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Chapter 1: Introduction

Teaching is a complex cognitive activity. As S. Borg (2003) states, “teachers are active, thinking decision-makers who make instructional choices by drawing on complex, practically-oriented, personalized, and context-sensitive networks of knowledge, thoughts, and beliefs” (p. 81). Teachers’ beliefs, in particular, have been considered as one of the most valuable psychological constructs for understanding and improving teaching and teacher education (Johnson, 1994). Researchers have come to a realization that complete understanding of teachers’ behavior requires the exploration of teachers’ beliefs. This recognition of the importance of teachers’ beliefs has initiated much research exploring teachers’ beliefs. As a part of this research endeavor, seminal research reviews on teachers’ beliefs were introduced to the field of research on teaching (e.g., Calderhead, 1996; Pajares, 1992; Richardson, 1996; Stuart & Thurlow, 2000; Woods, 1996). A substantial body of research on teachers’ beliefs, along with these reviews, has further expanded the understanding of teaching.

An underlying assumption of research on teachers’ beliefs is that teachers play a critical role in education (Richardson, 1996). Johnson (1994) finds three basic assumptions shared by research on teachers’ beliefs as follows: a) teachers’ perceptions and judgments are influenced by beliefs that teachers hold and thus affect what they say and do in the classroom, b) teachers’ beliefs have an impact on the ways they interpret new information about teaching and learning and on the ways information on teaching is translated into classroom practices, and c) to improve
teaching practices and teacher education program, it is critical to understand teachers’ beliefs. Similarly, other researchers state that teachers’ beliefs influence the ways that they teach and learn how to teach and perceive educational reforms (Allen, 2002; M. Borg, 2001; S. Borg, 2003; Freeman, 2002).

Research on teachers’ beliefs can “contribute to a fuller recognition of teacher beliefs and enhance our appreciation of how they influence the process of learning to teach and how the quality of such processes might be improved” (H. Zheng, 2009, p. 75). The necessity of research on teachers’ beliefs is much emphasized in the literature for a variety of reasons. First, investigation of the relation between teachers’ beliefs and classroom actions can inform educational practices (Allen, 2002). Second, if teacher education is to have an influence on how teachers will teach, it should engage teachers in reflecting on their beliefs (Mattheoudakis, 2007), because they bring deeply grounded beliefs about teaching and learning which affect what and how they learn (MacDonald, Badger, & White, 2001; Terrcanlioglu, 2005). Third, “attempts to implement new classroom practices without considering teachers’ beliefs can lead to disappointing results” (Allen, 2002, p. 519). Thus, in order to successfully implement new teaching practices, it is necessary to examine what beliefs teachers have.

The growing realization of the need for studies that explore beliefs of teachers, particularly ESOL teachers, and these beliefs’ impact on classroom practices (e.g., Farrell, 1999; Farrell & Bennis, 2013; S. Borg, 2011; Phipps & S. Borg, 2009; Xiang & S. Borg, 2014) and the growing consensus in the literature on the close relationship between teachers’ beliefs and teaching practices (e.g., Assalahi, 2013;
Bamanger & Gashan, 2014; S. Borg & Al-Busaidi, 2012; Chou, 2008; Kuzborska, 2011; X. Zheng & S. Borg, 2014) imply that investigating teachers’ beliefs is particularly important in contexts where a great deal of effort has been exerted to improve and innovate English language teaching. The literature of ESOL teachers’ beliefs implies that successful implementation of English language education reform initiatives may be closely related to what ESOL teachers believe since their beliefs may have an influence on the ways they perceive, interpret such reform initiatives and on the ways such reform initiatives are translated into classroom practices (e.g., Chan, 2014; Könings, Brand-Gruwel, & Erriënboer, 2007). Therefore, if such reform efforts are to be successfully implemented by teachers in the classroom, to understand teachers’ beliefs is necessary.

1.1. English language education reform initiatives in Korea

In recent years, the English language has greatly spread all over the world and it is now acknowledged as the lingua franca (Crystal, 1997, 2003). As a result, this global importance of English has tremendously influenced the society of Korea. It has created a widespread interest in the English language, the extent of which continues to increase. English is now the most important foreign language in Korea and to demonstrate high English proficiency is a necessary route to a success in, for example, college entrance, career building, and even the improvement of one’s social status. The Korean government proposes that “to be able to match and contribute to the rapidly changing culture of a globalized world, the Koreans should be able to effectively communicate in English” and thus it is important that “English language
education at the primary and secondary school levels build up English oral proficiency” (Ministry of Education, 2000).

Traditionally, approaches to English language education in Korea are close to what Celce-Murcia (2001) called the grammar-translation approach and the reading approach, which are characterized by focus on isolated grammar and reading skills, translation of English passages into Korean, rote learning of words and idioms, and teacher-centeredness (S. Choi, 2000) and these approaches have failed to develop an adequate level of communicative competence in Korean English learners. A lack of language production skills in students taught by these traditional approaches and methods, which are largely decontextualized and unrelated to their real life (Tedick & Walker, 1994), has been the impetus for the efforts that the Korean Ministry of Education (MOE) has put forth to reform English language education. To bring innovation to the traditional English language classroom, the Korean government has implemented curricular reforms and relevant policies and programs mandating communicative language teaching (CLT).

The 7th National English Curriculum (NEC), the most recent MOE English curriculum manual, which was implemented from 2001, criticizes traditional English language classes that put a heavy emphasis on grammatical knowledge as inhibiting the development of students’ oral proficiency:

The introduction of the communicative approach to English education is a practical response to traditional English education which produced learners that have good grammatical knowledge but experience difficulties in
communication. It is also a reaction to social demands for English education that enhances communication ability (Ministry of Education, 1998, p. 13).

The 7th NEC, in which developing students’ communicative competence is represented as the greatest learning goal, adopts the concept of communicative competence proposed by Canale and Swain (1980) and Bachman (1990). It introduces the definition of communicative competence as follows:

- **Grammatical competence**: knowledge about linguistic features, vocabulary, word structure, sentence structure, meanings, pronunciation, and word spelling
- **Sociolinguistic competence**: ability to use language in various social contexts to fulfil communicative functions
- **Discourse competence**: knowledge of how to combine utterances and communicative functions with respect to discourse principles
- **Strategic competence**: ability to use verbal and non-verbal communication strategies to compensate for communication breakdowns due to lack of competence (Ministry of Education, 1998, p. 13).

This curriculum requires that in order to be communicatively competent, students be taught how to combine knowledge of the language system with knowledge of cultural conventions and discourse conventions to engage in social interactions and convey and receive messages successfully (National Standards in Foreign Language Learning Project, 2006).

According to the 7th NEC, communicative competence results “only through communicative activities” (Ministry of Education, 1998, p. 13). The curriculum
requires teachers to select learning activities that well engage students in meaningful and authentic language use, which will lead to meaningful communicative exchanges among students as well as between teacher and students and which is also expected to develop students’ fluency and accuracy:

Middle school English education should develop students’ ability to communicate in English and maximize learning experience and activities so as to improve fluency and accuracy. As such, classroom tasks and activities need to provide students with authentic practice opportunities, that is, communicative exchanges in or in similar to actual real-world context (Ministry of Education, 1998, p. 7).

The importance of classroom tasks and activities that provide real-life communication is reinforced in the task-based language teaching that the curriculum upholds. Task-based language teaching is defined in the curriculum as follows:

It is an instructional approach in which learners perform communicative tasks or activities that use authentic language and provide meaningful purpose, that is, make them communicate in or in similar to actual real-world context (Ministry of Education, 1998, p. 2).

Task-based activities have been regarded as a central element of CLT (Ellis, 2003; VanPatten & Lee, 1995; Nunan, 2004; Richards & Rodgers, 2001; Savignon, 1983). The main focus of task-based language teaching is the actual task itself. A task can be “as simple as a brief exercise and also as complex as problem-solving and decision-making activities” (Ministry of Education, 1998, p. 53). The curriculum particularly adopts the definition of task proposed by Willis (1996) as shown below. It stresses
tasks that make learners to use the target language to negotiate meaning during performing tasks.

According to Willis (1996), a task is an activity where the target language is used by the learner for a communicative purpose to achieve an outcome. Some examples of an outcome include making a chart, drawing, or marking a map. What is important in performing tasks is to negotiate meaning using the target language not to just repeat particular linguistic forms mechanically. (Ministry of Education, 1998, p. 53).

The curriculum claims that in enacting task-based language teaching the teacher’s role is important. It is particularly stressed that “teachers play a role as a resource provider” and that “teachers should avoid teacher-centered instruction (i.e. one-sided explanations by the teacher) and instead facilitate learners to perform tasks and activities by themselves” and thus, it is critical for teachers to have “the ability to facilitate learning opportunities for students for real communication, in particular, the ability to manage small group” (Ministry of Education, 1998, p. 7).

The 7th NEC promotes learner-centered language learning. It defines learner-centered education as follows: “Considering learners’ interests, needs, and proficiency levels, learner-centered education provides various programs which develop learners’ potential and creativity and it provides teacher and learner with autonomy (p. 3). The curriculum promotes learner-centered instruction by means of the level-differentiated instruction (Ministry of Education, Science, and Technology, 2008a). English education is provided with different levels to meet diverse academic needs of students with different proficiency levels. All the students take the basic-
level course at first and then they can take either the lower-level course or higher-level course depending on their individual proficiency (Y. Lee, 2015). The curriculum also supports the idea of learner-centeredness in that learners participate in decision-making processes. In other words, learners can choose content they want to study: “Teachers choose topics that students have interest in and are curious about. Students can decide the content they want to study” (Ministry of Education, 1998, p. 46).

The curriculum promotes the use of the target language by teachers and students: “A teacher’s use of English not only helps students experience communication in English but also provides students with more English input and with more opportunities to practice listening in English” (Ministry of Education, 1998, p. 7). It specifies English as a medium of instruction: “it makes it a rule to teach English lessons in English as much as possible and teachers are recommended to use English according to their ability to use spoken English” (p. 7).

In addition to the curricular reforms, the Korean government put forth other initiatives to innovate English education, at the heart of which is communicative language teaching. In 1997, the MOE implemented the Early English Learning (EEL) policy which introduced English education at the primary school level. 3rd to 6th graders were provided with two hours of English instruction weekly. In 2006, the MOE reformed the national college entrance examination by including a section of testing English listening comprehension, which otherwise included only sections that test English grammar and reading skills. With the aim of cultivating communicative competence of Korean English learners, the Korean government recruited native English-speaking teachers that are to teach in Korean public schools through two
English programs called the English Program in Korea (EPIK) and the Teach and Talk in Korea (TaLK) launched in 1995 and in 2008 respectively. In 2010, the Korean government instituted the Teaching English in English (TEE) policy which requires teachers to use English for 80% or more of instruction in the lesson (Seoul Metropolitan Office of Education, 2012).

To summarize, the CLT construct that the Korean government has promoted is characterized as follows: 1) development of communicative competence is a primary learning; 2) learners learn the target language through using it to communicate, 3) communicative interaction in the target language among students and between students and the teacher is important; 4) teachers use the target language as a medium of instruction; 5) teachers use learning tasks and activities in which authentic and meaningful communication is made; 6) teachers use authentic materials that provide genuine and real-life situations; 7) when designing lessons, teachers consider learners’ interests, needs, cognitive ability, and target language proficiency levels; 8) teachers play a role as a facilitator as well as a resource provider; 9) teachers create comfortable, nonthreatening atmosphere in which learner autonomy is secured.

1.2. Problem statement

Literature on teachers’ beliefs agrees, in general, that teachers’ beliefs function as filters through which they perceive and interpret new information and thus guide their thinking and action (Pajares, 1992; M. Borg, 2001). Similarly, literature on ESOL teachers’ beliefs suggests that teachers’ beliefs exert a significant impact on the way they perceive educational reforms and the way they teach in the classroom.
(e.g., Bamanger & Gashan, 2014; J. Choi, 2008; Chou, 2008; Freeman, 2002; Johnson, 1994; X. Zheng & S. Borg, 2014). This general consensus in the literature implies that the ways Korean EFL teachers perceive and teach in relation to a new educational reform may be closely associated with Korean EFL teachers’ beliefs about English language education. In other words, in order to get a deeper understanding of the feasibility of educational innovations that the Korean government has initiated, it is important to understand what beliefs Korean EFL teachers have about English language education and how these beliefs are related to their perceptions of educational reforms and to their implementation of such reforms in the classroom.

