aids to help students become interested in the lesson. For example, I use flash cards and pictures to draw their attention to words, some expressions, and phrasal verbs, etc...

I often use pair or group activities for talking to one another in class.

Another teacher, who seems to have a dual rule-based/function-based theoretical orientation, describes a good EFL student :

Students need to memorize a lot of words, grammar, and structure to know about English. Basic knowledge about the language will help them to create numerous sentences and dialogues... I try to make a situation for them to communicate with each other in English because oral skills are nowadays becoming important... I use the 'dialogue' part in the textbook...

Here, in the following description of the tasks and activities she uses, is another case of the teacher having a dual skill-based/function-based theoretical orientation :

At the beginning of the lesson, I always ask students to listen carefully to the tape and repeat after the native speaker's sound... I think pronunciation is really important. I provide different kinds of activities to give students chances to speak English through role-plays or sometimes discussion about a specific topic given... It is not so easy for them to speak freely but at least they can try to say one or two words to communicate with their peers...

Some teachers describe their instructional practices as reflecting a dual skill-based/rule-based theoretical orientation. This is evident in these responses :

The main tasks I give to my students are exercising to get knowledge of grammar. I explain the key grammatical point presented in the new unit of the textbook. And then I ask students to remember the way it works in the sentences... Of course I take some time to let students repeatedly practice new words, difficult pronunciation and patterns of expressions... Like other teachers, I use a tape recorder for the purpose...

Before learning to speak English, students need to know some basic words and sentence structures to get some ideas about the language. I therefore first have students learn new vocabularies, grammar. After this exercise, I ask them to repeatedly practice the pronunciation, accent location and natural intonation...

The results suggest that Korean EFL teachers incorporate certain aspects of two or three methodological approaches and incorporate them into their multifaceted nature of theoretical beliefs. In particular, the dual or multiple theoretical orientations including function-based approaches may be evidence that in response to the New National curriculum Korean EFL teachers are involved in some sort of cognition change.

2. Changes in Korean EFL teachers' classroom practices

The frequency of "form-based" and "task-based" approaches in their classroom teaching was measured to examine Korean EFL teachers'

classroom practices. The intention is to examine, in terms of form-based and task-based approaches, teachers' classroom practices at the curriculum decision-making, syllabus design, and instructional levels.

Form-based approaches, as non-communicative approaches, represent the skill-based and rule-based methodological approaches toward foreign-language teaching, which involve the specification of a sequence of language items (Willis & Willis, 2001). Whereas, task-based approaches, a term that refers to features of CLT (Savignon, 2002), were adopted as communicative (function-based) approaches, which focus

on engaging learners in communicative tasks to achieve an outcome through the exchange of meanings (Skehan, 1996a; 1998; Willis & Willis, 2001).

As presented in Table 2 below, 47.3% of the teachers indicate that they practice task-based approaches often or more, while 28.6% of them indicate that they practice form-based approaches often or more. At the level of less frequency, 39.8% of the respondents sometimes implement "task-based" approaches, while 59.3% of them sometimes practice "form-based" approaches in classroom teaching.

Table 2.

Teachers' Classroom Practices of Task-based and Form-based Approaches in EFL Teaching

	Never or Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Very Often or Almost Always
Task-based approaches	12.9%	39.8%	38.4%	8.9%
Form-based approaches	12.1%	59.3%	25.9%	2.7%

The results indicate that Korean EFL teachers frequently employ task-based approaches in their teaching practices. This is evidence of pedagogical changes taking place in Korean EFL teachers' classroom practices.

3. The relationship between teachers' theoretical beliefs and classroom practices

Korean EFL teachers' classroom practices reflect to a large extent their underlying beliefs about EFL teaching and learning. Teachers who have more positive beliefs about function-based

approaches toward foreign-language teaching implemented task-based approaches more often in their classroom teaching, while those who possess more positive beliefs about rule-based approaches practice form-based approaches more often in their teaching.

The results show that there are some discrepancies as well as consistencies existing between teachers' theoretical beliefs and their classroom practices. Concerning consistencies, Korean EFL teachers who have more positive

function-based theoretical beliefs implement task-based approaches more often in their classroom teaching. Likewise, teachers who have more positive rule-based theoretical beliefs practice form-based approaches more often in their teaching.

