

Korean Professor and Student Perceptions of the Efficacy of English-Medium Instruction*

Kyung-Rahn Kim
(Dankook University)

Kim, Kyung-Rahn. 2011. Korean Professor and Student Perceptions of the Efficacy of English-Medium Instruction. *Linguistic Research* 28(3), 711-741. The purpose of this study was to investigate the efficacy and problems of current EMI classes and to find an alternative model for them. The research was based on surveys in the form of questionnaires and interviews targeting 24 professors and 169 students from universities in the Seoul area. Three questions were posed for the study: (1) Can the efficacy of EMI classes change depending on different levels of English and subjects? (2) What are student preferences and professor views regarding EMI classes and what needs to be improved? (3) What are the successful features of EMI classes? Students and professors agreed on the necessity of EMI classes, but pointed out that improvements were needed for better efficacy. 60% of students in the beginner level classes and 24.6% of students in the intermediate level classes understood less than 70% of the course content. Thus, the majority of the students and professors preferred to have some portion of L1 as an expedient to help students understand complicated content. Most students in all levels opposed to have CBI classes because understanding their major subjects was the priority rather than English skills. Current EMI classes seemed to reduce efficacy since they might help students improve communication ability but interfere with their academic depth. (Dankook University)

Key words English-Medium Instruction (EMI), Teaching English through English (TETE), Teaching English in English (TEE), English-Only Instruction (EOI), Immersion, Content-Based Instruction (CBI)

1. Introduction

As Korean society aims to keep up with globalization, it is common sense that universities and the students should prove and develop their capacities to compete in international fields. They should be able to demonstrate their capacities in

* I would like to thank the anonymous reviewers for their valuable comments and for the time spent towards the improvement of this paper. The present research was conducted by the research fund of Dankook University in 2011.

communicating in English so as to achieve more competitive power. Thus, the whole country strives to become better at English, developing better programs to overcome the fact that this country is dominantly Korean with the English-speakers being a minority. There are many trials to provide places where students are able to gain enough experiences to become fluent in English. One of the best ways for it is to become immersed in it; therefore, many universities are expanding English-Medium Instruction (EMI)¹ where everything from the lectures to the written assignments is all in English.

As Oh and Lee (2010) argue, EMI/Teaching English through English (TETE) classes at universities have played a positive role in lowering students' anxiety and enhancing students' English abilities by having students exposed to natural and authentic classroom language. Considering that the interpersonal language in the classroom plays a very important role in EFL, EMI classes help maximize the use of the target language so as to foster language learning.

However, many researchers have shown worries and concern about EMI classes and indicate that EMI classes are not efficient. That is, some students who have English proficiency benefit from EMI classes, but most other students do not understand them and learn less efficiently. Lee and Kim (2010) states that listening was the most benefited skill from TETE and that the intermediate-level TETE group did not benefit from EOI (English Only Instruction) in reading comprehension. Negative opinions or views have been directed at English courses and Content-Based Instruction (CBI) courses including major courses. Especially in CBI courses, Korean professors feel burdened to give lectures and will likely avoid them due to lack of confidence (Oh and Lee, 2010), or fail to have productive outcomes in teaching and building up trust with students (Willis, 1991). In major courses, professors need to have a higher level of English because they should provide course content with diverse explanations to make students understand it; thus, in the current education system, it seems too large a burden for professors and students to enroll in EMI

¹ Oh and H. Lee (2010) use the term English Medium Instruction (EMI) when talking about teaching English related courses in English and regular major courses in English, and explain that a lecture that uses English to deliver the content and information is what it defines. Thus, teaching English through English (TETE) and content-based instruction (CBI), which teaches the target content in English, are separate and the two teaching methods together are called EMI.

Many researches use TETE/TEE (teaching English in English) rather than EMI, but this study separates the use of TETE and CBI and use the term EMI to group the two together. When quoting other articles, the term used in the original will be kept.

classes.

Starting off may not be easy, but in order to develop and establish EMI policy, there needs to be more research on how EMI lectures are effective and toward what direction they should be improved. Furthermore, they should be revised with regard to differences between levels of understanding when lectures are given in L1 versus in L2; and finding whether there are any preferences in EMI lectures depending on the level of students. These should be followed by studies on the impact on students in terms of educational and psychological effects by having EMI classes. And then, based on the outcome of the research, defects of the EMI should be compensated with more effective methodology. However, there have been insufficient researches on these issues compared to the growing number of EMI classes in universities. This study aims to investigate the efficacy and problems of current EMI classes and to find an alternative model of it based on surveys in the form of questionnaires and interviews targeting professors and students. The following questions were posed for the current study:

- 1) Can the efficacy of EMI classes change depending on different levels of English and subjects?
- 2) What are student preferences and professor views regarding EMI classes and what needs to be improved?
- 3) What are the successful features of EMI classes?

2. Background

2.1 TETE in the 7th National English Curriculum

After the Revised 6th National English Curriculum of 1992 (Ministry of Education) was announced, the Korean English education started to center around communication skills. Leaving the grammar-focused education system that valued accuracy the most, the new education focused in detail on daily conversation, opinion exchange, problem solving and others communication skills. Later on, the 7th National English Curriculum of 1997(Ministry of Education), the Revised 7th National English Curriculum of 2006(Ministry of Education and Human Resources

Development), and the newly Revised 7th National English Curriculum of 2008 (Ministry of Education, Science and Technology) proposed a plan called 'Teaching English through English' in order to strengthen communication, which is the main focus of English education. When this policy was announced, TETE lessons started from elementary school grades 3 and 4 and middle school first year, and they were systematically expanded up to high school until 2004.

Such a policy was to provide the elementary, middle and high school students of that time with the basic skills to communicate in English in a global information society. For this, they decided that teaching at least the English class in English was essential. It supported the point that English lessons taught in Korean were not advisable, and that to improve the EFL situation students must be immersed in an English environment for a longer time. The TETE that has been applied since 2001 has a detailed framework to successfully develop such aims.

The 7th National English Curriculum, which mainly focuses on improving communicative competence, suggests the following rules. First, stress upon the significance of daily English. Teach the students to realize the importance of English and to become more acquainted to using English expressions in their daily lives. Second, for better communicative competence, oral language must be given greater importance. Break out of the Grammar-Translation Method of the past and through listening practice, and multi-media use, develop speaking ability. This is so as to not only focus on oral language but to bring up the level of the basic listening and speaking practice to the level of written language. Third, more emphasis should be placed on activities and task-based learning. Through group activities, teachers provide students an environment where they can learn English in a fun and natural way and use games and role plays to increase the use of language. Fourth, make the achievement criteria more accurate and specific. Compared to the Revised 6th National English Curriculum, there are six times more criteria, and the teachers and learners are given more abundant materials to be more efficient in their lessons. Lastly, prepare the right studying environment for each level. Apply individual curriculums to both higher level and beginner level students in order to reduce low effectiveness and provide quality education. Therefore, the 7th National English Curriculum is a policy which encourages students to use oral language and written language more correctly and fluently.