However, only a handful of empirical studies have investigated Korean EFL teachers’ beliefs about English language education in the context of educational innovations, not to mention research on teachers’ beliefs more generally (e.g., E. Kim, 2008; H-J. Lee, 2006; Yook, 2010). The majority of these few existing research studies of teachers’ beliefs in the Korean EFL curricular reforms context is concerned with in-service EFL teachers. Research on Korean EFL pre-service teachers’ beliefs about English language education is almost non-existent. There has been only one study by J. Choi (2008), to my knowledge, which included only a small number of Korean EFL pre-service teachers from one institution. As such, largely unknown are the Korean EFL pre-service teachers’ beliefs about English language education, particularly those that are from post-curricular reforms generations. This need for research on Korean EFL pre-service teachers’ beliefs also reflects the needs of research identified in the literature of L2 teachers’ beliefs more generally. An
increasing number of research studies have acknowledged the need for more research on ESOL pre-service teachers’ beliefs and the need for ESOL pre-service teachers’ beliefs to be explored during the teacher education program so that teacher education program can address and act on any beliefs that may negatively influence the teachers’ own learning to teach or their future students’ learning (e.g., S. Borg, 2011; Mattheoudakis, 2007; Peacock, 2001; H. Zheng, 2009).

Reforming efforts of English language education promulgated by the Korean government have drawn research interest in Korea. Some researchers have examined Korean EFL teachers’ perceptions of MOE-initiated reforms such as CLT or CLT-based curriculum innovations (e.g. Choe, 2005; M. Lee, 2014; Li, 1998), the TEE policy (e.g., H. Lee, 2012; Son & K. Lee, 2003), the EEL policy (e.g., Paik, 2005), and the ability grouping policy (i.e. the level-differentiated instruction) (e.g., Y. Kim, 2012). Others have studied the relation between Korean EFL teachers’ perceptions of such reforms and implementation of them in classroom teaching (e.g., Kang, 2008; T-H, Choi & Andon, 2014). Studying of Korean EFL teachers’ perceptions of the feasibility of the reforms is important since their perception is “a crucial factor in the ultimate success or failure of that innovation” (Li, 1998, p. 698). Teachers play a critical role in such reform efforts. They are ultimate gatekeepers with regard to educational reforms. It is teachers that determine whether reforms can be successfully implemented in the classroom as intended. They are actual players that enact reform initiatives. However, what the research discussed above largely disregards is that teachers’ perceptions of and practice of reform initiatives may be affected by their beliefs as teachers.
To better understand Korean EFL teachers’ beliefs about English language education, it is important for English language teacher educators and education policies makers in Korea to know what factors may influence these teachers’ beliefs. That is, it is significant to understand teachers’ beliefs related to the potential sources of teachers’ beliefs. However, little research interest has been drawn to possible sources of Korean EFL teachers’ beliefs about English language education. No study has been made about sources of Korean EFL pre-service teachers’ beliefs about English language education. Investigation of the sources of Korean EFL pre-service teachers’ beliefs will not only lead to a deeper understanding of how their beliefs are formed but also provide valuable insights into how we act on the beliefs if necessary.

In summary, a gap in the literature and the needs of research discussed above point to a research need which explores 1) Korean EFL pre-service teachers’ beliefs about English language education based on relatively a large sample, of which findings can be more representative of a larger target population, and particularly pre-service teachers at the secondary school level, since secondary school English education is a primary concern in the Korean government’s concerted efforts to reform English education and 2) the sources of their beliefs and 3) how their beliefs are related to their perceptions of and implementation of the government initiated reforms.

1.3. Purposes of the study

The overall purpose of this study is to address the gap in the literature and the needs for research stated above. The first purpose of this study is to understand overall trends of Korean EFL pre-service secondary school teachers’ beliefs about
English language education in Korea, beliefs specific to 1) the nature of foreign language learning, 2) the nature of teaching, 3) Korean EFL teaching goals, 4) Korean EFL teaching methods, and 5) teacher roles. These five areas of teachers’ beliefs were chosen considering the foci of English language education reform initiatives in Korea discussed earlier in this chapter. The areas of teachers’ beliefs used in this study also largely match the beliefs teachers hold in areas that Calderhead (1996) suggested. In his review of literature on teachers’ beliefs, Calderhead suggests five main areas, concerning which teachers have significant beliefs. First, teachers hold beliefs about how students learn. According to Calderhead, these beliefs may influence the ways teachers teach and interact with their students, and the types of activities they provide in class. Second, teachers have beliefs about the nature of teaching. For example, teachers view teaching as a process of facilitating students’ learning or as a process of transferring knowledge. Third, teachers hold beliefs about the subject they teach. Fourth, teachers hold beliefs about learning to teach. Calderhead finds that teachers commonly report that “teaching is largely a matter of personality together with a few managerial tactics that can be learned from observing other teachers” (p. 720). Lastly, teachers hold beliefs about themselves as teachers. Calderhead notes that these beliefs may affect the kinds of activities that teachers provide in class or their classroom management style.

The second purpose is to explore potential sources of Korean EFL pre-service secondary school teachers’ beliefs about English language education. The Korean government has made tremendous concerted efforts to improve English language education in the form of initiating numerous reform policies and curricular
innovations. Consequently, there has been increasing demand for Korean EFL pre-/in-service teacher education programs to prepare teachers for the reforms. Considering that teachers’ beliefs form a filter through which they put into practice such reforms, the need for understanding how Korean EFL pre-service secondary school teachers’ beliefs are formed becomes more inevitable.

The third purpose is to draw a comprehensive picture of how Korean EFL pre-service secondary school teachers perceive the reforms promoted by the government. Existing research studies focused only individual reform policies or curricular innovations. By investigating how the Korean EFL pre-service teachers perceive major reform policies and curricular reforms discussed in the earlier section, English language education reform initiatives in Korea, such as CLT, the EEL policy, the TEE policy, the ability grouping policy, and the EPIK and the TaLK programs, this study aims not only to understand how the teachers perceive these individual reform initiatives but also to draw overall trends of their perceptions.

The fourth purpose is to understand overall trends or general patterns of Korean EFL pre-service secondary school teachers’ implementation of curricular reforms in the practicum such as use of English for classroom instruction, use of authentic language learning materials, provision of interactive language learning opportunities, and pursuit of learner-centered learning. This will provide valuable information for reform agents, that is, the extent to which curricular reforms are currently put into practice by the pre-service teachers in their practicum. This will also provide pre-service teacher educators/teacher education programs with valuable
information for pedagogical purposes, that is, the extent of preparation of the pre-service teachers for the reforms.

The fifth purpose is to investigate how Korean EFL pre-service secondary school teachers’ beliefs are related to their perceptions of and implementation of the government initiated reforms. Literature on teachers’ beliefs generally suggests that teachers’ beliefs may be closely associated with how they perceive educational reforms and teach in the classroom. However, existing research studies conducted in the Korean educational reform context have only focused on Korean EFL teachers’ perceptions and teaching practice in relation to the reforms. By probing into the relations among three constructs, teachers’ beliefs, perceptions, and teaching practice, a deeper understanding of the feasibility of the reforms can be achieved.

1.4. Research questions

The purposes of this study translate into the following five research questions:

1. What self-reported beliefs do Korean EFL pre-service secondary school teachers have about English language education in Korea in relation to (a) the nature of foreign language learning, (b) the nature of teaching, (c) teaching goals, (d) teaching methods, and (e) teacher roles?

2. What are the sources of their beliefs?

3. How do Korean EFL pre-service secondary school teachers perceive the MOE-initiated reforms of English language education?

4. What is their self-reported implementation of the MOE-initiated reforms of English language education in their practicum?
5. What is the nature of relations (i.e. strength and direction) among the following three constructs: (a) Korean EFL pre-service secondary school teachers’ self-reported beliefs about English language education, (b) their perceptions of the MOE-initiated reforms of English language education, and (c) their self-reported teaching practices in the practicum in relation to the MOE-initiated curricular reforms?

1.5. Significance of the study

Significance of this study first lies in its potential to fill a very important gap in the body of research on L2 teachers’ beliefs as stated earlier: the needs of research on 1) second language pre-service teachers’ beliefs in general, 2) the sources of Korean EFL pre-service teachers’ beliefs, and 3) Korean EFL pre-service teachers’ beliefs in the educational reform context. The significance of this study in particular lies in that it explores Korean EFL pre-service teachers’ beliefs in a way that has not been done before, that is, in relation to teacher perceptions and teaching practice in the reform context.

Second, the significance of the study lies in its potential in 1) providing teacher educators/teacher education programs with pedagogical suggestions/recommendations that can help enhance Korean EFL pre-service teacher preparation for the educational reforms promoted by the government, 2) providing teacher educators/teacher education programs with valuable insights into how they act on the beliefs if necessary, that is, possible contributions of teacher educators and teacher education programs to Korean EFL pre-service teachers’ beliefs formation, and 3) providing reform agents with practical recommendations and concrete guides
about what measures they need to take for successful implementation of the
government initiated reforms.

1.6. Overall research design

This research inquiry is designed to be a mixed-methods explanatory
sequential design. Both quantitative and qualitative methods are used to gather data to
address research questions. Quantitative data are first collected through a self-
reported questionnaire. The questionnaire is used to mainly explore overall trends or
patterns of Korean EFL pre-service teachers’ beliefs about English language
education and their perceptions and teaching practice in relation to English
educational reforms. The questionnaire developed for the study was field-tested and
pilot-tested. Data collected through the questionnaire is statistically analyzed.
Qualitative data are collected through semi-structured interviews that are conducted
with select participants to achieve a deeper, richer, fine-grained understanding of the
topic under investigation – Korean pre-service teachers’ beliefs, perceptions, and
teaching practice in the context of educational reforms. The interview data are
analyzed following thematic analysis. The quantitative analysis and qualitative
analysis are given equal weights. These two analyses are synthesized in the final
analysis and conclusions are drawn from the joint results.

1.7. Definition of key terms

This section defines several key terms used in this study.

*Communicative language teaching (CLT):* The term CLT largely refers to “an
approach to language teaching methodology that emphasizes authenticity, interaction,
student-centered learning, task-based activities, and communication for real-world, and meaningful purposes” (Douglas, 2006, p. 378).

*Communication-oriented/based/focused approach or teaching:* These terms are used to refer to such teaching approaches and methods as communicative language teaching and task-based language teaching.

*English as a foreign language (EFL):* EFL refers to the “formal classroom setting, with limited or no opportunities for use outside the classroom, in a country in which English does not play an important role in internal communication (China, Japan, and Korea, for example)” (Richards & Schmidt, 2010, p. 197).

*English learners (Els):* English learners refer to the individuals that are in the process of learning English in addition to their native language.

*English as a second language (ESL):* Following research literature reviewed in this study, the term ESL in the current study refers to English instruction or learning in “a setting in which the language is necessary for everyday life (for example, an immigrant learning English in the US) or in a country in which English plays an important role in education, business, and government (for example in Singapore, the Philippines, India, and Nigeria)” (Richards & Schmidt, 2010, p. 197). However, it is worth noting that this term is now only used in post-secondary settings. In second language P-12 settings, the term is now ESOL (English to Speakers of Other Languages).

*Grammar translation method:* The term grammar translation method largely refers to a language teaching method in which “the central focus is on grammatical rules,
paradigms, and vocabulary memorization as the basis for translating from one language to another” (Douglas, 2006, p. 382).

**Practicum:** Also known as practice teaching, student teaching, internship, field experience, apprenticeship, practicum refers to one of the main components of initial teacher preparation, which “is intended to give student teachers the experience of classroom teaching, an opportunity to apply the information and skills they have studied in their teacher education program, and a chance to acquire basic teaching skills” (Richards & Schmidt, 2010, p. 589). Although there are many differences across the designs of practicums in the U.S. or abroad, it “usually involves supervised teaching, experience with systematic observation, and gaining familiarity with a particular teaching context” (Gebhard, 2009, p. 250).

**Pre-service teachers:** Also known as teacher candidates, pre-service teachers in this study refer to student teachers that participate in pre-service education, “program of study which student teachers complete before they begin teaching” (Richards & Schmidt, 2002, p. 416) and are working toward teacher certification.

**Second language (L2):** The term second language is “a language other than the mother tongue, learned in an environment in which that language is the dominant language (e.g., English in the U.S., French in France, for immigrants or minority learners), or where the language is an international language of commerce and industry (e.g., English in Hungary, German in Poland or Russia)” (Kramsch, 2008, p. 4).

**Teachers’ beliefs:** The term teachers’ beliefs has been defined by researchers in various ways with different focuses of characteristics such as implicit or explicit
nature (e.g., Kagan, 1992), stable or dynamic nature (e.g., Calderhead, 1996; Mansour, 2009), and individual or integrated system (e.g., Fang, 1996; Thompson, 1992). Regardless of how the term teachers’ beliefs is defined, the literature indicates that all teachers are thought to hold beliefs about, for example, their work, students, subject matter, roles, and responsibilities. A shared core of the concept suggested in the literature is that teachers’ beliefs are subjectively true for the individual and relatively stable over time and influential in the individual’s perception and interpretation of new information and behavior.

Teacher perceptions: Teacher perceptions in this study refers to positive or negative views that a teacher holds regarding any new phenomenon or information such as a new educational reform policy.

Teaching English to speakers of other languages (TESOL): The term TESOL is used to refer to the teaching of English in situations where it is either a second language or a foreign language. It does not distinguish between ESL and EFL contexts.

Teaching practice: Teaching practice in this study refers to any action that is part of the teaching process such as decision making, instructional approaches, and planning.