This supports the view that Korean EFL teachers' classroom practices reflect their belief systems, showing positive relationship between the two, as Johnson (1992) found out that "teachers teach in accordance with their theoretical beliefs" (p. 101). Many other studies also identified the relationships between teacher cognition and classroom practices. (e.g. Bailey, 1996; Bartels, 1999; Breen et al., 2001; Burns, 1996; Gathbonton, 1999; Golombek, 1998; Johnson, 1992; Lam, 2000; Nunan, 1992; Richards, 1996, 1998; Smith, 1996; Ulchiny, 1996; Woods, 1991, 1996).

Conversely, there are some discrepancies identified between Korean EFL teachers' beliefs and classroom practices. As "any language teaching program reflects both the culture of the institution as well as collective decisions" (Richards & Lockhart, 1996:38), the discrepancy in the Korean context is explained by both the massive government-initiated curriculum innovations impacting teachers' classroom practices as well as teachers' theoretical beliefs. Taking into consideration the effects of globalization, the Korean government developed new policies concerning English teaching and learning in order to introduce a more commu-

nicative approach, including all four-macro skills of communication.

Where audiolingual methods were previously and dominantly used before, the Seventh National Curriculum introduced a pedagogical re-orientation toward a more communicative approach in Korean middle schools (Development Committee, 1992). This Korean Government initiative to restructure the traditional English language curriculum seems to have encouraged Korean classroom practitioners to apply the communicative approach in their teaching. This is evident in these responses :

What the government asks English teachers to do is to use the communicative approach and teach students to speak in English in communication. The textbook is written reflecting the new curriculum requirement, so we now have to teach in a way we are asked to... (I11)

I am trying to encourage students to speak in English in class... Students do not participate in such activities... They are very reserved and are not motivated in speaking English at all... Not easy... Yeah, but we are supposed to teach students how to communicate in English... (I01)

Below, another teacher comment on the New Curriculum requirements, which illustrates the difficulty facing teachers who are encouraged to teach in English in classroom instruction :

From 2001 the Ministry of Education required teaching English in English only and we English teachers were asked to mainly focus on communicative competence of students. I am not confident in doing so... Also, when I teach in English, students do not appreciate that... They are more likely to make noise... (I26)

Overall, the collective decisions made by the government had a positive influence on change toward curriculum innovation, i.e., communicative approaches in Korean EFL teachers' classroom teaching practices. The empirical evidence shows that there are external factors that influence teachers' professional lives in the classroom. There is a need to further explore teachers' cognition, particularly their perceptions concerning classroom practices. The exploration then holds promise for understanding the frequently noted discrepancies between theoretical understanding of second/foreign language acquisition and classroom practice (Kleinsasser & Savignon, 1991:299).

V. Conclusion

This study mainly presents statistical evidence, gathered from a large-scale survey study, which reveals a communicative conception of foreign-language teaching and learning among Korean public middle school EFL teachers. The survey also maps out the frequent level of communicative teaching practices. Data analysis indicates that changes are taking place in

Korean EFL teachers' cognition and practices in the EFL classrooms in the process of curriculum change.

It is found that, in response to the national curriculum change, Korean EFL teachers, who are still much attached to their traditional mixed methods, have begun to incorporate aspects of communicative teaching into their classroom practices. Data show that the curriculum change has led to pedagogical changes in teachers' beliefs and teaching practices, though it is observed that teachers are reluctant to abandon their traditional theoretical beliefs.

The results demonstrate that teacher belief underlies teachers' classroom practices in the Korean EFL teaching context, and these beliefs and practices are mutually informing with variables playing an important role in determining the extent to which teachers can or should implement change in the classroom.