In order to plan public education, we have to consider the rapidly changing

globalized world, and constantly revise the materials to help cultivate creativity (Jeon, 2011). Therefore, this can be seen as the national instruction on education reflecting the needs and demands of the times. Thus, this takes giving a direction and specific feedback on the elementary, middle and high school education system as the main principle; however, the change of direction in the educational aims also affects contents in private and university education. Especially, the number of university level TETE courses, which emphasizes the importance of TETE, has become the primary standard in judging a university's level of globalization. Consequently, the number of TETE classes, along with English immersion or CBI courses has increased significantly within universities.

2.2 Different Notions of TETE

TETE was suggested as the best method to help students learn English in the EFL environment by having students come in contact with L2 frequently and obtain L2 acquisition (Pak, 2005). Willis(1997) defines TETE as follows:

Teaching English through English means speaking and using English in the classroom as often as you possibly can, for example, when organizing teaching activities or chatting to your students socially. In other words, it means establishing English as the main language of communication between your students and yourself: your students must know that it does not matter if they make mistakes when they are talking or they fail to understand every word that you say.

As above, the instructor uses L2 during the lesson as frequent as possible to allow students to come in contact with natural English, in other words, the English language not just taught in class but also used in daily life. Therefore, it specifically provides students the practical language expressions, and also increases the opportunity for students to use such expressions.

Teaching English in English (TEE), which is considered the same as TETE is defined as teaching the target language, which is English, in English. As the terms TETE and TEE, which have similar interpretations, show, English is the medium of instruction, but there is confusion on how much English should be used in class.

Other terms which show the confusion with conceptual interpretations are English-Only Instruction (EOI) and English-Please Instruction (EPI). In the early 1900s, a political movement, known as EOI, acknowledged English as the main language to be taught in public schools and to be used all across the United States. Having EOI in public schools established that foreigners were able to learn and speak English well, therefore allowing them to have job opportunities in the working society of America. EOI created issues for native students from other countries by increasing the high school dropout rates and putting a limit on students' imaginations and diversity in the classroom. Consequently, it brought up emotional debates and controversies related to teaching methods, which then brought criticism upon bilingual educational systems. The new teaching method was more effective depending on the student's native language. The students lectures are all taught in their native language except for the English class, but when ready, students are required to switch to learning all their subjects in English. This educational system was believed to be more effective in an English spoken environment. The EOI concept has borrowed its name from English immersion education. EPI, which is used separately from EOI, is when English is used to teach the lesson as much as possible, and partial use of L1 is implied. In other words, bilingual teachers may help students improve their skills in their L1, and the students may be allowed to ask questions in L1.

As such, in the current education policy and study, different terminologies are used according to the different interpretation and methods of TETE. Jo (2011) points out that EMI policies provide conceptual confusions in that EOI is interchangeably used with EPI, which causes unnecessary conflicts and disagreement between the authority and educators. For the TETE policy to succeed, there must be a unified meaning of the terms.

2.3 Literature Review of TETE and English Immersion

For more effective second language acquisition, there are many arguments in favor of using the target language during class time. First of all, Krashen's Input Hypothesis states that language input helps induce foreign language acquisition. Krashen claims that fluency in second language performance is due to what we acquired, not what we have learned (1981:99). Acquisition, as opposed to studying

grammar or semantics on a conscious level, means it occurs in a natural state. The sole condition for acquisition is said to be having an $i+1$ input a step higher than the learner's level and be in a simple language that the learner can understand.

Swain (1985, 1995, 2005) proposed for second language acquisition, comprehensible output as important as input. While promoting acquisition, output has three functions: while attempting to produce the target language, learners may notice a gap between "what they want to say" and "what they can say", test hypotheses including what is possible and what is not possible in the target language, and reflect on language itself such as forms and structures (Brown, 2007).

Long (1983a, 1983b) expanded on Krashen's comprehensible input by introducing conversational adjustments. Conversational adjustments, or conversational modifications, can provide contexts for the practice of grammar, and the knowledge of grammatical rules is acquired from conversational interaction. This idea was revised in his updated version of the interaction hypothesis (Johnson, 2004). The Interaction Hypothesis by Long (1985) defines that environmental contributions to acquisition are mediated by selective attention and the learner's developing L2 processing capacity, and these resources are brought together most usefully during negotiation for meaning. That is, second language learners acquire a new language while they are stimulated to create their own language in a socially constructed process (Brown, 2007) which is negotiation for meaning between the teacher and the learner. Long's Interaction Hypothesis centers us on the language classroom not just as a place where learners of varying abilities, styles and backgrounds mingle, but as a place where the contexts for interaction are carefully designed.

Using Long's theory as support, Snow (2005) claims that learners need to make efforts to interactively communicate with others in order to obtain the course material better, and participate in interactive activities in order to improve communication skills. Even in a level of language the learner has yet to obtain, by having them see the desperate need for interaction, it can induce more enthusiastic efforts. By using the target language as such and using it as a means of interaction, learners are able to naturally immerse themselves in a realistic environment and make it possible for a more fluid communication (Johnson, 1995).

There have been studies that present logical flaws² in Long's statements.

² According to Johnson (2004), there is a logical problem in Long's definition of the IH: environmental contributions to acquisition are mediated by selective attention and the learner's

However, there is still great support for his theories regarding maximal use of L2 in the classroom. In an EFL environment like Korea, the instructor's use of L2 is the only source of natural input, and since students can naturally focus in the target environment, to increase the students' proficiency level, there needs to be more L2 input from the educated teachers. Kang and Hong (2004) argue that if TETE lessons are successfully enforced, students not only acquire content knowledge, but there is also the positive effect that they acquire the target language. Through more exposure to L2, the learner can naturally learn the language and overcome the fear of the language (Kim, M., 2009; Oh and Lee, 2010). The positive effects of the TETE lessons that W. Lee (2000) suggests are that firstly, instructors build up confidence in the class; secondly, increase the chances to use L2 in the lacking EFL environment; thirdly, by having learners guess and predict the meaning even while lacking knowledge or skill, it increases their level of understanding; and lastly, while having students tensed on understanding the course material, they can indirectly learn L2 by understanding the language used in the instruction.