1.8. Organization

This chapter introduced the core construct of this study, teachers’ beliefs, briefly described English language education reforms in Korea, and outlined the study in terms of (a) problem statement, (b) purposes of the study, (c) research questions, (d) significance of the study, (e) overall research design, and (f) definition of key terms.
Chapter 2 reviews research studies that conceptualize teachers’ beliefs and research studies on L2 teachers’ beliefs in the following areas: (a) sources of L2 teachers’ beliefs, (b) L2 teachers’ beliefs and teaching practices, (c) L2 teachers’ beliefs and educational reforms, (d) Korean EFL teachers’ beliefs and educational reforms.

Chapter 3 presents the methodology used in this study. This chapter reintroduces research questions and provides an overview of the research methodology in terms of (a) research design, (b) research setting and participants, (c) instrumentation, (d) data collection, and (e) data analysis.

Chapter 4 reports results of quantitative analysis in the following order: (a) descriptive statistics of pre-service teachers’ self-reported beliefs about English language education, (b) descriptive statistics of pre-service teachers’ perceptions of educational reforms, (c) descriptive statistics of pre-service teachers’ self-reported implementation of educational reforms, (d) relations between pre-service teachers’ self-reported beliefs about English language education and their perceptions of and implementation of educational reforms. These analyses address research questions 1, 3, 4, and 5 in order.

Chapter 5 presents fourteen major themes identified in the analysis of interview data, which are subsumed under four categories: (a) beliefs about English language education in Korea, (b) beliefs sources, (c) perceptions of reform policies, and (d) impediments to the implementation of reform policies. These analyses address research questions 1, 2, 3, and 4 in order.
Chapter 6 integrates and discusses the quantitative and qualitative findings. This chapter provides implications for four areas: implications for (a) future research, (b) reform agents, (c) Korean EFL teacher education programs, teacher educators, and specialists, and (d) EFL countries. This chapter also provides inferences and contributions of this study.
Chapter 2: Literature Review

This chapter consists of two major sections presenting an overview of conceptual framework and a review of studies on second language teachers’ beliefs.

2.1. Conceptual framework

The current section consists of two parts. The first part review studies that provide definitions and conceptualizations of teachers’ beliefs. Related perceptions such as teachers’ knowledge is also discussed. Based on this review of literature on teachers’ beliefs, a shared conceptual core of teachers’ beliefs is presented. The second part presents a working definition of teachers’ beliefs for this study.

2.1.1. Defining teachers’ beliefs and related perceptions

From the cognitive perspective, Pintrich (1990) notes that “teachers are active thinkers, decision makers, reflective practitioners, information processors, problem solvers, and rational human beings” (p. 827). Teachers’ beliefs are a critical concept in understanding teachers’ thoughts, perceptions, behaviors, and attitudes (Richardson, 1996). Pajares (1992) states that “all teachers hold beliefs, however defined and labeled, about their work, their students, their subject matter, and their roles and responsibilities” (p. 314). In other words, the beliefs that teachers hold serve to filter, frame, and guide their teaching, decisions, and actions (Fives & Grill, 2015). Teachers’ beliefs are generally considered as a main determinant of instructional decisions and of student learning (Bohlmann & Weinstein, 2013). Fives and Buehl (2012) argue that it is crucial for teacher educators and school leaders to help teachers make their beliefs explicit.
The concept of teachers’ beliefs has drawn researchers’ attention for decades. Researchers at the early stage introduced the concept of teachers’ beliefs through elaborating on its origins, nature, and classifications, rather than attempting to define the concept in a clear way. Lortie (1975), for example, noted that teachers’ beliefs originate from their personal experiences as students or from their personal life experiences such as family traditions and social interaction. Nespor (1987) regarded teachers’ beliefs as being affective and narrative in nature.

Pajares (1992), who is known to have greatly contributed to the topic of teachers’ beliefs, provided a summary of theoretical syntheses of teachers’ beliefs. Reviewing 20 different research studies on teachers’ beliefs, Pajares stated that while researchers acknowledged the importance of teachers’ beliefs on the classroom decision-making process, they were not clear about the definition for the concept and failed to reach a clear definitional consensus. He pointed out that “poor conceptualizations and differing understandings of beliefs and belief structures” have made more difficult the research on teachers’ beliefs (p. 307).

There has been no definitional consensus about the construct, teachers’ beliefs (S. Borg, 2003; Fives & Buehl, 2012; Skott, 2015). Researchers have defined teachers’ beliefs in various ways, with different emphases on the characteristics such as implicit or explicit nature, stable or dynamic nature, individual or integrated system, and relationship to knowledge. Implicit beliefs are what a person holds unconsciously and can only be inferred from actions (Argyris & Schon, 1974; Breen, Hird, Milton, Oliver, & Thwaite, 2001), whereas explicit beliefs are what a person can readily articulate (Johnson, 1992). Kagan (1992), for example, broadly defined
teachers’ beliefs as “tacit, often unconsciously held assumptions about students, classroom, and the academic material taught” (p. 65). Osisioma and Moscovici (2008) also supported the implicit nature of beliefs. From this implicit view of beliefs, teachers’ beliefs guide a teacher’s behavior and filter his or her understanding of teaching experiences without the teacher’s awareness (Fives & Buehl, 2012). Others, on the other hand, hold that consciousness is an inherent attribute of teachers’ beliefs (e.g., Rimm-Kaufman, Storm, Sawyer, Pianta, & LaParo, 2006). That is, a teacher can explicate what his or her beliefs are and provide justification for her beliefs to be maintained.

Teachers’ beliefs have also been conceptualized based on the view of beliefs either as stable or as dynamic. Many researchers have described that teachers’ beliefs are, for the most part, stable and resistant to change and are likely to change only as a result of engaging in relevant social practices (e.g., Calderhead, 1996; Kagan, 1992; Mansour, 2009; Richardson, 2003). McAlpine, Eriks-Brophy, and Crago (1996) assert that “[m]ost belief systems are formed early and changes in belief systems during adulthood are difficult and thus rare” (p. 392). Others, in contrast, hold that teachers’ beliefs do change over time (e.g., Alger, 2009; Burton, 1992; La Paro, Siepak, Scott-Little, 2009). Thompson (1992) notes that “[b]elief systems are dynamic, permeable mental structures, susceptible to change in light of experience” (p. 140). However, Fives and Buehl (2012) argue that beliefs exist along a continuum of stability. In other words, the view of beliefs that allows both some degree of plasticity and of consistency is needed. Fives and Buehl note that beliefs that are
long-held, deeply integrated are placed at the most stable end and beliefs that are relatively new and isolated at the most unstable end.

Another issue in defining teachers’ beliefs relates to the view that beliefs exist as integrated systems. There has been a widespread agreement that beliefs exist within interconnected system (e.g., Clark & Peterson, 1986; Fang, 1996; Fives & Buehl, 2012; Thompson, 1992). For example, McAlpine, Eriks-Brophy, and Crago (1996) stated that [b]eliefs are understood to be a set of interrelated notions … (for example) educational beliefs are a substructure of the total belief system and must be understood in terms of their connections to other, perhaps more influential beliefs” (p. 392). Beliefs, therefore, should be viewed as integrated systems not as an individual, discrete system. Likewise, Buehl and Beck (2015) note that within this integrated system, “beliefs may be primary or derivative (i.e., grounded in primary beliefs), (and) core or peripheral (i.e., endorse with more or less conviction)” (Green, 1971, cited in Buehl & Beck, 2015, p. 66) and that all beliefs exist within a complex, multidimensional system.

The relationship between beliefs and knowledge may be the most complex and recurring theme in the discussion of conceptualizing beliefs (Allen, 2002; S. Borg, 2003; Pajares, 1992; Woolfolk-Hoy, Dvais, & Pape, 2006). Some people view beliefs and knowledge as distinct constructs (e.g., Buehl & Beck, 2015; Cash, Cabell, Hamre, DeCoster, & Pianta, 2015; Calderhead, 1996; Philipp, 2007). In this perspective, viewing beliefs as distinct from knowledge, beliefs are “psychologically held understandings, premises, or propositions about the world that are felt to be true” (Richardson, 1996, p. 103). In other words, beliefs are subjective claims that
individuals accept as true or want to be true regardless of verification (Murphy & Mason, 2006). In short, beliefs are value-laden. The construct of knowledge, as distinct from beliefs, has been characterized to be based on facts that are agreed upon by particular members of communities (Calderhead, 1996; Lundeberg & Levin, 2003; Richardson, 1996, 2003). Therefore, knowledge is true in some external sense (M. Borg, 2001). Others, on the other hand, note that it is difficult to differentiate beliefs from knowledge (e.g., Kagan, 1992; Verloop, Van Driel, & Meijer, 2001; Murphy & Alexander, 2004). Beliefs and knowledge are interwoven and thus distinctions between them become blurred. For example, Pajares (1992), pointing out that not only beliefs but also knowledge involves affect and evaluation, concluded that beliefs and knowledge are “inextricably intertwined” (p. 325) and thus “little will be accomplished,” if researchers fail to connect teachers’ beliefs with their knowledge. Similarly, Verloop et al. (2001) noted that “in the mind of the teacher, components of knowledge, beliefs, conceptions, and intuitions are inextricably intertwined” (p. 446). Kagan (1992) also supported the use of the terms, beliefs, and knowledge, interchangeably, arguing that much of what had been considered professional knowledge should be categorized as beliefs. However, it is important to note that in TESOL beliefs and knowledge are viewed as different categories.

Although there has been a lack of definitional congruence, some researchers have attempted to conceptualize teachers’ beliefs by examining common threads identified in the literature. For example, applying Abelson’s (1979) psychological analysis of the distinction between knowledge systems and belief systems, Nespor (1987) developed a preliminary model of belief systems. In this model, Nespor
identified six features that distinguished belief systems from knowledge systems. The features include 1) existential presumption, 2) alternativity, 3) affective and evaluative loading, 4) episodic structure, 5) nonconsensuality, and 6) unboundedness. First, belief systems, according to Nespor, often include existential presumptions or “propositions or assumptions about the existence or nonexistence of entities” (p. 318). Existential presumption refers to personal, incontrovertible truth that everyone holds. Thus, for example, a teacher may believe something as true when it is not. Nespor illustrated existential presumption in a way that a teacher, attributing success in mathematics to maturity, believes she cannot force student to learn mathematics because maturation cannot be forced, that is, it is beyond her control. Second, belief systems, Nespor argues, often include representations of ideal situations that differ significantly from present realities, which “serve as means of defining goals and tasks” (p. 319). Nespor called this as alternativity. A teacher, for example, who had ‘mortifying experiences’ as a student, wished to provide her students with different experiences contrary to her own. Third, belief systems heavily reply on affective and evaluative components. These affective and evaluative aspects are “important regulators of the amount of energy teachers will put into activities and how they will expend energy on an activity” (p. 320). In other words, a teacher’s beliefs, being separated from her knowledge of a content area, are often expressed in the form of feelings and subjective evaluations based on her preferences and these preferences also affect how the content is taught. Fourth, Nespor characterized belief systems as having episodic structure, that is, beliefs are “derived from personal experience or from cultural or institutional sources of knowledge transmission” (p. 320). The power
of these experiences “frame the comprehension of events later in time” (p. 320). That is, a teacher’s beliefs are often associated with particular episodic events that the teacher previously experienced and this experience influences the teacher’s approach to teaching. All the features discussed so far point to ‘nonconsensuality’. Nespor argues that the elements of belief systems (e.g., concepts, propositions, rules, etc.) are not consensual. They are idiosyncratic, derived from personal experiences. Finally, the unboundedness of belief systems refers to the idea that belief systems do not contain clear logical rules for how beliefs are linked to real world. Therefore, Nespor argues, belief systems may contain inconsistencies and this inconsistent nature of the system helps in dealing with less predictable, complicated areas such as teaching behavior.

Pajares (1992) and M. Borg (2001) also provided a list that describes features of beliefs. Pajares presented 16 fundamental assumptions that may reasonably be made when initiating research of teachers’ educational beliefs. Some notions among the assumptions are: 1) beliefs are formed early and tend to self-perpetuate, 2) beliefs are a filter through which new phenomena are interpreted, 3) beliefs are connected to other beliefs, which results in some beliefs being more prioritized than others and even in the existence of among beliefs, 4) beliefs strongly influence perception, and 5) beliefs must be inferred (p. 324-326). M. Borg added other features of beliefs: 1) beliefs are considered as true for the individual holding it, while knowledge is true in some external sense, 2) individuals may be conscious or unconscious of their beliefs (p. 186). Both Pajares and M. Borg commonly identified that beliefs function as filters through which people perceive and interpret new information and thus guide
people’s thinking and action. Affective and evaluative aspects of beliefs are a common feature that Nespor, Pajares, and M. Borg all recognized.