References

1. Ajzen, J. (1988). **Attitudes, personality, and behaviour**. Buckingham: Open University Press.
2. Ajzen, J. (1991). **The theory of planned behaviour**. *Organisational Behaviour and Human Decision Processes*, 50, pp. 179-211.
3. Bartels, N. (1999). How teachers use their knowledge of English. In H. Trappes-Lomax & I. McGrath (Eds.), **Theory in Language**

- Teacher Education** (pp. 46-56). London: Prentice Hall.
4. Berliner, D. C. (1986). In pursuit of expert pedagogue. **Educational Researcher**, 15(7), 5-13.
 5. Borg, S. (2003). Teacher cognition in language teaching: A review of research on what language teachers think, know, believe, and do. **Language Teaching**, 36, 81-109.
 6. Breen, M. P., Hird, B., Milton, M., Oliver, R. & Thwaite, A. (2001). Making sense of language teaching: teachers' principles and classroom practices. **Applied Linguistics**, 22(4), 470-501.
 7. Brown, J. & McGannon, J. (1998). What do I know about language learning? The story of the beginning teacher. From <http://www.cltr.uq.edu.au/ala/proceed/bro-macgan.html>.
 8. Buelens, H., Clement, M. & Clarebout, G. (2002). **University assistants' conceptions of knowledge, learning and instruction. Research in education**, May. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
 9. Cabaroglu, N. & Roberts, J. (2000). Development in student teachers' pre-existing beliefs during a 1-Year PGCE programme. **System**, 28(3), 387-402.
 10. Clark, C. M. & Peterson, P. L. (1986). Teachers' thought processes. In M. C. Wittrock (Ed.), **Handbook of Research in Teaching** (3rd ed.) (pp. 255-296). New York: Macmillan.
 11. Cumming, A. (1989). Student teachers' conceptions of curriculum: Towards an understanding of language teacher development. **TESL Canada Journal**, 7(1), 33-51.
 12. Development Committee of the Sixth Curriculum for Middle School English (1992). **The report on the revision of the English curriculum for middle school**. Seoul, Korea: The Ministry of Education.
 13. Duffy, G. (1982). **Conceptions of reading: Final report (Research Series No. 111)**. East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University, Institute for Research on Teaching.
 14. Duffy, G. & Anderson, L. (1986). Teachers' theoretical orientations and the real classroom. **Reading Psychology**, 5, 97-104.
 15. Duffy, G. & Ball, D. (1986). Instructional decision making and reading teacher effectiveness. In J. Hoffman (Ed.), **Effective teaching of reading: Research and practice**, 163-80. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
 16. Ellis, R. (2003). **Task-based Language Learning and Teaching**. Oxford: OUP.
 17. Freeman, D. (1993). Renaming experience/reconstructing practice: developing new understandings of teaching. **Teaching and Teacher Education**, 9(5-6), 485-497.
 18. Freeman, D. (2002). The hidden side of the work: Teacher knowledge and learning to teach. **Language Teaching**, 35, 1-13.
 19. Gattbonton, E. (1999). Investigating experi-

- enced ESL teachers' pedagogical knowledge. **The Modern Language Journal**, 83(1), 35-50.
20. Golombek, P. R. (1998). A study of language teachers' personal practical knowledge. **TESOL Quarterly**, 32(3), 447-464.
21. Halliday, M. A. K. (1973). **Exploring the functions of language**. London: Edward Arnold.
22. Harste, J. C. & Burke, C. L. (1977). A new hypothesis for reading teacher research: Both the teaching and learning of reading is theoretically based. In P. D. Pearson (Ed.), **Reading: Theory, research and practice** (pp. 32-40). New York: National Reading Conference.
23. Hawley, W. D. & Valli, L. (1999). The essentials of effective professional development. A new consensus. In L. Darling-Hammond & G. Sykes (Eds.), **Teaching as the learning profession. Handbook of policy and practice** (pp. 127-179). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
24. Hoffman, J. V. & Kugle, C. L. (1982). A study of theoretical orientation to reading and its relationship to teacher verbal feedback during reading instruction. **Journal of Classroom Interaction**, 18, 2-7.
25. Hymes, D. (1972). On communicative competence. In J.B. Pride & J. Holmes (Eds.), **Sociolinguistics**. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
26. Johnson, K. E. (1992). The relationship between teachers' beliefs and practices during literacy instruction for non-native speakers of English. **Journal of Reading Behaviour**, 24(1), 83-108.
27. Jones, A. (2000). **Research methods 2: data analysis and statistics**. Lidcombe, N.S.W.: School of Behavioural and Community Health Sciences.
28. Kember, D. (1997). A reconceptualisation of the research into university academics' conceptions of teaching. **Learning and instruction**, 7(3), 255-275.
29. Kleinsasser, R. C. & Sauvignon, S. J. (1991). Linguistics, language pedagogy and teachers' technical cultures. In **Georgetown University Round Table in Language and Linguistics**. Georgetown: Georgetown University Press.
30. Korean Ministry of Education website. <http://www.moe.go.kr/english/edukorea/index.html>
31. Kvale, S. (1996). **Interviews: An Introduction to Qualitative Research Interviewing**. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
32. Lam, Y. (2000). Technophilia vs. technophobia: A preliminary look at why second-language teachers do or do not use technology in their classrooms. **Canadian Modern Language Review**, 56(3), 390-420.
33. Lampert, M. (1985). How do teachers manage to teach? Perspectives on problems in practice. **Harvard Educational Review**, 55, 178-194.