Furthermore, even in Park(2007)'s study on students who major in English, it has been shown that even if the major courses are taught in English without regard to each of their levels, they were all able to understand the material better, and increased improvements in their reading, listening and speaking skills. Within the Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) approach, CBI has been considered a principal instructional tool which provides appropriate target language experience and respects learner's cognitive and educational background (Kang, 2009). In her research, the adult learners learn graduate-level academic knowledge and skills as well as make themselves more comfortable in using the target language in a CBI course.

However, there also have been skeptical statements made on TETE and immersion lessons. Lee (2007) said that while the load of language the instructor is using may help with L2 acquisition, this does not mean that more input means that L2 is acquired. On the contrary, the quality of the input, which is to say how much meaningful and noteworthy input is provided, has greater importance on the effects

developing L2 processing capacity. She states that these mediatory devices are part of learner's mind, and they are extracted from the learner's mind to play the role of mediator between the learner's internal and external worlds. Thus, environmental contributions do not have any representation in Long's mediatory device.

of the L2 acquisition. This is suggesting the negative points of how the overuse of the L2 can be in terms of the effectiveness of English education. Also, using L2 only in a foreign language class, the effects are limited to specific groups or there is a lack of efficacy of students understanding. It is because a stubborn use of the target language to low level learners can actually interfere with learning. (Auerbach, 1995; Boo, 1998; Kim S. Y. 2002). Auerbach (1993) is especially critical of monolingualism – using only English to teach English – and said that there is no justifiable and educational evidence to support the theories that suggest using only English in the classrooms. His controversy over monolingual education brings a focus on the question of whether it is effective or even desirable for English learners to be taught core subjects in fully immersed English. Even in reality, many studies support his argument for bilingual education in ESL environments. Even if English is the main language used, appropriate use of the native language proves more effective. (Phillipson, 1992).

3. Research Method

3.1 Participants

169 students and 24 professors from universities in the Seoul area participated in this study. Students are those from two universities in Seoul and a university located in Kyunggi who are taking or have taken TETE or CBI lectures, and participated in a survey asking their overall opinions on the EMI lectures. Out of these, 141 students were those from D. University taking various levels of English classes, 60 from beginner, 41 from intermediate, and 30 from advanced (see Table 1).³ Those that have participated in the supplementary interviews for the survey were 6 from each level, totaling 18, and were completely voluntary.

³ D. University students' level was decided by placement tests, and their levels were equivalent to the following Toeic scores : the advanced was above 850, the intermediate was between 849 and 600, and the beginner was below 600. The levels of other students who participated in the survey were classified based on their Toeic score.

TABLE 1. Participants' Information – Students

		Number of the participants	Percentage
Gender	Male	92	54.4
	Female	77	45.6
Native Language	Korean	168	99.4
	English	1	0.6
Major	Humanities	28	16.6
	Science	19	11.2
	Business	53	31.4
	Social science	32	18.9
	Arts	20	11.8
	Others	17	10.1
English Learning Experience	below 3years	0	0
	3 years or more	26	15.4
	5 years or more	33	19.5
	7 years or more	46	27.2
	10 years or more	64	37.9
TETE/CBI Experience	below 3years	121	71.6
	3 years or more	47	27.8
	5 years or more	0	0
	7 years or more	1	0.6

The data were compiled from the professors, 17 professors from 4 Seoul-based universities, 6 from Kyunggi-based universities and 1 from a Daejeon university, participating in in-depth, semi-structured interviews. Excluding 3 native English teachers, 21 were Korean professors with those either experienced in teaching TETE or CBI. 24 of the respondents were in their 40s, 3 in their 30s and 2 in their 50s. Excluding 2 of the responders, the other 22 had experience studying abroad. 23 of the responders had more than 5 years of teaching experience, but those 75% had less than 3 years of EMI experience (see Table 2).

TABLE 2. Participants' Information – Professors

		Number of participants	Percentage
Gender	Male	19	79.2
	Female	5	20.8
Nationality	Korean	21	87.5
	American	2	8.3
	Canadian	1	4.2
Teaching	below 3years	0	0
Experience	3 years or more	1	4.2
	5 years or more	15	62.5
	10 years or more	8	33.3
TETE/CBI	below 3years	18	75
Experience	3 years or more	5	20.8
	5 years or more	1	4.2
	10 years or more	0	0

3.2 Data Collection

Data were collected using mixed methods. First, a questionnaire was distributed to 169 college students, and semi-structured interviews were conducted with 18 students among them. The questionnaire was divided in to 4 sections, with 10 non-Likert items and 3 open-ended questions. Section 1 included the students' basic information such as gender, major, length studying and experiences in TETE or CBI lectures. Section 2 had questions involving asking about their understanding of the lecture, and section 3 with questions about the preference factors of the TETE or CBI courses and their effectiveness. The last section was composed of open-ended items asking about their difficulties in the EMI classes. The interview was made up of 18 students from the survey with 6 from each level, and involved mostly asking extra questions on top of those asked in the survey and about their experiences in a satisfying EMI lesson in order to build a successful TETE and CBI model. The survey and interview were done after the end of the first semester in 2011, and the interview being done by groups made up of each level in a 30-40 minute debate format where a moderator gave out a question and they came up with answers.

Secondly, the semi-structured interviews done on the professors were on an

individual 30-40 minute basis from March 14 to June 17, 2011. The contents of the interview were audio-taped and made into partial transcriptions. The questions were as follows: 1. What do you think TETE/ EMI is? 2. How does your TETE/EMI or CBI class perform currently? 3. Do you think TETE and CBI classes are necessary? If yes or no, why do you think so? 4. What do you think needs to be changed for TETE and CBI to become more effective and successful? These questions were then expanded to asking about the their TETE and CBI experiences and expectations during the interview, and there were suggestions made based on the survey based on students' perceptions

Lastly, the top four of the most highly evaluated TETE and CBI lectures of D. University in 2010 and 2011 were chosen and analyzed by categories based on the student reviews. Of these lectures, 4 of the professors (3 native English teachers, 1 Korean) were those that participated in the professor interviews, asking suggestions while preparing the lessons and special traits of their lessons.