As shown in this review, researchers have conceptualized teachers’ beliefs in various ways but there seems to be a shared core of the concept of beliefs. The key characteristics to such a core can be summarized as follows: 1) beliefs are subjectively true for the individual, 2) some beliefs are explicit to the individual whereas others are implicit, 3) beliefs are a set of interrelated notions, 4) beliefs are affective and evaluative, 5) beliefs are more or less stable within the individual but likely to change with time and or experience, 6) beliefs function as filters through which the individual perceives and interprets new information, and 7) beliefs influence behavior.

2.1.2. A working definition of teachers’ beliefs and areas of teachers’ beliefs for the study

The current study aims to understand teachers’ beliefs and how these beliefs are related to their perceptions of and implementation of educational reforms in the Korean context, where significant efforts to reform English language education have been made solely by the central government, the Ministry of Education (MOE). In such a context in which educational reforms are initiated in the top-down manner, it becomes very critical to understand teachers’ beliefs and their perceptions of and implementation of reforms because top-down educational reforms may not achieve intended results if teachers’ beliefs are not congruent with the ideas underlying such reforms (Nunan, 2003). Teachers are, after all, the agents of change who need to
incorporate reforms into their belief systems before they can make any changes in their teaching practice (Zhang & Liu, 2014).

Taking this rationale into consideration, definitions of teachers’ beliefs provided by M. Borg (2001) seem well formulated to guide the current study: “a belief is a proposition which may be consciously or unconsciously held, is evaluative in that it is accepted as true by the individual, and is therefore imbued with emotive commitment; further, it serves as a guide to thought and behavior” (p. 186). This definition highlights that beliefs are personal and affective and evaluative in nature and that beliefs have influence upon perceptions and behavior. This indicates that teachers’ beliefs are subjectively true for the individual and influence the way teachers perceive and behave. This implies that teachers’ beliefs are an important concept in understanding teachers’ perceptions and teaching practice. Therefore, M. Borg’s conceptualization of teachers’ beliefs provides good guidance for the current study which will explore Korean EFL pre-service secondary school teachers’ beliefs about English language education and how these beliefs are related to their perceptions of and implementation of educational reforms promulgated by the Korean government.

Teachers are known to hold many different kinds of beliefs. Researchers have suggested various areas of teachers’ beliefs. For example, Richardson (1996) notes that teachers hold beliefs about 1) curriculum, 2) the nature of content, 3) their students and what they bring to the classroom, 4) their role in helping students, and 5) their own efficacy in helping students. Nespor (1987) suggests slightly different areas: teachers hold beliefs about “their roles, their students, the subject matter areas
they teach, and the schools they work in” (p. 317). Similarly, Calderhead (1996) suggests that teachers hold beliefs about 1) how students learn, 2) the nature of teaching (e.g., facilitating students’ learning or transferring knowledge), 3) a subject they teach, 4) learning to teach, 5) their roles. Calderhead notes that teachers’ beliefs about how their students learn significantly affect the ways they teach and interact with students and that teachers’ beliefs about their roles as teacher may greatly influence the ways they manage a classroom and the kind of classroom activities they provide. Levin (2015) also suggests slightly different areas of beliefs. According to Levin, teachers hold beliefs about 1) knowledge (epistemology), 2) their students (e.g., motivation, culture, intelligence), 3) themselves as teachers (e.g., self-efficacy, self-esteem), 4) the subject matter they teach, 5) how to teach, and 6) moral and ethical dilemmas and societal issues that affect their teaching (e.g., politics, poverty, economics). Taking into consideration what has been discussed in the literature about areas of teachers’ beliefs and the foci of English language education reform initiatives in Korea discussed in chapter 1, the current study explores Korean EFL secondary pre-service teachers’ beliefs about English language education in relation to 1) nature of foreign language learning, 2) nature of teaching, 3) teaching goals, 4) teaching methods, and 5) teacher roles. These areas of teachers’ beliefs that the current study focuses on largely reflect the areas of teachers’ beliefs Calderhead (1996) suggests.

As discussed above, based on a general consensus about teachers’ beliefs made in the literature and particularly the construct proposed by M. Borg (2001), the present study assumes that teachers’ beliefs are closely related to the ways through which they perceive and implement educational reforms. In this study, the concept of
perceptions refers to positive or negative views that the individual holds regarding a particular phenomenon or information. To be more specific, perceptions in this study refers to Korean EFL pre-service secondary school teachers’ positive or negative views of particular reform policies or programs initiated by the Korean government to improve English language education in Korea.

2.2. Review of studies on second language teachers’ beliefs

This section describes the empirical foundation for this study. For this purpose, this section presents a critical review of previous inquiries into second language teachers’ beliefs. It focuses on 1) sources of second language teachers’ beliefs, 2) second language teachers’ beliefs and teaching practice, 3) second language teachers’ beliefs and educational reforms, and 4) empirical studies on Korean EFL teachers’ beliefs and teaching practice and educational reforms.

2.2.1. Sources of second language teachers’ beliefs

Sources of teachers’ beliefs that have been identified in research on second language teacher cognition include teachers’ previous experiences as a language learner and teacher education and teaching experience (e.g., Busch, 2010; S. Borg, 2011; Johnson, 1994; Saad, 2011; Rayati Damavandi & Roshdi, 2013; Yuan & Lee, 2014). The former refers to what Lortie (1975) calls ‘apprenticeship of observation’. Future teachers develop their beliefs over time from their experience as learners during this period of apprenticeship of observation. Teachers form images of their favorite teaching methods, which they might adopt later, from their own learning experience as learners and the way they were taught during this period of
apprenticeship of observation. Lortie notes that this learning experience of future teachers is based on what they feel to be true without conscious reasoning and based on their individual distinct character:

What students learn about teaching, then, is intuitive and imitative rather than explicit and analytic; it is based on individual personalities rather than pedagogical principles (p. 62).

Researchers have acknowledged that teachers’ previous language learning experiences might exert a considerable impact on teachers’ professional lives and undoubtedly affect teachers’ educational beliefs. For example, Rayati et al. (2013) examined a) Iranian EFL teachers’ beliefs about teaching grammar in relation to the role of grammar in learning a second language, the necessity of conscious teaching of grammar, mode of teaching grammar, use of terminology in teaching grammar, and correction of grammatical errors and b) to what extent their beliefs about teaching grammar were influenced by their prior language learning experiences, their teacher education courses, and their teaching experiences. The study revealed that the majority of the teachers hold beliefs that 1) grammar plays a role of ‘optional add-on’, that is, refining language production, 2) explicit teaching of grammar is not very necessary, and 3) inductive teaching of grammar is more helpful for students. These teachers’ prior language learning experiences were found to contribute, to a considerable extent, to their current beliefs about teaching grammar and these beliefs often persisted even when they contradict with the conceptualizations promoted in their teacher education courses. As such, Rayati et al. concluded that if teacher education is to be effective, teacher education courses should expose and challenge
teachers’ unanalyzed, incoherent beliefs and that teachers’ prior language learning experiences “should not be underestimated by either teacher educators or program designers in order to map out any comprehensive effective educational program for teachers” (p. 47).

To give another example, Numrich’s (1996) study also illuminates the influence of apprenticeship of observation on teachers’ beliefs and teaching practice. In studying the common beliefs about language teaching and learning shared by preservice teachers enrolled in a TESOL program in the U.S., Numrich found that these teachers’ own language learning experiences were reflected in the way they taught. The teachers decided to promote or avoid particular instructional strategies on the basis of their positive or negative experiences related to such strategies as learners. For example, those who had positive learning experiences with studying culture in their learning of a second language promoted the introduction of the U.S. culture in their teaching of English learners. Those who had learned a second language with an emphasis on communication provided students with many communicative activities. Some teachers chose to avoid explicit error correction since they had the negative experience of being corrected when learning a second language. Similarly, Debreli (2012) found that Cypriot EFL pre-service teachers’ current beliefs about EFL teaching and learning that are consistent with the CLT approach were derived from their previous learning experiences during their school years.

Teachers education and professional development programs are also a potential source of teachers’ beliefs. Some studies present evidence for L2 teacher education as a significant source of teachers’ beliefs (e.g., Busch, 2010; S. Borg,
2011; Cabaroglu & Robert, 2000; Scott & Rodgers, 1995). For example, Busch (2010) investigated the impact of the teacher education course on the second language teachers’ beliefs. Pre-service ESL teachers taking an introductory second language acquisition course at a U.S. teacher education program completed a pre-course survey that included 23 beliefs statements and provided extensive post-course explanations. Analysis of the survey revealed significant changes in beliefs in several areas including the length of time for acquisition, difficulty of language acquisition, the role of culture, the role of error correction, the importance of grammar, and the efficacy of audiolingual learning strategies. Analysis of written post-course explanations found that the teachers’ language learning experience in high school influenced their pre-course beliefs and what they learned in the second language acquisition course, together with their actual experience of tutoring English learners, contributed to their post-course changes in their beliefs. These findings imply that teacher education can be a source of new beliefs for pre-service teachers (S. Borg, 2011).

In-service teacher training programs have also been found to have considerable influence on teachers’ beliefs. Scott and Rodgers (1995), for example, examined the impact of a writing course on teachers’ beliefs about teaching writing. Secondary school second language in-service teachers took part in a nine-week writing course that involved the training in the use of process approach, holistic assessment, and positive feedback of writing in the second language classroom. Teachers’ beliefs about teaching writing were measured by pre- and post-course survey. The study found that in the pre-course survey 58.5% of the beliefs the teachers expressed were aligned with the principles and practices that the writing
course promoted but the post-course survey revealed that 89% of the beliefs the teachers expressed reflected what was taught in the course. This study indicated a significant influence of in-service teacher training on teachers’ beliefs.

Teaching experience is another potential source of teachers’ beliefs. Some studies provide evidence for teaching experience as a source of teachers’ beliefs (e.g., Nettle, 1998; Ng, Nicholas, & Williams, 2010; Özmen, 2012; Vibulpol, 2004). For example, Ng et al. (2010) examined how beliefs of thirty seven pre-service teachers including students enrolled in a TESOL postgraduate teacher education program in Australia changed in response to teaching experience. The study focused on the beliefs of the teachers in relation to what a good teacher/good teaching is. These teachers initially indicated a strong belief that good teachers know their students well and set firm limits. However, after their teaching practicum there was a significant decrease in their belief that good teachers are experts that set firm limits. There was instead an increase in their belief that good teachers listen more than they talk. Thus, the beliefs evolved from beliefs more focused on teachers themselves to beliefs more focused on students. The study notes that the change is due to the teachers’ increased confidence in being able to relate to students.

Vibulpol’s (2004) study on Thailand EFL pre-service teachers’ beliefs found mixed results. Concerning beliefs about English language learning, the teachers responded in the same way in both surveys, before and after their teaching practicum. Responses to the surveys consistently showed that the teachers believed in the importance of students’ 1) practice in English, 2) paying attention to their pronunciation, 3) learning through authentic materials such as listening to the radio or
watching TV programs in English. However, practicum experience positively influenced teachers’ self-efficacy beliefs. Some teachers reported that practicum experiences greatly increased their confidence in speaking English.

2.2.2. Second language teachers’ beliefs and teaching practices

As Johnson (1990) and Freeman and Richards (1996) noted, research interest in second language teachers’ cognition began to develop in the 1990s. It was during this period that researchers of second language education began to realize the critical significance of in-depth study of various dimensions of teachers’ beliefs and exploration of the ways these dimensions can influence the nature of teaching (Bamanger & Gashan, 2014). Underlying assumptions of such research are that studies of teachers’ beliefs can contribute to a more realistic and comprehensive understanding of teaching and that such understanding may result in change in teaching practices and even in teachers’ beliefs if necessary (Yook, 2010).

Teachers’ beliefs about second and foreign language education having come to be the focus of research, a number of studies investigated the relationship between those teachers’ beliefs and their classroom teaching practices. A wide variety of beliefs and practices have been assessed, such as language teaching approach, grammar teaching approach, interactions in the classroom, writing teaching orientations, and selection of activities for teaching.

Some of these studies have found that there is a correspondence between teachers’ stated, espoused beliefs, and their teaching practices. For example, based on narrative statements made about beliefs and instructional practice, Johnson (1994) examined four pre-service ESL teachers’ beliefs about second language learning and
teaching and their instructional practice; these were students enrolled in an MA in TESOL course in the U.S. A correspondence between teachers’ beliefs and instructional practice was found. The pre-service teachers’ instructional decisions during a practicum were influenced by beliefs that originated from their own experiences as second language learners such as images of teachers, materials, activities, and classroom organization generated by their own experience as second language learners. The pre-service teachers tended to teach the way they were taught. Johnson concludes that “preservice ESL teachers’ beliefs may be based largely on images from their formal language learning experiences, and in all likelihood, will represent their dominant model of action during the practicum teaching experience” (p. 450).