34. Leu, D. J. Jr. & Kinzer, C. K. (1991). Effective reading instruction: K-8 (2nd ed.) Columbus. **Harvard Educational Review**, 55, 178-194.
35. Littlewood, W. (1981). **Communicative Language teaching**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
36. MacDonald, M., Badger, R. & White, G. (2001). Changing values: what use are theories of language learning and teaching? **Teaching and Teacher Education**, 17(8), 949-963.
37. Magliaro, S. (2001, April). Making Sense of Teaching at a Research University: concerns and reflections of graduate teaching assistants, **paper presented** at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Seattle.
38. Munby, J. (1982). The place of teacher beliefs in research on teacher thinking and decision making, and an alternative methodology. **Instructional Science** 11, 201-225.
39. Nunan, D. (1992). The teacher as decision-maker. In J. Flowerdew, M. Brock & S. Hsia (Eds.). **Perspectives on Second Language Teacher Education**, 135-65. Hong Kong: City polytechnic.
40. Nunan, D. (1993). Task-based syllabus design: selecting, grading and sequencing tasks. In G. Crookes & S. M. Gass (Eds.). **Tasks in a Pedagogical Context**. Cleveland, UK: Multilingual Matters. 55-66.
41. Richards, J. C. (1996). Teachers' maxims in language teaching. **TESOL Quarterly**, 30(2), 281-296.
42. Richards, J. C. (1998). Teacher beliefs and decision making. In J. C. Richards (Ed.), **Beyond Training** (pp. 65-85). Cambridge: CUP.
43. Richards, J. C., Ho, B. & Giblin, K. (1996). Learning how to teach in the RSA Cert. In D. Freeman & J. C. Richards (Eds.), **Teacher Learning in Language Teaching** (pp. 242-259). Cambridge: CUP.
44. Richards, J. C., Tung, P. & Ng, P. (1992). The culture of the English language teacher: a Hong Kong example. **RELC Journal**, 23(1), 81-102.
45. Richards, J. C. & Lockhart, C. (1996). **Reflective teaching in second language classrooms**. Cambridge: CUP.
46. Richards, J. C. & Rodgers, T. S. (2001). **Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching (2nd ed.)**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
47. Rubin, H. J. & Rubin, I. S. (1995). **Qualitative interviewing: The art of hearing data**. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
48. Sanday, P. R. (1983). The ethnographic paradigm(s). In J. Van Maanen (Ed.), **Qualitative methodology** (pp.19-36). Beverly Hills: Sage.
49. Savignon, S. (2002, January). Communicative Curriculum Design for the 21st Century.

English Teaching Forum, 2-7.