4. Results

4.1 Students' Perspective on TETE & CBI

1) Students' understanding of EMI lectures

One of critical weaknesses in EMI classes is the efficacy of understanding the course material or content. Practically, students have different levels of understanding English, thus professors will unlikely deliver course content at an appropriate level for all students, and it is obvious that students will not understand the course content, either (Oh and Lee, 2010; Lee, J-A, 2010). To specify more, I performed research on the level of understanding English. In beginner classes, only 60% of students understood less than 70% of class content; in intermediate classes, 75.4% of students understood more than 70% of class content; lastly, 90% of students in advance understood the content of course material (see Table 3). Considering that in beginner classes, professors used minimum or easy expressions and a slow pace, this result indicates the limitation of EMI classes.

TABLE 3. Students' Understanding of EMI Classes

	Beginner	Intermediate	Advanced
Less than 30%	5 (8%)	3 (4.9%)	0 (0%)
Less than 50%	6 (10%)	3 (4.9%)	0 (0%)
Less than 70%	25 (42%)	9 (14.8%)	0 (0%)
Less than 90%	22 (37%)	27 (44.3%)	5 (10.4%)
Less than 100% or 100%	2 (3%)	19 (31.1%)	43 (89.6%)
	60 (100%)	61 (100%)	48 (100%)

In previous studies (Jo, 2011; Oh and H. Lee, 2010), there was indication that a poor capacity of English would be a burden to students; thus it can be predicted that the efficacy of EMI classes will be lower. 52% of beginner answered that lack of understanding in EMI classes was due to capacity of their L2 skills; 32% of students answered that course content was too difficult but this is also somewhat related to L2 skills (see Table 4). If students cannot understand what a professor is trying to deliver to students, students often tend to think or believe the course content is too complicated. Without knowing previous content and as it piled up high, teaching or explaining with easy expressions is meaningless. Also 49.2% of students in intermediate classes are showing similar cases and answers. However, students in advanced classes answered that they understood the structure of sentences and if they were confronted with understanding complex content, they often could predict some portion of complicated content. Students in intermediate and advanced classes displayed difficulties that occurred in both EMI and non-EMI classes. These factors included lack of background knowledge of the course content, not reviewing the subject properly or being absent. Also, students tend to dislike solving problems by questioning and feel burdened to ask questions in L2. Thus, this presents a possible correlation that L2 skills and understanding EMI classes are closely related.

TABLE 4. Reasons Why EMI Classes are Difficult

	Beginner	Intermediate	Advanced
Cannot understand English in the lecture	31 (52%)	30 (49.2%)	0 (0%)
Cannot understand the content of the course material	2 (32%)	3 (4.9%)	5 (10.4%)
Pace of lecture or professor explanation is too rapid	1 (2%)	3 (4.9%)	9 (18.8%)
Other reasons	2 (3%)	25 (41%)	34 (70.8%)

Students in the beginner class answered that the major obstacle in EMI classes was listening skills. Comparing EMI classes to their classes taught in L1, they concluded that their language skill was a problem.

For me, understanding lectures in English is very difficult. Even if I concentrate, I still find it hard to understand the content, I sometimes feel lost when course material gets complicated. As a result, I experience difficulties in concentrating on lectures and feel like daydreaming. I even read textbooks in advance but focusing on lectures seems to be impossible and I end up visiting English institutes to register for listening lessons. (student, beginner)

Intermediate students had similar problems in EMI classes.

There seems to be a decrease in the number of questions asked by students when classes are taught in English. Those students who are good at English tend to ask questions and they are the usual ones that ask questions. For other students, it takes time to think about the question in English so sometimes the professor just moves on to the next point by the time they are ready to ask questions in English. (student, intermediate)

On the other hand, advanced classes had no problem understanding the content because of their language capacity. This output can be nicely translated into the fact that language is the major point regarding students understanding EMI classes. Especially, in beginner and intermediate classes, they should carefully think about

using English as their course language or percentage usage of English in course material. To overcome this problem that they face, using L1 in some portion is needed. As indicated in previous researches, students showed a positive reaction to using L1 in some parts of the class. 83% of beginner and 70.5% of intermediate students showed positive reactions toward the solution (see Table 5); even those 20.8% of advanced students were positive about the partial use of L1. For some complex areas, they sometimes needed or wanted an explanation in L1 to gain better understanding. In contrast, those students with different perspectives answered that language might not be the critical point in CBI courses because the content itself was too difficult to understand, so explaining in L1 would be meaningless.

TABLE 5. Korean Explanation in EMI Classes

	Beginner	Intermediate	Advanced
It would be helpful	50 (83%)	43 (70.5%)	10 (20.8%)
It would not matter	6 (10%)	4 (6.6%)	24 (50%)
Other opinions	4 (7%)	14 (22.9%)	14 (29.2%)

2) Students' preference for EMI classes

To understand students' responses regarding their classroom language more specifically, I did research regarding language preferences in TETE courses. First, those students in advanced classes all agreed or preferred to have native English speaking teachers (NESTs); however, those students in beginner and intermediate had no preference for having Korean or native professors, which means they do not really care. The advanced students' preference for NESTs is correlated to their complete understanding of course content. Since they have no trouble understanding the language, they prefer diverse expressions and accurate pronunciation in TETE classes; also they prefer the friendly and comfortable environment which will likely bring more motivation. On the other hand, asking questions in L1 can lessen the burden for beginner students. Students in intermediate had no clear preference because they tended to share both reasons from beginner and advanced classes (see Table 6).

As E. S. Park (2009) notes, NESTs have advantages in language proficiency and tend to create more relaxing, friendship-oriented relationships with students and it does affect advanced-level students' preferences; on the other hand, nonnative

English speaking teachers (NNESTs) have an advantage in knowledge of grammar, local language and culture, and it has students feeling more inclined to Korean teachers.

TABLE 6. Preference for TETE Instructor

	Beginner	Intermediate	Advanced
Native English teachers	5 (8%)	27 (44.3%)	48 (100%)
Korean teachers	55 (92%)	34 (55.7%)	0 (0%)

Students' preferences are shown to differ based on classroom language, course content and student capacity of English level, but its tendency seems to be similar at all levels (see Table 7, 8, and 9). Those students who wish to practice communication skills seem to prefer classes conducted in L2. Because they believe it will be beneficial to their studies to be exposed to authentic language, they tend to prefer experiencing more target language. However, if they put more weight on understanding professors' explanations rather than practicing their L2 skills, they prefer using L1 more often in classes such as reading, writing, and CBI courses.