Four Thailand EFL pre-service teachers in Vibulpol’s (2004) study reported their beliefs in the importance of grammar and English skills, that is, the importance of form-focused instruction and English skills in interviews and responses in surveys. In observing these pre-service teachers in the classroom, Vibulpol found that the teachers’ reported beliefs were closely related to their choice of approach and activity types in the classroom. The pre-service teachers were observed to pay explicit attention to grammar and to use grammar-oriented learning activities. With the belief that English learners should experiment with speaking practice, all the four teachers were observed to conduct practice activities that used speaking skills. They attended to the pronunciation and sentence structures of the students’ spoken discourse during the activities.
Kuzborska (2011) conducted a qualitative study to explore the beliefs construction of eight English for Academic Purposes (EAP) teachers, concerning their practices in the teaching of reading to advanced English learners. Video stimulated recall was used to obtain measures of teachers’ beliefs and teaching practices, while comparing those beliefs and practices against the research norms. The findings of the study showed that there is an obvious consistency between what teachers believe and the teaching approaches that they apply in their classroom teaching. The teachers’ beliefs, which were congruent with their teaching practices, reflected a skills-based approach to reading instruction that emphasizes vocabulary, reading aloud, whole class discussion of texts, and translation.

Similarly, Chou (2008) and Bamanger and Gashan (2014) also found a consistent relationship between what teachers believe about teaching reading and their actual classroom employment. Chou (2008) investigated the construct of teachers’ belief systems about reading theories and strategies and explored the degree of (in)consistencies between teachers’ beliefs about reading theories and strategies and their teaching practices. Forty two Taiwanese college EFL instructors responded to a questionnaire that asked them about three domains – the importance of reading theories and strategies in reading comprehension, the necessity of reading theories and strategies in teaching practices, and their actual use of these theories and strategies in classroom. The findings revealed that the college instructors hold beliefs in the significance of linguistic knowledge, cognitive strategy, and metacognitive strategy, and these beliefs were reflected in their classroom teaching practice.
To give another example, Bamanger and Gashan (2014) examined teachers’ beliefs about the significance of teaching English reading strategies and these beliefs’ influence on classroom teaching practice. Based on questionnaire data drawn from twenty seven Saudi EFL teachers, the teachers were found to place great emphasis on the significance of teaching reading strategies, among which the most important ones they identified include ‘to guess the meaning of the ambiguous vocabulary’, ‘to explain vocabulary items’, ‘to scan the text’, and ‘to ask questions to check the comprehension of the text’, while identifying as the least important ‘to translate words into Arabic’. The study also found that what the teachers believed about the efficient strategies of teaching reading significantly correlates with what they really do in classroom teaching. Bamanger and Gashan concluded that in order to change teaching practices, there is a need to change what teachers believe about these practices.

However, research has not always provided evidence of a perfect match between teachers’ beliefs and practice. I. Lee (2009), for example, investigated the beliefs and practice in written feedback of secondary EFL teachers in Hong Kong, using feedback analysis based on texts collected from twenty six teachers and a questionnaire administered to 206 teachers and focus group interviews. Teachers’ actual written feedback was drawn from feedback analysis and their beliefs and practice were probed through a survey questionnaire and interviews. The findings showed there were ten salient mismatches between teacher beliefs and practice in written feedback. To take some examples, despite the strong beliefs of all the teachers that good writing should be concerned with both accuracy and development of ideas
and organization, the feedback analysis showed that 94.1 percent of the teacher feedback focused exclusively on language form. Although the majority of teachers (96 percent) believed that students should learn to locate and correct errors, they were found to tend to correct and locate errors for students. The feedback analysis showed that about 70 percent of teacher feedback was direct. These findings demonstrate that teachers’ error feedback is not consistent with their beliefs. Some teachers in the study contributed the gaps between their beliefs and practice in written feedback to institutional constraints such as exam pressure and a school policy that highly values error feedback. The researcher, however, was not certain whether these were real explanations for the gaps.

Others also have often found that teachers’ espoused beliefs are not always present in their enacted practices and that they actually engage in practices that they indicated they do not support. For example, Van der Schaff, Stokking, and Verloop (2008) studied eighteen Dutch teachers’ beliefs towards teaching behavior and their relation to actual teaching behavior. Both beliefs and behavior were analyzed as described in the teachers’ portfolios. Two raters independently assessed each portfolio and the teachers’ classroom behavior was additionally assessed by their own students in a questionnaire. The study found mixed evidence about the consistent relationship between teachers’ pedagogical beliefs and their teaching behavior. To take some examples, teachers’ beliefs in ‘choosing and arguing for teaching strategies that meet students’ knowledge, abilities, and experience’ turned out to be highly reflected in their teaching behavior. On the contrary, teachers’ beliefs in the importance of assisting students with their classroom research activities were not
reflected in their actual teaching behavior. The study found that teachers’ behavior was very much controlling rather than assisting, talking most of the class hour and hardly offering any assistance in teaching students research skills.

Although the importance of research on teachers’ beliefs originates from the possible relationship between beliefs and practice (Woolfolk-Hoy, Davis, & Pape, 2006), the lack of congruence in the relationship is ‘no reason to discount the power of beliefs’ (Buehl & Beck, 2015). With respect to the strength of the relation between teachers’ beliefs and practice, Basturkmen (2012) points to a need of understanding of more complex relationships. Instead of seeking evidence of a perfect correspondence or a complete inconsistency between teachers’ beliefs and practices. Buehl and Beck (2015) contend that it is necessary to seek to understand the potential relations between beliefs and practices and the variations in the relations. Following this alternative line of inquiry, some studies have showed evidence of a complex relationship between teachers’ beliefs and teaching practices.

S. Borg (1999), for example, examined the impact of teachers’ beliefs about grammar instruction on their classroom teaching. Based on the interviews and classroom observations of four EFL teachers in Malta, the study found a complex relationship between teachers’ beliefs and their teaching. The teachers’ instructional decisions about the use or avoidance of grammatical terminology were found not to directly relate to beliefs they held. Rather, there were complex interactions between the teachers’ beliefs about the best way to learn grammar, their own knowledge of grammatical terminology, their perceptions of students’ knowledge, and their experience of grammatical terminology. To take an example, one teacher that had a
lack of confidence in her explicit knowledge of grammar due to the unsuccessful learning of her native language and second language grammars believed that her students learned English better without explicit grammar instruction. This teacher was observed to tend to avoid the use of grammatical terminology in the classroom teaching.

In summary, the studies reviewed above suggest that “it is not a matter of whether beliefs and practices are or are not congruent but rather the degree of congruence or incongruence between beliefs and practices” (Fives & Buehl, 2012, p. 281). In other words, it is critical to understand more complex relations between second language teachers’ beliefs and their teaching practices and the variations in the relations. For the improvement of second language teacher preparation, it is important to understand this complex relation between beliefs and teaching practice. The review of this section also describes research methods used when exploring teachers’ beliefs and practice. Qualitatively oriented research studies that included relatively very few participants often used interviews and classroom observations. Quantitatively oriented research studies that included a relatively large number of participants commonly used surveys only or a combination of surveys and interviews. The scarcity of research on beliefs related to second language pre-service teachers is a major gap in the literature, and S. Borg (2011) and Peacock (2001) stress the need for more research on second language pre-service teachers’ beliefs.

2.2.3. Second language teachers’ beliefs and educational reforms

Teachers’ beliefs have generally been understood to influence the ways through which teachers perceive and interpret new phenomenon and information and
consequently their behavior (e.g., M. Borg, 2001; Johnson, 1994; Nespor, 1987; Pajares, 1992). That is, beliefs influence how new phenomenon and information are perceived and thus guide people’s action, either accepting or rejecting them. This indicates that teachers’ beliefs influence how teachers perceive and interpret educational reforms and guide their subsequent implementation of those reforms. In short, teachers’ beliefs may be closely related to the success of educational reforms.

Studies have found that teachers’ beliefs play a critical role in the enactment of educational reforms. For example, Könings, Brand-Gruwel, and Erriënboer (2007) explored the relations between teachers’ beliefs and their perceptions and implementation of the educational reform, called the Second Phase, initiated by the Netherlands government. This reform aimed to optimize student learning by creating a powerful learning environment that promotes acquisition of high-quality knowledge, self-directed learning, collaborative problem-solving skills, and transferability of knowledge and skills. This reform required teachers to play a role as a coach rather than an instructor and to be sensitive to students’ individual progress and problems. Könings et al. surveyed 142 secondary school teachers to measure their perceptions of the reform. The study found teachers, in general, hold a negative perception of the reform. One of the reasons for the negative perception was the discrepancy between what teachers believed about student autonomy and what the reform promoted about it. The teachers’ negative perception was reflected in their classroom teaching. For example, the teachers believed in teacher-centered education. This belief influenced the teachers to perceive negatively the reform that encourages student-centered and students’ self-directed learning. This negative perception was in
turn reflected in their teaching practice: The teachers prioritized and placed more emphasis on rote learning than productive learning, which was recommended by the reform. In addition to the findings of teachers’ beliefs and their influence on perceptions and teaching practice. Könings et al. noted that beliefs do not change easily over time.

In recent decades numerous efforts have been made to reform English language education in many countries in which the English language is learned in addition to one’s native language. As global communication continues to expand, the importance of learning English language has become greater than ever before. To join “a globalized village” and compete in a global economy, governments have made extensive efforts to strengthen their workforce’s communicative competence in English (Littlewood, 2007). In response to this need, many countries, particularly those in the EFL context, have made fundamental reforms in English language education. This resulted in a widespread adoption of communication-oriented English education reforms. For example, in order to develop learners’ competence of using the English language, the Chinese government required the communicative language teaching (CLT) approach be applied in both primary and secondary school English education by implementing the New Curriculum early in 2001 (H. Zhang, 2014). Iran also in the mid-2000s developed new English language curricula and syllabi that encouraged more use of CLT in English language classroom (Jafari, Shokrpour & Guetterman, 2015). Likewise, Turkey made two major complementary educational reforms in 1997 and in 2005, which resulted in more communication-oriented English curricular (Uysal and Bardakci, 2014).
This widespread adoption of CLT-based educational reforms has drawn a great deal of research interest in the EFL context. Some researchers explored the power of teachers’ beliefs in implementing a curriculum innovation. Chan (2014), for example, identified the teaching beliefs held by Hong Kong secondary school English teachers and examined the influence of their beliefs on their implementation of task-based language teaching (TBLT) which was introduced to Hong Kong secondary school English teachers as the preferred methodology for English language teaching by the government in 1999. This TBLT approach aims at motivating learners to enhance their language proficiency and explore and experiment with the language by completing tasks. The study found that TBLT is implemented only to a limited extent in classrooms and it reported teachers’ beliefs as a major factor contributing to the limited implementation of TBLT. The majority of the teachers did not believe in the advantage of tasks as the core units of planning and instruction. Even those whose beliefs were consistent with TBLT principles did not implement TBLT to its full extent due to their more strongly held beliefs. For example, one teacher who believed tasks are advantageous was observed to often use exercises rather than tasks. His practice was due to the influence of two central beliefs: first, English lessons are to equip students well for assessment and second, exercises can prepare students well for assessment. Chan concluded that teachers’ teaching beliefs do not change according to the principles underlying a curriculum innovation and this is a major factor hindering the implementation of a curriculum innovation. Chan contended that curriculum developers should pay attention to the power of teachers’ beliefs in implementing a curriculum innovation.
The empirical studies in the EFL context has often focused on EFL teachers’ perceptions of CLT and the impact of teachers’ perceptions on their teaching practices. Underwood (2012), for example, explored the impact of innovations of the Japanese national curriculum for English. The Japanese government initiated the new Course of Study (COS) 2009 that requires the teaching of grammatical rules and terminology in English language classes be minimized and grammar be taught in a way to support communication, integrating grammar into language activities. Through interviews and surveys of English teachers in senior high schools, Underwood found that although this curriculum innovation has had a positive impact on English language grammar instruction that had traditionally been delivered in the form of independent grammar class or a grammar-translation method, teachers’ adoption of the new COS 2009 has been difficult because of the misalignment of this policy with the high-stakes college entrance examination, which emphasizes grammatical accuracy, knowledge of grammar, and reading comprehension, and the lack of teaching skills and teaching materials necessary to successfully implement the innovations. Similarly, Nishino (2012) found that Japanese high school English teachers negatively perceived CLT and the difficulties they experienced in implementing CLT contributed to teachers’ low self-confidence as English language teacher and college entrance English exam that heavily focuses on English grammar.

In the Pakistani context were also found difficulties in adopting the CLT approach similar to those found in Underwood’s (2012) and Nishino’s (2012). Ahmad and Rao (2013) surveyed and interviewed Pakistani English secondary school teachers to investigate their perceptions of the CLT approach and their perceived
difficulties in its application at the secondary level. The teachers showed their willingness to incorporate communicative activities in classrooms and a good understanding of the use of the CLT approach. The identified difficulties in applying the communicative approach include lack of teacher training and appropriate materials, students’ hesitation in the use of target language, grammar-based examinations, and over-crowded class rooms.