50. Sendan, F. & Roberts, J. (1998). Orhan: a case study in the development of a student teachers; personal theories. **Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice**, 4, 229-244.
51. Shulman, L. (1999). Foreword. In L. Darling-Hammond & G. Sykes (Eds.), **Teaching as the Learning Profession** (pp. xi-xiv). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
52. Skehan, P. (1996a). A framework for the implementation of task based instruction. **Applied Linguistics**, 17, 38-62.
53. Skehan, P. (1996b). Second language acquisition research and task-based instruction. In J. Willis & D. Willis (Eds.). **Challenge and Change in Language Teaching** (pp. 17-30). Oxford: Heinemann.
54. Skehan, P. (1998). **A Cognitive Approach to Language Learning**. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
55. Smith, D. B. (1996). Teacher decision making in the adult ESL classroom. In D. Freeman & J. C. Richards (Eds.). **Teacher Learning in Language Teaching** (pp. 197-216). Cambridge: CUP.
56. Stern, H. H. (1983). **Fundamental concepts of language teaching**. Oxford: OUP.
57. Thompson, A. G. (1992). Teachers' beliefs and conceptions: a synthesis of the research. In D. A. Grouwa (Ed.). **Handbook of research on mathematics teaching and learning** (pp. 127-146). New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.
58. Ulichny, P. (1996). What's in a methodology? In D. Freeman & J. C. Richards (Eds.), **Teacher Learning in Language Teaching** (pp. 178-196). Cambridge: CUP.
59. Verloop, N., Van Driel, J. & Meijer, P. C. (2001). Teacher knowledge and the knowledge base of teaching. **International journal of Educational Research**, 35(5), 441-461.
60. Widdowson, H. G. (1978). **Teaching Language as Communication**. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
61. Widdowson, H. G. (2000). **Teaching Language as Communication**. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
62. Williams, M. & Burden, R. L. (1997). **Psychology for Language Teachers: A Social Constructivist Approach**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
63. Willis, D. & Willis, J. (2001). Task-based language learning. In R. Carter & D. Nunan (Eds.). **The Cambridge Guide to Teaching English to Speakers to Other Languages** (pp. 173-179). Cambridge: CUP.
64. Woods, D. (1991). Teachers' interpretations of second language teaching curricula. **RELC Journal**, 22, 1-19.
65. Woods, D. (1996). **Teacher Cognition in Language Teaching**. Cambridge: CUP.
66. Yang, Y. (1999). **Reflection on English Teaching and Learning in China: A Case study of Two Chinese Students in their First Semester at Harvard**. **International Education**, 28(2), 31-44.

APPENDIX A. SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

Part I : Teachers' Theoretical Beliefs about EFL Teaching and Learning

This part includes questions regarding your beliefs or approaches to EFL instruction and main goals in your classroom instruction. In order to answer Part I questions, please use the key below and circle the number that best describes the level of your agreement with each statement.

KEY

6	=	Strongly Agree	(STA)
5	=	Agree	(A)
4	=	Rather Agree	(RA)
3	=	Somewhat Disagree	(SD)
2	=	Disagree	(D)
1	=	Strongly Disagree	(STD)

1. Your theoretical beliefs about EFL learning and teaching

In my beliefs about how English as a foreign language is learned and how English as a foreign language should be taught, ...	STD	D	SD	RA	A	STA
1. Language can be thought of as a set of grammatical structures which are learned consciously and controlled by the language learner	1	2	3	4	5	6
2. As long as students understand what they are saying, they are actually learning the language.	1	2	3	4	5	6
3. When students make oral errors, it helps to correct them and later teach a short lesson explaining why they made that mistake.	1	2	3	4	5	6
4. As long as students listen to, practice, and remember the language which native speakers use, they are actually learning the language.	1	2	3	4	5	6
5. Students generally need to understand the grammatical rules of English in order to become fluent in the language.	1	2	3	4	5	6
6. When students make oral errors, it usually helps them to provide them with lots of oral practice with the language patterns which seem to cause them difficulty.	1	2	3	4	5	6

7. Language can be thought of as meaningful communication and is learned subconsciously in non-academic, social situations.	1	2	3	4	5	6
8. If students understand some of the basic grammatical rules of the language, they can usually create lots of new sentences on their own.	1	2	3	4	5	6
9. Usually it is more important for students to focus on what they are trying to say and not how to say it.	1	2	3	4	5	6
10. If students practice the language patterns of native speakers they can make up new sentences based on those language patterns which they have already practiced.	1	2	3	4	5	6
11. It is important to provide clear, frequent, precise presentations of grammatical structures during English language instruction.	1	2	3	4	5	6
12. Language can be described as a set of behaviors which are mastered through lots of drills and practice with the language patterns of native speakers.	1	2	3	4	5	6
13. When students make oral errors, it is best to ignore them, as long as you can understand what they are trying to say.	1	2	3	4	5	6
14. Students usually need to master some of the basic listening and speaking skills before they can begin to read and write.	1	2	3	4	5	6
15. It is not necessary to actually teach students how to speak English, they usually begin speaking English on their own.	1	2	3	4	5	6

Part II: Teachers' Actual Classroom Design and Instruction

This part includes questions regarding your actual classroom at design and instructional level. In order to answer Part II questions, please use the key below and circle on the number that best describes the frequency of your instruction.