TABLE 7. Preference Language - Lower Level

	In English	In Korean	In English and Korean
Listening	45 (75%)	2 (3%)	13 (22%)
Speaking	41 (68%)	3 (5%)	16 (27%)
Reading	35 (58%)	8 (14%)	17 (28%)
Writing	15 (25%)	16 (27%)	29 (48%)
CBI	1 (2%)	36 (60%)	23 (38%)

TABLE 8. Preference Language – Intermediate Level

	In English	In Korean	In English and Korean
Listening	46 (75.4%)	4 (6.6%)	11 (28%)
Speaking	51 (83.6%)	3 (4.9%)	7 (11.5%)
Reading	30 (49.2%)	7 (11.5%)	24 (39.3%)
Writing	21 (34.4%)	10 (16.4%)	30 (49.2%)
CBI	1 (1.6%)	41 (67.2%)	19 (31.2%)

TABLE 9. Preference Language – Advanced Level

	In English	In Korean	In English and Korean
Listening	48 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Speaking	48 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Reading	29 (60.4%)	0 (0%)	19 (39.6%)
Writing	34 (70.8%)	0 (0%)	14 (29.2%)
CBI	13 (27.1%)	19 (39.6%)	16 (33.3%)

A noteworthy response has shown that 58% of students in beginner classes prefer to have a reading class in L2, which is similar to those students in advanced and more than in intermediate classes. This result was related to the course material or professor's teaching method. As a matter of fact, those students in beginner had relatively easy textbooks and a good understanding without professor's explanations compared to those students in intermediate and advanced.

Those 27.1% of students in advanced class with full understanding on their course material tend to prefer to use L2 in CBI courses because they believe that it might be very helpful when they are applying for their career after they graduate. Intriguingly, the other 72.9% of students tend to prefer L1 technique or a portion of L1 in their classes including CBI for the same fundamental reason.

The good point of having or studying my major subject in English is that I can get to learn more vocabulary in English regarding my major. I wish to get a job in the area of my major after I graduate and I believe that taking lectures in English will help me with this and possibly work abroad. (student, advanced)

If students take lectures which are taught in English, then they will learn more technical terms in English and as a result, if they choose to get a job within Korea, which is generally true for most Korean students, they need to learn those terms again in Korean. Most Korean students will work in domestic workplaces, and they need to communicate in Korean. Considering this, partial use of the Korean language is desirable. (student, intermediate)

Because the majority of students focus on understanding course content rather than aiming to improve English skills in their CBI classes, they agree to use L1 in some areas. Some students believe that there is a limitation on explaining course content in L2 without clearly knowing the course material, and that learning fundamental content of their major is just as important as learning L2. In this respect, a weakness of EMI classes has been pointed out because EMI classes tend to make no adaptations based on students' level and course material.

3) Difficulties in EMI classes

Regardless of a student's level of English, preference for using L1 in EMI classes depends on the amount of explanation on their course textbook. Especially, in classes like CBI, considering the percentage of students who prefer using L1 only or L1 and L2 mixed together in the class, it seems impossible not to use L1 in EMI classes.

I am currently taking two major courses in English and I am having a hard time understanding half of the course content. If professors make explanations in Korean, then it is much easier and I can possibly guess the next content but enrolling in English oriented classes gives too much pressure and eventually I give up. I am guessing there are a lot of students feeling similarly and I am having a hard time understanding why class has to be done in English. I personally believe learning in English will not give a clear interpretation of the course content or improve my English skills, either. (student, intermediate)

Comparing classes taught in Korean and EMI classes in terms of grade, I tend to get lower grades in EMI. It was due to my lack of English skills because I had a hard time contributing to classes and felt too much pressure expressing my thoughts in English; thus I end up giving up on my class. (student, intermediate)

I had an EMI major class, but only the first 3 weeks was taught in English and the rest was taught in Korean. Honestly, students had a hard time understanding the explanation of terms and also professors had difficulties in explaining the course material; thus the professor decided to teach in

Korean after 3 weeks. Even though it was an English major course, the professor and students still had a hard time running with the EMI method. (student, advanced)

When classes are taught in English, an absolute grading system is used and students can get good grades; however, it is hard to say that their English skills have been improved because there are only limited English expressions used in classes and they usually don't get to hear or use diverse expressions. Therefore, it doesn't really mean that their English ability has been improved because those classes so compact with students have limited time for asking questions and presenting their opinions. (student, advanced)

The most critical problem of EMI classes is that classroom language is not properly understood. Those students being confident in English will likely follow up with course content but those students with lack of skills in English eventually lose interest in studying and give up on their courses. Also, some of students in the advanced level pointed out that sometimes EMI classes were missing out some content because in-depth lessons were impossible with professor's poor explanations and the fast pace of the classes.

The problem of classroom language becomes more serious in CBI classes than TETE classes. CLT-based lectures are not very disturbed by the EMI method, but course content was not clearly understood in TETE classes which need understanding through explanations on grammar (Min, 2008), for instance, and CBI classes which are conducted regardless of students' English level.

4.2 Professors' Perspectives on EMI classes

1) Understanding the concept of TETE/ EMI and their classroom language

The research on how professors understood the concept of TETE/EMI shows interesting results in that 75% of the professors answered that the class is conducted 100% in English; 25% of professors answered 80% in English (see Table 10). The conceptual confusion of TETE/EMI was not very serious; but they used L1 sometimes as an expedient to help students when explaining course material in L2 was difficult or inefficient. This can be interpreted to mean that they are accepting

TETE/EMI as EOI.

TABLE 10. The Concept of EMI and Using English as a Classroom Language

	Using English for 100%	For 80% or more	For 50% or more	When necessary
What does EMI/TETE mean?	18(75%)	6(25%)	0(0%)	0(0%)
How do you perform your EMI/TETE classes?	13(54.2%)	8(33.3%)	2(8.3%)	1(4.2%)

If there are two interpretations of TETE/EMI, the literal interpretation and practical interpretation, they can give conceptual confusion as Maeng (2009) and Jo (2011) point out. In the field of education, we often use the term TETE/EMI, but linguistic difficulties always follow between the literal interpretation of the terminology and the class in reality. Some portion of L1 used in EMI classes to solve this problem logically is sometimes misled to be destructing the purpose of EMI in the environment where EMI is regarded as EOI. To improve practical aspects of EMI policy, a clear statement of EMI method and its effective practice should be prepared.