In this line of study, some researchers also included discussion of the impact of professional training courses on teachers’ perceptions of curriculum reforms. For example, in a recent study conducted in the Iranian context, Jafari et al. (2015) found that high school English teachers held largely favorable perceptions towards the CLT approach that was mandated by the Iranian government to implement in teaching English. The teachers positively perceived the core principles of CLT approach promoted by the government such as learner centeredness, learner autonomy, and the role of teacher as a facilitator. The study also revealed that the more professional training courses such as workshops, seminars, and conferences the teachers attended, the more positive the teachers’ perceptions were inclined towards CLT. Jafari et al., thus, contended that in-service teachers need opportunities to retain themselves in CLT approaches. The challenging difficulties the teachers encountered in implementing CLT in classrooms include large class sizes, learners’ low English proficiency and lack of motivation, and teachers’ perception of their own low English proficiency. For a successful implementation of CLT, these difficulties also merit attention, since “the realization of policy in practice [also] depends on the fit between capabilities that support implementation and aims” (Cohen, Moffitt, & Goldin, 2007).
To sum up, the studies reviewed in this section suggest that teachers’ perceptions of the feasibility of a particular educational reform or curriculum innovation is a critical factor that may influence the successful implementation of that reform or innovation and that teachers’ beliefs may influence this perception of teachers and subsequently their teaching practice. The dearth of studies that explore teachers’ beliefs in the context of educational reforms or curricular innovations is a major gap in the literature. It is even more so in the EFL context. Most studies conducted in EFL countries largely focused on teaches’ perceptions of reforms in English language education and its impact on teaching practice. What remains largely unexplored is the potential influence of EFL teachers’ beliefs on their perceptions of government-initiated reforms. In other words, there is a need for study that investigates how closely EFL teachers’ beliefs about English language education are associated with their perceptions of educational reforms and or curricular innovations. Studies on EFL teachers’ beliefs in this manner will greatly contribute to the understanding of the feasibility of any reforms or innovations in English language education.

2.2.4. Empirical studies on Korean EFL teachers’ beliefs and educational reforms

The need for research identified in the literature on teachers’ beliefs, that is, the need for research on second language teachers’ beliefs, particularly pre-service second language teachers’ beliefs, becomes even more evident. Only a handful of empirical studies have investigated Korean EFL teachers’ beliefs. Some explored teachers’ beliefs about English language education in Korea and others examined teachers’ beliefs in relation to teacher education programs. For example, J. Choi
(2008) conducted an interview study with twenty Korean EFL pre-service teachers from one educational institution to explore their beliefs about proficiency goals for secondary English education in Korea. Among the findings were that the pre-service teachers hold strong beliefs on teaching and learning that are grammar-based, text-oriented, and teacher-centered, regardless of teaching methods. J. Choi argued that teachers’ beliefs in grammar-focused and teacher-centered teaching and learning led to their negative perceptions of reform policies which are communication-oriented. These beliefs stand in sharp contrast to those found in E. Kim (1997) and Yook (2010), both of which focused on in-service teachers. Korean primary school EFL teachers in E. Kim’s study were found to hold beliefs that for effective English language teaching, teachers should use small group work, which is critical in the Korean context where average class size is large, and teachers should teach English through English. Similarly, based on teachers’ reported responses to a survey and interviews, Yook (2010) found that the majority of the Korean primary and secondary school EFL teachers reported to hold pedagogical beliefs that uphold communicative language teaching and learning.

Research on teachers’ beliefs and their relation to teacher education is also scant and reveals mixed results. For example, H-J. Lee (2006) and E. Kim (2008) found that the role which EFL teacher education programs play in changing teachers’ beliefs was not significant. The participating teachers in both studies showed no change in their pedagogical beliefs and teaching practices even after their participation in CLT-related training programs for practicing teachers. For example, in E. Kim’s case study which examined one experienced English teacher’s experience
with the CLT-based curricular reform in a secondary school context, interviews and classroom observations of this teacher revealed that she made little change in her pedagogical beliefs and teaching practices in spite of her participation in different teacher education programs relevant to curricular reform. Her pedagogical beliefs and teaching practices were closely aligned with grammar-translation methods.

In contrast to very few empirical studies that directly explored Korean EFL teachers’ beliefs, MOE-initiated curricular reforms have drawn much more research interest in Korea. CLT is at the heart of current reforms of English language education in Korea. Therefore, CLT-related reforms or innovations have particularly drawn research attention. For example, Li (1998) surveyed and interviewed eighteen Korean secondary school EFL teachers to investigate their perceptions of CLT-based curriculum innovations, while S. Choi (2000) surveyed ninety seven Korean EFL secondary school teachers to explore their perceptions about CLT and their practices of CLT-oriented methods and activities. Both studies revealed that participating teachers had difficulties in using CLT due to various reasons. Among them are lack of authentic materials for communicative activities, large number of students in a class, teachers’ own deficiency in spoken English and their lack of cultural knowledge of English, and few opportunities for in-service teacher training.

In more recent years, E. Kim (2011) and K. Ahn (2009) explored Korean EFL teachers’ perceptions and practices of CLT. K. Ahn, for example, studied four pre-service EFL teachers’ experiences in relation to CLT-oriented teaching in their four-week practicum. Based on interviews of the pre-service teachers and their mentor teachers and classroom observation of the pre-service teachers’ classroom teaching,
K. Ahn found that the extent to which CLT-oriented teaching was espoused and implemented by the pre-service teachers was decided by several factors such as experiences the pre-service teachers had as English learners, their mentor teachers’ perceptions of CLT-oriented curriculum reform, and institutional constraints such as students’ lack of classroom participation.

Most recently, M. Lee (2014) examined thirty seven Korean elementary and secondary school EFL teachers’ perceptions of CLT. The teachers were surveyed with a questionnaire designed based on Li (1998). The results showed that the teachers’ perceptions of CLT were very restricted to speaking skill. The findings also indicated that teachers from different school levels have differences in their concerns related to implementing CLT. For example, while elementary school EFL teachers were concerned about enhancing students’ involvement, secondary school EFL teachers were more concerned about difficulties in enacting CLT. For example, the secondary school teachers pointed out as hindrance to implementing CLT the heavy focus of grammar and reading based tests. The studies reviewed above suggests that CLT has not been fully embraced and implemented by Korean EFL teachers.

Some other studies explored Korean EFL teachers’ perceptions of and their enactment of a specific reform policy. Son and K. Lee (2003) surveyed 270 Korean secondary school EFL teachers to explore how they perceive the Teaching English in English (TEE) policy, which was instituted in 2001 by the Korean MOE to designate English as the medium of instruction with the aim of improving students’ and teachers’ ability to communicate in English, while D. Kang (2008) conducted a case study based on interviews and classroom observations to investigate one Korean EFL
teacher’s perception and implementation of the TEE policy. In more recent years, some studies explored Korean EFL teachers’ perceptions of the TEE Certification scheme, which was introduced by the Korean government to reinforce the TEE policy. For example, H. Lee (2012) interviewed eleven secondary school EFL teachers and two TEE Certification examiners to explore their perceptions of the system, while T-H, Choi (2014) interviewed and observed four secondary EFL teachers’ lessons to investigate the impact of the TEE Certification scheme on their practice of English as the medium of instruction.

A synthesis of these studies suggests that the TEE policy has not been fully adopted, largely because the policy was perceived negatively by Korean EFL teachers and their negative perceptions of this reform policy was due to various reasons. For example, teachers in Son and K. Lee (2003) were very doubtful of the presumed benefits of the policy and as teachers in D. Kang’s (2008) study, they negatively perceived the policy due to students’ as well as their own low English proficiency. The impact of the policy on teaching was, thus, limited. Lack of a clear understanding of the TEE policy also hindered a full adoption of it by teachers. For example, T-H, Choi (2014) found that Korean EFL teachers had varied understanding of the TEE policy. Some teachers regarded the policy as rigid, asking for the use of English for 100% of their normal lessons, while others thought they could be more flexible about the use of English, using English even at the level of 5% or 10%. Subjective interpretations of the policy made varied understandings of the policy among the teachers. The TEE Certification scheme had only limited impact in developing teachers’ English proficiency. The teachers in T-H, Choi’s study reported that English
proficiency cannot be improved within a limited timeframe. The Certification scheme also achieved only partial success in changing teachers’ perceptions of it. For example, two teachers in T-H, Choi’s study became more accepting of the use of English as the medium of instruction, while the other two teachers strongly resisted to use English as a medium of instruction after the Certification, believing that teaching English in English did not serve students’ needs. The impact of the Certification scheme on immediate adoption of TEE in normal lessons, thus, was found to be limited.

In summary, this section presented a review of empirical research studies that investigated Korean EFL teachers’ pedagogical beliefs and educational reforms initiated by the Korean government to improve English language education. Very few studies explored Korean EFL teachers’ beliefs. Research that focused on pre-service teachers is almost non-existent. Only one study explored Korean EFL secondary school pre-service teachers’ beliefs, which indicated that these teachers’ beliefs are grammar-based, text-oriented, and teacher-centered. The review of research on Korean EFL teachers’ beliefs suggests that the teachers’ beliefs do not easily change and that the beliefs contribute to how the teachers perceive the government initiated reforms. Most studies that examined educational reforms examined teachers’ perception or their perception with related teaching practice regarding the reforms. Findings from these studies suggest communication-oriented EFL educational reforms have not been fully embraced and implemented by Korean EFL teachers.

Most studies reviewed above reveal some limitations. J. Choi (2008), the only study that focused on Korean EFL secondary pre-service teachers, explored solely
one aspect of teacher’s beliefs (i.e., beliefs about proficiency goals) based on twenty
pre-service teachers from only one educational institution. Similarly, E. Kim (2008)
and H-J. Lee (2006) also included very small number of participants, one in-service
teacher and four in-service teachers respectively. This line of research is inadequate
to draw a comprehensive view of Korea EFL teachers’ beliefs. E. Kim (1997)
claimed to have investigated teachers’ beliefs about effective teaching but what the
participant teachers actually did is simply self-evaluated what they did in their
teaching in the classroom. Yook (2010) focused on both primary and secondary
teachers. This is an issue because teachers at primary and secondary levels will focus
on different things and this is also an issue with regards to validity of her findings
since as mentioned in the literature review (M. Lee, 2014), teachers at primary and
secondary levels have different needs concerning English instruction. Research
studies on educational reforms (e.g., K. Ahn, 2009; S. Choi, 2000; E. Kim, 2011; M.
Lee, 2014; Li, 1998) disregarded teachers’ beliefs, focusing only on teachers’
perceptions and teaching practice of reforms.

The review of studies conducted in the Korean context points to the following
research needs. First, there is a need for research that investigates teachers’ beliefs
about English language education in the context of educational reforms, particularly
teachers’ beliefs related to their perception and implementation of educational
reforms, a relation which is identified as a major gap in the established literature. As
discussed earlier, teachers’ perception of the feasibility of educational innovation is a
critical factor in the ultimate success or failure of that innovation and what
contributes to their perception is their beliefs (Li, 1998). Second, there is a need for
research that focuses on pre-service teachers particularly at secondary level. Due to the scarcity of research on Korean EFL pre-service teachers’ pedagogical beliefs, their perception/practice in the educational reform context, little is known about the preparation of pre-service teachers for the educational reforms. Since English education is a primary concern in secondary education as opposed to primary education, and secondary education is a main concern of the current reforms, research on pre-service teachers particularly at the secondary level is needed. Third, most studies reviewed which targeted pre-service teachers are small scale in the form of case studies. To draw a comprehensive view of the teachers’ beliefs and perception and practice, large scale based research is needed. Findings of such research can be more representative of a larger target population. Finally, it is unknown what factors influence the formation of Korean pre-service teachers’ beliefs about English language education. Understanding how their beliefs are formed will provide valuable insight into how we can act on the beliefs if necessary. The current study aims to meet the research needs discussed above.

2.3. Summary of chapter 2

`This chapter first provided a review of research studies that help conceptualize teachers’ beliefs. Although researchers did not reach agreement on how to define teachers’ beliefs, a shared conceptual core of teachers’ beliefs are drawn from the review of literature on teachers’ beliefs: Teachers’ beliefs are subjectively true for the individual, more or less stable within the individual, and influential in the individual’s perception and interpretation of new information and behavior. This indicates that teachers’ beliefs are an important concept in understanding teachers’
perceptions and behaviors. Definitions of teachers’ beliefs made by M. Borg (2001) provide good guidance for the current study which focuses on Korean EFL teachers’ beliefs, perception, and practice: “a belief is a proposition which may be consciously or unconsciously held, is evaluative in that it is accepted as true by the individual, and is therefore imbued with emotive commitment; further, it serves as a guide to thought and behavior” (p. 186).