KEY

6	=	Almost Always	(AA)
5	=	Very Often	(VO)
4	=	Often	(O)
3	=	Sometimes	(S)
2	=	Rarely	(R)
1	=	Never	(N)

1. General objectives of EFL teaching determined for your instruction

Main teaching objectives are to ...	N	R	S	O	VO	AA
16. help learners identify the rules of grammar, vocabulary and the structural features of texts.	1	2	3	4	5	6
17. help learners trained in listening comprehension, accurate pronunciation, practice exercises on language patterns of native speakers, and respond quickly and accurately in speech situations.	1	2	3	4	5	6
18. help learners challenge a range of tasks and achieve learning goals through completion.	1	2	3	4	5	6
19. help learners read English passages and sentences aloud and translate into Korean or vice versa.	1	2	3	4	5	6
20. help learners develop their ability to express, negotiate, and interpret meanings through active participation and interaction.	1	2	3	4	5	6
21. help learners practice oral skills and later develop reading and writing skills.	1	2	3	4	5	6
22. help learners learn exceptions and irregularities of grammar rules.	1	2	3	4	5	6
23. help learners experience actual language use and achieve a communicative goal.	1	2	3	4	5	6
24. help learners master key linguistic patterns and knowledge of sufficient vocabulary to use with these patterns to speak fluently.	1	2	3	4	5	6

2. Syllabus designed or selected in your EFL instruction

In general, my teaching focus is on...	N	R	S	O	VO	AA
25. discrete items of vocabulary, pronunciation system, and rules of grammar with sufficient explanation.	1	2	3	4	5	6
26. learner's memorization of structure-based dialogues.	1	2	3	4	5	6
27. learner's being conscious on what is being learnt and what remains to be learned.	1	2	3	4	5	6
28. teaching how to analyze sentences organized in a text and translate into Korean.	1	2	3	4	5	6
29. learner's goal achievement for communication and learning.	1	2	3	4	5	6
30. learners' use of existing knowledge and abilities for problem solving.	1	2	3	4	5	6
31. knowledge about how English works.	1	2	3	4	5	6
32. pattern drills and learner's thorough practice with memorized materials.	1	2	3	4	5	6
33. learner's meaningful experience in real-time communication.	1	2	3	4	5	6
34. learner's participation in communication and communicating for learning.	1	2	3	4	5	6

3. Tasks, practice activities, techniques, and material used and provided in your instruction

In general, I use or provide...	N	R	S	O	VO	AA
35. activities which have learners identify and correct grammar errors in their own or others' writing.	1	2	3	4	5	6
36. check-up exercises which present learners their own or others grammatical errors.	1	2	3	4	5	6
37. grammar exercises before introducing the whole text in teaching materials.	1	2	3	4	5	6
38. sentence-combining exercises.	1	2	3	4	5	6
39. pattern drill activities repeatedly.	1	2	3	4	5	6