2) Necessity and improvement of EMI classes

Discussing the necessity of EMI, many different reasons and perspectives were found, but in conclusion professors agreed on having EMI. Even though there were a lot of problems in EMI classes, students still felt they needed EMI classes due to current trends and gaining competitive power. To make EMI classes more effective and successful, professors pointed out to find and fix problems from a realistic point of view. Their explanations are as follows:

Since Korea is in line with globalization, students will eventually experience overseas expansion and realistically English is one of the key fundamentals of globalization. Therefore, universities need to put weight on students' communication ability. (professor, college of business)

For Korean students, taking lectures in English instead of Korean might seem a little unnatural and awkward in the beginning, but to me, they are getting used to it as time goes by. Also students can actually focus and participate better in classes. Especially when foreign students take classes together with Korean students, the atmosphere becomes much more active and natural. (professor, college of humanities)

It is practically impossible for me to speak English at the level of native speakers. But American and British English are not the only kinds of English in the world, and so-called world English may be enough to communicate with each other from around the world. (professor, college of business)

Given the current trend of emphasizing globalization in the field of education and society in general, EMI policy is necessary. In consideration of students' future careers and possibilities of going abroad, it is essential to use English comfortably and as a result, teaching English and their major subjects in English seems absolutely necessary. However, if we hasten EMI classes in an objective-oriented manner or without considering real word situations, it may cause counterproductive effects. Universities might have considered and prepared their own EMI policy, but problems indicated in this research prove that they need to revise and improve the EMI policy.

There is a problem in English-only classes in that even though some expressions can be explained within a short time and accurately understood in Korean, teachers explain them in English in a difficult and complicated way. Also, if students do not understand, it is still necessary for teachers to explain them in Korean again. (professor, college of engineering)

Some students do not understand English, and so they can't keep up with CBI classes that are related to their majors. Professors have to be concerned and deal with this. If professors summarize lecture material in Korean for the last 10 minutes of the class, it will give students better focus just for the 10 minutes. Eventually, if we contrast classes taught 100

percent in English and 100 percent in Korean, classes taught in Korean seem to have greater depth of course content. (professor, college of social science)

CBI is a great idea, but I wouldn't want to be a part of it right now as a student. Many students are very smart in their major, but their English abilities lag far behind. Putting them into a CBI only situation would punish those students. For CBI to work in the present, some sort of safety net would need to be erected to help students. As for English instruction in class, the teacher must remember to use vocabulary and grammar structures in their instructions that the students are comfortable with. If the instructions use unfamiliar words or grammar structures, the students will probably not know what to do. Additionally, instructions need to be broken down into smaller pieces or steps for clearer understanding. Based on our university's current levels of beginner, intermediate and advanced, the teacher needs to vary their instructions from simplified and broken into broken into many steps to a more in depth instruction with fewer steps based on the level of class. (professor, college of humanities)

100 percent TETE is not a valid goal. I am not sure what the ratio should be, but would guess around 90 percent of a lesson in English, with a smattering of Korean would probably come in handy. However, the teacher must use Korean only as a last resort and also beware of students 'claiming' to not understand in order to receive easy to understand explanations in Korean. Though I am nowhere near a conversationalist in Korean, I do use the odd word here and there to help. But I have the advantage over a NNEST. In my class the students assume I know zero Korean, and thus are resigned to working harder to understand most of what I say. (professor, college of general education)

I can't think of perfect and uniform methodology to improve TETE instruction. It depends on the students' level of English proficiency and the content or subject of the lecture. It's really up to the teacher to gauge their students understanding and employ Krashen's $i+1$ theory. If the teacher is

unsure, simply question the students to determine their level of understanding and adjust your next set of instructions accordingly.
(professor, college of general education)

Most professors agree that EOI classes make it difficult for students to understand the content knowledge and professional field, compared to other classes held in their L1. They are not familiar with technical terms and also complicated content that will be accumulated more and more as the class progresses. As the efficiency of running the class decreases, professors eventually have to use L1 to re-explain or to give key notes. It is said that sometimes students even have difficulties in understanding the homework given in the class and fail to submit it. Also, in exams, they do not even understand the instructions for how to prepare for exams adequately. These are more or less burdensome to students.

Considering this, classroom language is the critical obstacle of current EMI classes, whether TETE or CBI. Many students believe that EMI is more efficient in classes such as English speaking or listening that are more likely involved in linguistic training rather than understanding content knowledge. Classes for teaching grammar and knowledge of the major show the limits of delivering the course content. Even if English skills can be improved, students miss the major factor of the course. Also, those students with a poor capacity in English language tend to feel burdened and dissatisfied with the course. Nevertheless, universities are setting and expanding more EMI classes because their globalization index is rated by the number of CBI classes. This reduces the efficacy of CBI classes since they might help students improve communication ability but interfere with their academic depth. Universities should reconsider expanding CBI courses in terms of objective and efficiency, and if CBI is necessary and available depending on majors, administrative and practical supports should be provided for more qualified CBI classes.

In order to improve the quality of EMI, including CBI, lectures, there needs to be effort to find some model lectures and information that can be shared with professors who participate in EMI classes. Also through regular workshops, professors should seek to improve and spread clever teaching methods. As an alternative, properties of successful EMI classes are referred to and analyzed in the following section.

3) Properties of successful EMI classes

For the current EMI classes to be effective and productive, methodologies and procedures should be realistic. Suggestions were collected through listening to students' and professors' comments for successful aspects of EMI classes with high evaluations. The biggest success in EMI classes conducted by NESTs was due to class environment that made students overcome fear in English by giving kindness and diverse expressions in their explanations. Students enjoyed diverse course materials, UCC for instance, and also those professors explained course content in a clear and easy way, which was another key point of success.

The special feature of NEST's teaching method was kindness. Not only did he have good pronunciation and expressions, he put in a lot of effort to gain participation from each student; overall, his teaching style was very confident and detailed so he had no trouble running classes in English. (student, advanced)

He was a NEST, and made an effort to memorize names and the specific character of every single student. Using humorous jokes, he kept students interested in course material, and so the lecture was not very tight. But I learned a lot from the class, especially, he helped me and other students become confident in speaking. (student, intermediate)

Concerning NEST's classes, their teaching environment encouraged students to easily notice their own mistakes and naturally fix them, which helped reduce anxiety in the EMI class. This resulted from NEST's efforts and preparations for the classes and noticing the weakness of students to give proper explanations rather than their good pronunciation and English proficiency. These properties led to high evaluation from students, but all NESTs did not share them.

Also, successful EMI classes taught by Koreans had similar points as NESTs in that they provided a comfortable class environment, most of all, and professors' fluency in L2, not to mention clear pronunciation, enabled their lecture to adjust to students' difficulties.