Second, this chapter reviewed studies on second language teachers’ beliefs. The sources of teachers’ beliefs identified in the literature include teachers’ experiences as a language learner, teacher education, and teaching experiences. The review of studies on second language teachers’ beliefs and teaching practices suggests that for the improvement of second language teacher preparation, it is critical to understand the relations between beliefs and practices, not simply congruent or incongruent relations, rather more complex relations, that is, the degree of congruence or incongruence between beliefs and practices. The review of studies on second language teachers’ beliefs and educational reforms suggests that teachers’ perception of the feasibility of educational reforms exerts a strong influence on the success of reforms and that teachers’ beliefs may be a critical factor that contributes to teachers’ perceptions and subsequently practice. Studies on teachers’ beliefs in an educational reform context has been scarce. The need for such studies becomes even more evident in the EFL context. Most studies conducted in EFL countries largely focused either on teachers’ perceptions of reforms or teachers’ perception of reforms and its impact on teaching practice, without relating to teachers’ beliefs. Finally, this chapter reviewed empirical studies on Korean EFL teachers’ beliefs and educational
reforms. The review of these studies conducted in Korea suggests that communication-oriented EFL educational reforms have not been fully embraced and implemented by teachers. This review indicates that to fully understand the feasibility of the reforms, it is necessary to explore Korean EFL teachers’ beliefs in relation to how they perceive and put into practice the reforms. This chapter concludes with a summary of research needs identified in this review, which led to the pursuit of the current study exploring Korean EFL pre-service secondary school teachers’ pedagogical beliefs, perception, and practice of reforms.
Chapter 3: Methodology

This chapter presents the methodology used in the present study. The first section of this chapter restates the research questions. The second provides an overview of the research methodology, including research design, researcher’s positionality, research settings and participants, instrumentation, data collection, and data analysis. The third discusses limitations of the study. A summary of the methodology is provided at the end of this chapter.

3.1. Restatement of research questions

As a reminder to the reader, the research questions are reiterated below:

1. What self-reported beliefs do Korean EFL pre-service secondary school teachers have about English language education in Korea in relation to (a) the nature of foreign language learning, (b) the nature of teaching, (c) teaching goals, (d) teaching methods, and (e) teacher roles?

2. What are the sources of their beliefs?

3. How do Korean EFL pre-service secondary school teachers perceive the MOE (Ministry of Education)-initiated reforms of English language education?

4. What is their self-reported implementation of the MOE-initiated reforms of English language education in their practicum?

5. What is the nature of relations (i.e. strength and direction) among the following three constructs: (a) Korean EFL pre-service secondary school teachers’ beliefs about English language education in Korea, (b) their perceptions of the MOE-initiated
refor

3.2. Overview of the research design

This section provides a detailed description of the research methodology, including research design, researcher’s positionality, research settings and participants, instrumentation, data collection, and data analysis.

3.2.1. Mixed-methods design and the rationale for using mixed-methods design

In order to address the abovementioned questions, the current inquiry utilized mixed-methods methodology which can help researchers “achieve a balance so that a greater diversity of divergent views is heard, [and] questions are answered that other methodologies cannot, and stronger and better inferences are provided” (Crump & Logan, 2008, p. 21). Mixed-methods is a research approach that is often guided by pragmatism as a theoretical framework (Johnson & Onweugbuzie, 2004) and is popular in the social sciences (Creswell, 2013). Because social phenomena are so complex, and social problems are so intractable, different methodological tools are needed for understanding such phenomena and social problems (Greene, 2001). Analyzing the definitions of research design from leaders of the field, Johnson, Onweugbuzie, and Turner (2007) found strong agreement that mixed method research includes both quantitative and qualitative research approaches:

“Mixed methods research is the type of research in which a researcher or team of researchers combines elements of qualitative and quantitative research approaches (e.g., use of qualitative and quantitative viewpoints, data
collection, analysis, inference techniques) for the broad purposes of breadth and depth of understanding and corroboration.” (p. 123)

Greene and her colleagues (Green, Caracelli, & Graham, 1989) further identified five purposes for a mixed-methods design:

1. **Triangulation**: seeking convergence, corroboration, and correspondence of results across different methods studying the same phenomenon;

2. **Complementarity**: seeking elaboration, illustration, and clarification of the results from one method with results from the other method;

3. **Initiation**: uncovering paradoxes and contradictions that lead to further analysis or new insights;

4. **Development**: sequentially implementing different methods so that findings from one method help inform the other method;

5. **Expansion**: extending the scope and range of research by using different methods for different inquiry components.

To summarize, mixed-methods allow for a more robust analysis since when used in combination quantitative and qualitative methods complement each other, which enables taking advantage of the strengths of each (Ivankova, Creswell, & Stick, 2006). Many researchers (e.g., Creswell, 2003; 2013; Greene & Caracelli, 1997; Greene, Caracelli, & Graham, 1989; Miles & Huberman, 1994; Tashakkori & Teddlie, 1998) regard mixed-methods as a legitimate research design with well-defined and well-structured techniques.

To be specific, this study was designed to be a mixed-methods explanatory sequential design. This approach consists of two phases: quantitative and qualitative
phases (Creswell, Plano Clark, Gutmann, & Hanson, 2003). In this design, a researcher collects and analyzes the quantitative instrument data first and the qualitative data second. The qualitative phase builds on the results from the quantitative phase. The qualitative data help interpret the quantitative results obtained on the first, quantitative phase. Figure 1 presents a diagram of explanatory sequential design.

Research questions largely determine the adoption of research design in this study. Mixed-methods design is suitable for the current study since either quantitative research only or qualitative research only is insufficient to fully understand the research questions in this study. Both a quantitative phase and a qualitative phase are required to address research questions. The quantitative phase can answer questions about overall trends or general patterns of study participants’ beliefs about English language education and of their perceptions of the MOE-initiated reforms of English language education and of their implementation of such reforms in their practicum (research questions 1, 3, and 4, respectively) and a question about the relations among the three constructs: beliefs about English language education and perceptions of and implementation of the MOE-initiated reforms of English language education (research question 5). The qualitative phase, on the other hand, can answer not only a
question about sources of study participants’ beliefs (research question 2) but also research questions with richer, more in-depth information such as the study participants’ opinions about (a) the adequacy of training they receive at their teacher education programs and (b) specific reforms of which they are aware, and (c) difficulties or challenges they experienced in their teaching practicum in relation to the MOE-initiated reforms. Therefore, the mixed-methods research design adopted for the current study helps provide a comprehensive picture as well as fine-grained, deep, rich information about the topic under investigation by the combination of the quantitative phase and the qualitative phase which adds breadth and depth to the understanding of research questions.

3.2.2. Researcher’s positionality

“Positionality is … determined by where one stands in relation to ‘the other”’ (Merriam, Johnson-Bailey, Lee, Ntseane & Muhamed, 2001, p. 411). As a Korean who was born and raised in Korea and has experiences of learning and teaching English language in Korea, I become an insider with the participants. My coming with much knowledge about Korean society, culture, and education made the participants more connected with me and led us to the development of close relationships. Although I am a graduate student and an emerging EFL researcher while they are undergraduates and pre-service EFL teachers, we have a common educational background and a shared interest. The participants and I learned English as a non-native language in Korea and we had a considerable interest in English education in Korea. This commonality made us relate quite readily to each other and aided us in achieving a sense of solidarity.
Although my “insider” status can bring a deeper understanding to the research, it also brings its own bias (Choi, 2006). Although as an outsider, that is, a researcher, I am aware that reflection of the participants’ voices in the research is critical, I acknowledge that my values, experiences, beliefs, and previously held perspectives might come into play and have an impact on shaping the research process. For example, the lens through which I view EFL education is communication-oriented and I am critical of test-driven English education. Thus, my own subjectivity might influence the ways in which I interact with the participants, in which I account for their experiences, and in which I report research findings. I am mindful about the influence of my own subjectivity and of the relationship between the participants and myself upon the research process. “[T]he research in which I engage is shaped by who I am, … I will [also] be shaped by it, and by those with whom I interact” (Bourke, 2014, p. 7).

3.2.3. Research settings and participants of the study

The primary interest of the current inquiry is to investigate an understudied group, Korean EFL pre-service secondary school teachers and their beliefs about English language education and their perceptions of and implementations of the MOE-initiated reforms about English language education. Therefore, study participants were undergraduate students enrolled at six EFL pre-service secondary school teacher education programs in Korea. Altogether, 204 undergraduate students participated in this study: 60 males, 144 females, and 10 that did not fully respond to the questionnaire. They ranged in age from 21 to 25. 103 out of 194 students excluding the 10 that did not complete the questionnaire turned out to have completed
their teaching practicum and the remaining 91 students did not yet have practicum experience. My goal is to obtain a medium effect size (e.g., Pearson correlations which are equal to or larger than a population correlation of 0.3) in the population and at power .8 for $\alpha = .05$, the necessary number of respondents is 84 (Cohen, 1977). Thus, the number of the participants recruited is sufficient to meet the required number of respondents.

The six EFL pre-service teacher education programs from which the study participants were drawn are university-based, located in South Korea. Four of these pre-service teacher education programs are housed in national universities and two in private universities. These six EFL pre-service teacher education programs are initial teacher licensure preparation programs. All of them are 4-year undergraduate programs integrating university coursework and a practicum. Much of course work of individual programs is commonly shared across all these six programs: for example, all the programs include a) course work that aims to develop four skills in English such as ‘Listening and Speaking Skills Practice in English’, ‘English Conversation’, ‘English Reading’, and ‘English Composition’, b) courses about English language teaching such as ‘English Education’, ‘Teaching Methods’, ‘Theories in Teaching EFL’, and ‘Curriculum and Teaching Materials in English Education’, c) general education courses such as ‘Philosophy of Education’ and ‘Educational Psychology’, and d) courses about English linguistics and such as ‘Introduction to English Linguistics’, ‘English Phonetics’, and ‘Readings in British & American literature and culture’. A four-week teaching practicum is required in all six pre-service teacher education programs.
3.2.4. Instrumentation

Two types of instruments were used in this study: a) a self-reported questionnaire with both close-ended and open-ended questions and b) qualitative interviews.

3.2.4.1. Quantitative instrumentation

A questionnaire is one of the primary sources of obtaining data in this study. The use of questionnaire for the current study is appropriate since the focal interest of this study is to explore overall trends or patterns of the study participants’ beliefs about English language education and perceptions of the MOE-initiated reforms of English language education and teaching practice related to such reforms which requires a large number of study participants. Questionnaires are one of the efficient means of collecting data on a large-scale basis (Brown, 2001; Lynch, 1996; Robinson, 1991). Not only are they a time-efficient way of collecting data from many people but also they can easily be analyzed in a straightforward way (Nunan, 1999; Seliger & Shohamy, 1989). A self-reported questionnaire, thus, was constructed to survey participants’ beliefs about English language education in Korea and their perceptions of and implementation of the MOE-initiated reforms to improve English language education. To develop a questionnaire for the current study, I referred to questionnaires used in previous studies: Yook (2010) investigated Korean EFL teachers’ beliefs about English language education, S. Choi (2000) explored Korean EFL teachers’ perceptions of and practice of CLT (communicative language teaching), Savignon and Wang (2003) assessed EFL learners’ perceptions with regard
to classroom practices, and Horwitz (1988) studied second language teachers’ beliefs about second language learning.

The questionnaire developed for the current study consists of seven sections (see Appendix A for survey questionnaire). Section A asks the respondents’ personal information such as age, gender, name of university, grade level in university, and completion or no completion of practicum. 45 items in sections B through F are on 7 point-scaled measure ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (7) with neutral (4) in the middle. Each of 45 items is associated with either traditional English language education in Korea characterized as teacher-centeredness, heavy emphasis on vocabulary, grammar, and reading learning, repetition, and drilling, or reforms of English language education promoted by the Korean government characterized as student-centeredness, emphasis on communication skills, authentic language learning, and interactive learning. Section B explores the respondents’ experience as English learners. Section C assesses the respondents’ beliefs about English language education in Korea, which is divided into five parts: a) beliefs about the nature of foreign language learning; b) beliefs about the nature of teaching; c) beliefs about EFL teaching goals in Korea; d) beliefs about Korean EFL teaching methods; e) beliefs about teacher roles. Section D explores the respondents’ perceptions of the MOE-initiated reforms of English language education in Korea. Section E assesses the respondents’ teaching practice in the practicum in relation to the curricular reforms promoted by the Korean government. Section F explores training that the respondents received at their pre-service teacher education programs. Open-ended
question in the last section, section G, is concerned with sources of the respondents’ beliefs.

Burns (1999, p. 160) states that “validity is an essential criterion for evaluating the quality and acceptability of research.” The quality of instruments is very important because “the conclusions researchers draw are based on the information they obtain using these instruments” (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2003, p. 158). Thus, it is critical to validate the data and the instruments (Tavakol & Dennick, 2011). In research using instruments, validity is concerned with the degree to which an instrument measures what it is intended to measure. Content validity deals with “a type of validity in which different elements, skills, and behaviors are adequately effectively measured” (Zohrabi, 2013, p. 258). This type of validity in this study was assessed by using a panel of experts that are familiar with the focal construct of the study, teachers’ beliefs. The experts examined the questionnaire items and decided what each item was intended to measure. Based on the experts’ comments, the questionnaire items were revised.