40. practice exercise on pronunciation and language patterns of native speakers.	1	2	3	4	5	6
41. communicative activities, such as information-gap, role-plays, or problem-solving tasks.	1	2	3	4	5	6
42. listening exercises which have learners memorize the native-speaker's model.	1	2	3	4	5	6
43. different difficulty levels of tasks and materials for different levels of learners (in linguistic aspects).	1	2	3	4	5	6
44. different difficulty levels of tasks and materials for different levels of learners (in cognitive aspects).	1	2	3	4	5	6
45. pre-activities which have learners prepare for the major task.	1	2	3	4	5	6
46. a brief description and outline of the major task to be given which explains how they will be sequenced.	1	2	3	4	5	6
47. brief exercises which have learners review or re-practice language patterns previously practiced, at the beginning or end of the lesson.	1	2	3	4	5	6
48. brief exercises which have learners explain or use the rules of grammar and structure previously learned, at the beginning or end of the lessons.	1	2	3	4	5	6
49. brief exercises which have learners self-evaluate what they have learnt and consciously understand their own weaknesses, at the beginning or end of the lesson.	1	2	3	4	5	6
50. authentic materials when the textbook materials are not sufficient enough to provide natural and communicative context.	1	2	3	4	5	6
51. familiar and concrete information or materials which help learners easily access tasks given.	1	2	3	4	5	6
52. computers.	1	2	3	4	5	6
53. cards/pictures and other audiovisual aids.	1	2	3	4	5	6
54. learner-centred and learner-initiated activities through tasks involving learners' active participation or problem-solving,	1	2	3	4	5	6

and activities among students.						
55. teacher-led activities through exercises involving learners' focused practice on language usage and patterns of language, and activities between the teacher and students or among students.	1	2	3	4	5	6
56. teacher-centred and teacher-initiated activities through explaining linguistic elements in detail, and between the teacher and students.	1	2	3	4	5	6
57. pair or group activities.	1	2	3	4	5	6
58. lecture-type teaching.	1	2	3	4	5	6
59. English as a medium of instruction.	1	2	3	4	5	6
60. myself as a participant within group activities and share opinions on topics and language use with learners.	1	2	3	4	5	6
61. oral exercises on native-like pronunciation and language specified by the teacher.	1	2	3	4	5	6
62. oral exercises on varieties of language through trial and error.	1	2	3	4	5	6
63. translation exercises with grammatical explanation.	1	2	3	4	5	6
64. different time limit, depending on task modality (e.g. speaking, writing, listening, or reading).	1	2	3	4	5	6
65. timely feedback and evaluation on task completed by individuals, pairs, or groups.	1	2	3	4	5	6

Part III: Teaching Environment in Korean Middle Schools and Training Support

Listed below are environmental factors, including your students, related to your teaching in Korean middle schools. In order to answer Part III questions, please use the key below and circle the number that best describes the appropriateness of the situation.

KEY

6	=	Fully Appropriate	(FA)
5	=	Appropriate	(A)
4	=	Rather Appropriate	(RA)
3	=	Somewhat Inappropriate	(SI)
2	=	Inappropriate	(I)
1	=	Absolutely Inappropriate	(AI)

Teaching environment and teacher training support	AI	I	SI	RA	A	FA
66. Content and difficulty of the textbook given to teach.	1	2	3	4	5	6
67. Classroom size.	1	2	3	4	5	6
68. Teaching hours allocated a week.	1	2	3	4	5	6
69. Teaching resources provided.	1	2	3	4	5	6
70. Frequency of provision of in-service teacher training for professional development.	1	2	3	4	5	6
71. Frequency of provision of in-service teacher training for language development.	1	2	3	4	5	6
72. Collaborative atmosphere among teachers.	1	2	3	4	5	6

Part IV: Demographics

Please circle the most appropriate response or fill in the blank.

73. Gender : 1) male 2) female

74. Age (western age): _____

75. English language teaching experience: _____ year(s)

76. Students' grade you are currently teaching: _____ graders

77. Period of studying or traveling in English-speaking countries: _____ days/months/years

78. Experience of in-service teacher programme within the past three years: _____ time(s)
_____ (topics of the programme)

79. Please circle on the number that best describes your rating of the level of your English language proficiency in the following items:

English language proficiency'	Very Low	Low	Slightly Low	Slightly High	High	Very High
Oral skill	1	2	3	4	5	6
Literacy skill	1	2	3	4	5	6
Linguistic knowledge (grammar)	1	2	3	4	5	6
Social and cultural knowledge	1	2	3	4	5	6

80. Please circle on the number that best describes your rating of the level of your professional awareness in the following items:

Professional knowledge	Very Low	Low	Slightly Low	Slightly High	High	Very High
Current language theories	1	2	3	4	5	6
Current learning theories	1	2	3	4	5	6
Current teaching methodologies	1	2	3	4	5	6
The New Curriculum policy	1	2	3	4	5	6

Thank you very much for your contribution to this study.