I took an EMI class taught by a Korean professor, but students felt less burdened because if they missed anything from the lecture, they could ask professor about it in Korean after the class. In fact, many students asked questions in Korean, and so confusing content did not pile up. (student, beginner)

Sometimes I feel NESTs speak too fast, but in contrast Korean professors' English is easy to understand and clear. My professor's explanations for complicated grammar and sentences were straight forward which was a positive perspective on Korean professors. She used PPT materials and gave detailed explanations to help students understand EMI lectures. Also, she spoke rather slowly but her English was as good as native speakers'. (student, intermediate)

I feel that students prefer NESTs because they assume that we (NESTs) will either know best or always be correct. It is a wrong assumption to make as teachers are people and will make mistakes at times. I think Korean students and parents prefer white faces as it has always been assumed that teachers from the target language country make the best teachers, and this is not so. I feel that NNESTs are better teachers for the fact that they understand the difficulties in learning English. They know where and when students will run into trouble and they'll know how to help them properly. Yes, their pronunciation is not perfect, but is understandable. (professor, college of humanities)

Since many students believe that I am not good at Korean, they believe that I will have no problem teaching EMI classes; however, teaching EMI is more about devotion and effort rather my English skills. I make predictions on parts where students will have difficulties understanding and prepare for easy and clear explanations for them. Not only trying to improve students' English abilities, but I tend to put similar weight on delivering course content because it is the real purpose of having EMI. To be an expert on EMI classes, an investment of time and effort is needed. (professor, college of general education)

Given hints from the responses, the majority of students in the advanced level evaluated NEST's classes highly compared to those taught by Koreans; on the other hand, some EMI classes taught by Koreans were nicely evaluated by students in the beginner and intermediate levels. Even though they put more weight on the class environment and clear explanations of the course content, English skills supported their teaching skills. Actually, students agreed that those professors with high evaluations had the same level of English skills as native speakers. Regardless of professors' efforts and sincerities, their poor pronunciation and explanations could not properly and reliably deliver the content to students, which led to cases where they often abandoned EMI to teach in Korean.

As intermediate and beginner classes noted, some explanations in L1 affected better efficacy and less anxiety of the lecture when students' English skills interfered with understanding EMI course contents. Those professors with good valuations tended to put explanations in L1 on the E-learning campus (an online info-sharing tool) in order to prevent students from learning without knowing the content of the course. Certain students believed that it was better to give explanations in L1 in the middle of the class rather than after the class. That is to say, homework and a summary of the lecture explained in L1 are sometimes necessary. Therefore, EOI, especially for major subjects, does not seem to be possible considering these facts.

4. Conclusion and Suggestion

The purpose of this research was to find students' and professors' perspectives or views on EMI classes and to find out what needs to be improved in order to make efficient EMI classes. By using research techniques of survey and interview, I tried to find answers to the questions presented in the beginning, and to seek for methods to improve and evolve EMI.

The majority of students and professors agreed on the necessity of EMI classes, but pointed out that improvements were needed for better efficacy. Above all, even if Korean professors had no problem teaching classes in L2, it was of no use if students lacked L2 abilities. 60% of students in the beginner and 24.6% of students in the intermediate understood less than 70% of the course material; 52% of students in beginner and 49.2% of students explained the reason was due to their poor skills

of L2. Considering that lectures were relatively easy and slow in the beginner classes, current EMI methods for the beginner were not very effective. Professors recognized the limit seriously. Those 83% of students in the beginner and 70.5% of students in the intermediate who took EMI classes answered that they preferred some explanations in L1, and also those 20.8% of students in the advanced agreed on it. There were different views and perspectives on using L1 in classes according to students' level of English ability, but the majority agreed or preferred to have some portion of L1 as there was more content knowledge provided in the course. In contrast, 98% or more of students in beginner and intermediate and 72.9% of students in advanced opposed to have CBI classes because understanding their major subjects was the priority rather than L2 skills.

Consequently, the current EMI policy should be revised if it leads unilateral and uniform education by disregarding students' English abilities and characteristics of individual courses.

Especially, this issue becomes more complicated and controversial in terms of efficiency in cases where EMI is interpreted as EOI. It will be effective only if EMI lectures are given when professors and students are both ready. Professors need to have English abilities in order to convey the knowledge in major subjects at the level that students can understand. At the same time, students should also have basic L2 skills to understand lectures taught in L2. Namely, they need to develop listening and reading skills in general English courses and have interest and background knowledge in their major subjects before taking EMI lectures. Improving EMI classes takes time, so they need to be broken down into specific steps and to be proceeded gradually making a better environment for EMI classes. In EMI classes, professors need to make different course materials according to the level of students' L2 skills; also, there should be particular and specific standards of using L1 in EMI classes, namely, when, how, and how often L1 should be used is to be specified. The teaching skills of speaking and listening classes cannot be simply applied to writing, reading, or major courses; thus, they should be differentiated in the beginner and the advanced courses. Eventually, it will give new understanding and perspective to the concept of EMI because confusing EMI with EOI sends the wrong message that partially using L1 in EMI classes damages the EMI policy.

As noted above, since it takes time for professors and students to participate in effective EMI classes, I could find alternative plans or successful models applicable

in the process of improvement. As for TETE classes, both NESTs and Korean professors' classes should be developed to help students reduce anxiety and understand EMI classes rather than expanding NEST's classes without discretion. In the case of TETE courses, advanced students preferred NESTs whereas many beginner and intermediate students preferred Korean professors. NESTs have advantages in good pronunciation and diverse expressions for their explanation, but not all of the students were satisfied with the lecture. NESTs achieved high evaluations only when serious effort was made to deliver a quality class. While TETE classes taught by Korean professors achieved relatively low evaluations compared to NEST classes, some of the intermediate and beginner classes evaluated high for Korean professors. They had advantages: they gave less anxiety of taking EMI classes, and students could ask questions in L1 if needed. Korean professors could predict where students might have trouble understanding the content of EMI courses and gave explanations in L1 when students had difficulties understanding the lecture. In fact, the professors tried to encourage students falling behind the course schedule and to motivate students to concentrate on their class by giving L1 directions.

However, many students still tend to take EMI classes based on biased ideas about NESTs and Korean professors if there is not enough information on them. Even if there is no prejudice against them, professors' English proficiency was regarded as an important factor for EMI classes to make clear explanations possible. Thus, in EMI classes, the most critical problem they face boils down to professors' and students' capacity of English knowledge. Nevertheless, it is true that many current EMI classes are proceeding with professors having a hard time explaining course content and students having a hard time understanding it.

Those EMI classes need more careful and systematic preparation, but the reality is the opposite. Universities increase the number of EMI lectures rapidly, which stirs another controversy. The reason why most universities are focusing so much on providing EMI lectures for major courses is because it is one of the main criteria of evaluating universities. One important indicator of the evaluation process is the globalization index and this is based on the rate of how many foreign professors, students and EMI classes universities have. Thus, in order to increase or expand EMI classes, universities are setting CBI classes without logically regarding their major. What is worse, universities tend to prefer new professors who are capable of giving

lectures in English. Now this can breed a misleading intention that universities prefer people who have acquired a PH. D. in English-speaking countries. This kind of social atmosphere gives the wrong message that lectures should be taught in English and EMI lectures are the only way to provide qualified education.

Universities should now revise their blanket policies on EMI classes and should have adaptive policies of voluntarily teaching EMI courses which are more fitting to the individual colleges or departments. Rather than expanding EMI classes, they should offer a broader range of choices and more flexible and effective classes. This will lead to a more practical orientation and will prevent situations in which students are applauded for their communication skills without deep academic knowledge.

References

- Auerbach, D. 1993. Reexamining English only in the ESL classroom. *TESOL Quarterly* 27(1): 9-32.
- Auerbach, D. 1995. The politics of the ESL classroom: Issues of power in pedagogical choices. In J. Tollerfson (Ed.), *Power and inequality in language education*, 9-33. Cambridge University Press.
- Boo, K. 1998. Classroom language in teaching English. *Journal of the Applied Linguistics Association of Korea* 14(1): 23-42.
- Brown, H. D. 2007. *Principles of language learning and teaching*. White Plains, NY: Pearson Education.
- Jeon, In-Jae. 2008. Korean EFL teachers' beliefs of English-only instruction. *English Teaching* 63(3): 205-229.
- Jeon, B. M. 2011. Current issues and future directions of the national English curriculum in Korea. *English Language Teaching* 23(1): 261-273.
- Jo, Inhee. 2011. Incoherent interpretation of the teaching English in English policy in Korea. *Modern English Education* 12(1): 221-243.
- Hohnson, M. 2004. *A philosophy of second language acquisition*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Kang, AeJin. 2008. First time in CBI. *English Teaching* 63(4): 85-113.
- Kang, AeJin. 2009. A case study of a graduate-level CBI course. *English Teaching* 64(4): 151-179.
- Kang and Hong. 2004. *Yeongoe molib gyoyukui irongwa silje*. Taejeon: Bosung.
- Kim, Myonghee. 2009. How do college students react to TETE? *Modern English Education*

10(3): 62-89.

- Kim, Sung Yeon. 2002. Teachers' perception about teaching English through English. *English Teaching* 57(1): 131-148.
- Kim, Sung Yeon and Lee Wan Ki. 2006. An evaluation of the English native instructor program of national universities of education. *Primary English education* 12(1): 35-62.
- Krashen, S. 1981. *Second language acquisition and second language learning*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Krashen, S. 1985. *The input hypothesis: Issues and implication*. New York: Longman.
- Lee, Eunpyo and Kim, Eunkyung. 2010. A comparative study on two types of English courses: TETE and TETE&K. *English Language & Literature Teaching* 16(2): 93-111.
- Lee, Jeong-Ah. 2010. Does the English-only class benefit all learners?: The teacher's perspective. *Primary English education* 16(2): 185-213.
- Lee, Jin-Hwa. 2007. Where to start teaching English through English: Based on perceived effectiveness of teachers' English use. *English Teaching* 62(4): 335-354.
- Lee, Wan Ki. 2000. *Chodeung yeonge Goyoyukron*. Seoul: Munjin Media.
- Long, M. 1983a. Linguistic and conversational adjustments to non-native speakers. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 5(2): 177-193.
- Long, M. 1983b. Native speaker/non-native speaker conversation and the negotiation of comprehensible input. *Applied Linguistics* 4(2): 126-141.
- Long, M. 1985. Input and second language acquisition. In S. Gass & C. Madden (Eds.), *Input in second language acquisition*, 377-393. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Maeng, Unkyoung. 2009. Perception of primary teachers and students on an English education policy in Korea, TEE. *Modern English Education* 10(1): 177-206.
- Min, Chan Kyoo. 2008. A survey of the English teachers' perception on teaching English in English (TEE). *English Language Teaching* 20(2): 167-190.
- Ministry of Education. 1997. *The 6th revised curriculum – foreign language (English)*. Seoul: Ministry of Education.
- Ministry of Education. 1997. *The 7th national English curriculum*. Seoul: Ministry of Education.
- Oh, Hee Jeong and Lee, Eun Hee. 2010. College students' attitude towards teaching English through English and its effectiveness. *English Language Teaching* 22(4): 211-229.
- Oh, Hee Jeong and Lee, Heewon. 2010. Characteristics of effective English medium instruction and support measures. *Modern English Education* 11(1): 191-212.
- Pak, Yunhwa. 2005. A study of university student's perceptions on TETE. *English language teaching* 17(1): 59-82.
- Park, Eun-Soo. 2009. The Korean university students' preferences toward native English speaking teachers. *Modern English Education* 1(3): 114-130.
- Park, Hyeson. 2007. English medium instruction and content learning. *English Language and Linguistics* 23: 257-274.

- Phillipson, R. 1992. *Linguistic imperialism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Phillipson, R. 1992. ELT: The non-native English speaker's burden. *ELT Journal* 46(1): 13-18.
- Snow, M. A. 2005. A model of academic literacy for integrated language and content instruction, In E. Henkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning*, 693-712. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Swain, M. 1985. Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development. In S. Gass & C. Madden (Eds.), *Input in second language acquisition*, 235-253. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Swain, M. 1995. Three functions of output in second language learning. In G. Cook & B. Seidlhofer (Eds.), *Principles and practice in applied linguistics: studies in honor of H. G. Widdowson*, 125-144. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Swain, M. 2005. The output hypothesis: Theory and research. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning*, 471-483. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Willis, J. 1991. *Teaching English through English*. Essex: Longman.

Kyung-Rahn Kim

College of General Education
Dankook University
152 Jukjeon-ro, Suji-gu, Yongin-si,
Gyeonggi-do 448-701, Korea
Tel: (031) 8005-3984
E-mail: kkim2266@hanmail.net

Received: 2011. 10. 28

Revised: 2011. 12. 05

Accepted: 2011. 12. 09