To ensure the respondents’ clear understanding of each item in the questionnaire and to help them feel comfortable, the questionnaire was translated into Korean, the native language of the respondents. To enhance the accuracy of translation, I consulted with a Korean EFL researcher and prepared a Korean-translated questionnaire. A high school Korean language teacher further reviewed and polished the Korean-translated questionnaire. When using questionnaires, one of the disadvantages that must be kept in mind is ambiguity of some questions that might lead to inaccurate responses or cause misunderstanding (Brown, 2001; Gillham,
Field testing of questionnaire items, an integral part of questionnaire construction, helps the researcher collect feedback regarding actual wording of the questionnaire items (Dörnyei, 2003). Thus, the Korean-translated questionnaire items were field tested with two Korean EFL pre-service teachers from the study participating programs and these two pre-service teachers were not included in the study sample. Each subject was asked to read each item in the questionnaire. The primary purpose of this field testing was to see if there is any confusion with the overall meaning of each item and misinterpretation of any terms used in items. No ambiguity of questionnaire items was reported.

After the field testing, the questionnaire was piloted. The primary goals of conducting pilot testing were to explore whether all the respondents in the pilot sample are able to follow instructions as indicated and to test how reliable the questionnaire is. I planned an external pilot survey, that is, administering the questionnaire to a small group of target participants that would not be included in the main survey. 20 students were recruited from one of the six participating pre-service teacher education programs. They participated on a voluntary basis. After the pilot survey, I asked them about how clear the instructions are and if there are any questions they find difficult to answer. All pilot survey respondents agreed that instructions in the questionnaire are clear and easy to follow, and that items are straightforward. To measure reliability of the questionnaire, I assessed the internal consistency of the questionnaire with the Cronbach Alpha reliability estimate. The internal reliability for the 45 items in the questionnaire was estimated as $r = .80$, suggesting that the items are closely related as a group, given that a reliable
A coefficient of .70 or higher is considered acceptable in most social science research situations. The reliability coefficients for each of the three subtests (i.e., beliefs, perceptions, and implementation) were $r = .74$, $r = .55$, and $r = .69$ respectively. The internal reliability of the items assessing perceptions of the MOE-initiated reforms are somewhat questionable. No revision of the questionnaire was made as a result of the pilot survey.

3.2.4.2. Qualitative instrumentation

Qualitative instrumentation in this study included interviews. Since interviewing allows researchers “to enter into other person’s perspective” (Patton, 1990, p. 196), interviews are generally used to investigate interviewees’ insider perspectives on their thoughts, feelings, and behavior (Bartels, 2006). The use of interviews for the current study, therefore, is appropriate since this study seeks to achieve in-depth understanding, which would otherwise lack insider perspectives if relying solely on a survey questionnaire, on Korean EFL pre-service secondary school teachers’ beliefs about English language education and their thoughts about and their teaching practice in relation to the MOE-initiated reforms of English language education. Semi-structured interviews were used in this study since they give me, the interviewer, a high degree of flexibility in the course of interviewing in terms of bringing up new ideas or new questions or asking for more in-depth elaboration on certain topics based on what the interviewee says. The semi-structured interview, by definition, is “an interview whose purpose is to obtain descriptions of the life world of the interviewee with respect to interpreting meaning of the described phenomenon” (Kvale, 1996, p. 5-6). In other words, this type of interview enables the
interviewee to discuss their interpretations of the world in which they live and to express their own point of view in regard of situations (Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2007). Thus, the interviewees for the current study had a high degree of freedom to express their own perspectives on and interpretations of the topics under study. Zohrabi (2013) stresses that semi-structured interviews allow the interviewee to provide more information than other interview types such as structured and unstructured interviews. An interview guide was used for the interviews in this study (see Appendix B for interview guide). The interview guide is a grouping of topics and questions that the interviewer can ask in different ways for different participants (Lindlof & Taylor, 2010). The interview guide used in this study was initially designed based on the research questions and later other topics and issues identified from the questionnaire results were additionally included in the guide.

3.2.5. Data collection procedures

This section discusses the collection of both the quantitative data and the qualitative data with the former preceding the latter.

3.2.5.1. Collecting quantitative data

To recruit participants for the survey, I contacted professors and deans of a faculty at six EFL pre-service secondary school teacher education programs in Korea. I explained to them what the study is about and the procedures related to the survey and obtained their permission. I aimed to recruit more advanced students who had significant experience in their teacher education courses so that they could provide a relatively informed view of the training they received in their program. For this
purpose, I targeted students who were at the end of junior and senior years at the time this study was conducted. To access this target population, I aimed students that were enrolled in mandatory courses for juniors and seniors. To enhance a response rate, with assistance and approval from course instructors, I administered a survey questionnaire face-to-face in intact classes. To further enhance a return rate, I made an announcement about a reward for participation in the survey before I administered the survey questionnaire. All participants were given a modest gift for their participation. Before administering a consent form, I explained to students the goals of my study and the procedures related to the survey. I gave each of the students a consent form (see Appendix C for consent form for survey). The students signed the consent form first on a voluntary basis and then completed the questionnaire. The same procedures were applied to all six-participating pre-service teacher education programs. I recruited altogether 204 participants and the qualified responses reached 194. 10 participants dropped out of the survey.

3.2.5.2. Collecting qualitative data

In order to reach a fuller understanding of Korean EFL pre-service secondary school teachers’ beliefs and their perceptions and implementation of English language education reforms, I conducted semi-structured interviews with ten Korean EFL pre-service secondary school teachers. I selected the interviewees from those that agreed to participate in the interviews and fully responded to the survey questionnaire based upon two criteria: a) the quality of responses to the open-ended questions of the survey questionnaire and b) the representativeness of the study participants. I judged the quality of responses based on three criteria: a) Is it responsive to the questions
asked?: b) Is information factually correct?: c) Does it provide in-depth description of factual information? To secure the representativeness of the study participants, I attempted to recruit interviewees across all the participating pre-service teacher education programs. At the end, ten interviewees were selected from four out of the six pre-service teacher education programs. Seven out of ten were seniors and the remaining three were juniors. All were females and had completed the practicum. Prior to interviews, interviewees signed a consent form (see Appendix D for consent form for interview) on a voluntary basis. All interviews were guided by the same interview guide. Interviews were conducted in Korean, the native language of both the interviewer and the interviewees for ease of communication and audio-recorded and transcribed. Each interview was approximately between 50 and 60 minutes long. All interviews took place in the interviewees’ universities. They were paid for their participation.

3.2.6. Data analysis

This section discusses two key parts of the data analysis procedure: the quantitative data and the qualitative data analysis.

3.2.6.1. Quantitative data analysis

Quantitative data were analyzed using the software SPSS to answer the research questions 1, 3, 4, and 5. Following other research literature on ESOL teacher beliefs, the Likert-derived data in this study were treated at the interval level where numbers on the scale not only have directionality but also are an equal distance apart. Research questions 1, 3, and 4 were answered through descriptive statistics of the
questionnaire data. Measurements of descriptive statistics, means and standard deviations, were computed to explore overall trends in the Korean EFL pre-service secondary school teachers’ beliefs about English language education in Korea (research question 1) and their perceptions of the government initiated reforms of English language education (research question 3) and their teaching practice related to such reforms (research question 4). To answer research question 5 that explores the relations among three variables: pre-service teachers’ beliefs and their perceptions and teaching practice, correlation coefficient, Pearson’s r, was calculated. I consulted an expert in statistical analysis about the quantitative data analysis procedures of this study.

3.2.6.2. Qualitative data analysis

The interview data and answers to the open-ended questions in the questionnaire were analyzed qualitatively to answer the research questions 1, 2, 3, and 4. Merriam (1998) defines data analysis as “the process of making sense out of the data. And making sense out of data involves consolidating, reducing, and interpreting what people said and what the researcher has seen and read – it is the process of making meaning” (p. 178). Thus, qualitative data analysis in this study was the process of making sense out of what the respondents wrote in response in the questionnaire and said in the interviews by reconstruction of and interpretation of information gathered. The main purpose of the qualitative data analysis is to provide insights and understanding about Korean EFL pre-service secondary school teachers’ beliefs about English language education and their perceptions and implementation of the government initiated reforms of English language education. However, I am
aware that it is difficult to claim generalizability based on data collected from only ten participants.

The qualitative data analysis in this study followed thematic analysis. Braun and Clarke (2006) present thematic analysis as “a foundational method for qualitative analysis” (p. 78) and define it as “a method for identifying, analyzing, and reporting patterns within data” (p. 79). Thematic analysis involves multiple readings of and coding of qualitative data, and categorizing of emerging themes. For the analysis of the qualitative data in this study, I generally followed the six phases of thematic analysis recommended by Braun and Clarke (2006) as follows: (a) familiarizing yourself with your data, (b) generating initial codes, (c) searching for themes, (d) reviewing themes, (e) defining and naming themes, and (f) producing the report. Following these guidelines, I first acquainted myself with the preliminary data through perusing the verbatim transcripts of interviews. In this phase, Braun and Clarke recommend generating an initial list of ideas about what is in the data and what is interesting about them. I read and reread interview transcripts to get a general sense of what was in the data and wrote down initial impressions and ideas. In the second phase, I generated initial codes that “identify a feature of the data that appears interesting to” me (Boyatzis, 1998, p. 63, cited in Braun and Clark, 2006). I paid special attention to segments of the transcripts that I thought might be relevant to and helpful for answering research questions. In the third phase, I identified recurrent codes. These recurrent codes were sorted into potential themes. In the fourth phase, I reviewed the potential themes identified. I examined if any of these themes could be merged together. In the fifth phase, I finalized emergent themes and named them. The
final stage in data analysis included reporting the results. In presenting and discussing themes, I related the discussion to relevant research questions. Following these phases was not a linear process, however, moving from one phase to the next but it was more recursive process, moving back and forth as needed through the phases (Braun & Clark, 2006, p. 86). To validate the qualitative data analysis, I did member checks. I shared with the interview participants the transcribed interview data and initial codes generated. They checked with me if their thoughts were correctly and completely reflected in the data. They provided feedback, clarification, and/or correction if necessary and further added if there was anything they wanted to add.

3.2.6.3. Synthesizing quantitative and qualitative data

In this study, data from different sources (i.e. the quantitative and qualitative data) were collated to provide collective answers to research questions. Cohen, Manion, and Morrison (2007, p. 468) noted that collation of different data sources enables “patterns, relationships, comparisons, and qualifications across data types to be explored conveniently and clearly.” The quantitative and qualitative data in this study spoke to each other in a coherent way and the synthesis of these two data granted important insights into research questions.

3.3. Limitations of the study

The purpose of this study is not to investigate core beliefs about the second language acquisition process or to make a direct connection to actual language learning in the classroom context, rather the focus of this study is to explore core beliefs about the second language pedagogy. This study only focuses on self-reported
data. Thus, without classroom observation data, this study cannot make a generalization about what actually happens in classroom teaching.

Self-report data may not be free from potential biases and limitations, which can affect and limit the validity and reliability of the information so gathered (Donaldson & Grant-Vallone, 2002). Survey respondents in this study might answer questionnaires in a biased manner in that they overreport desirable beliefs and or teaching behavior or underreport undesirable beliefs and or teaching behavior so that their answers would be socially desirable. Self-report data may also be biased by a person’s feelings at the time he or she filled out the questionnaire. If a person feels bad at the time the questionnaire is filled out, her answers will be more negative and if the person feels good at the time, then the answers will be more positive (Northrup, 1997). The respondents in this study are not insulated from this problem.

3.4. Summary of chapter 3

This chapter discussed the methodologies used in the present study. This study was designed to be a mixed-methods inquiry. 204 Korean EFL pre-service teachers from six EFL pre-service secondary school teacher education programs in Korea participated in this study. Quantitative and qualitative data were collected using a self-reported questionnaire and interviews. Descriptions of the questionnaire were presented. Validation of the questionnaire was discussed. The interviews were conducted using the interview guide. Detailed discussions of the data collection and data analysis procedures were presented. The quantitative analysis and qualitative analysis were given equal weights. The final analysis was made by synthesizing the
quantitative and qualitative analyses and conclusions were drawn from the joint results. This chapter also discussed limitations of the study.
Chapter 4: Quantitative Results

The purpose of the current research is to explore Korean EFL pre-service secondary school teachers’ beliefs about English language education in Korea and their perceptions and implementation of the MOE-initiated reforms of English language education. This is a self-report based study. In this chapter, results of the quantitative analyses are presented. Results of the qualitative analyses will be reported in Chapter 5. The purpose of the analyses is to explore how closely Korean EFL pre-service secondary school teachers’ beliefs about English language education in Korea and their perceptions and self-reported implementation of the MOE-initiated reform efforts to improve English language education align with communication-oriented English language teaching. This chapter provides answers to research questions 1, 3, 4, and 5. Statistical results reported include descriptive statistics (means and standard deviations) that answer research questions 1, 3, and 4 and correlation coefficient results that address research question 5.

Likert scale values used in the quantitative analysis are characterized as follows:

7: strongly agree
6: agree
5: somewhat agree
4: neutral
3: somewhat disagree
2: disagree
1: strongly disagree
4.1. Research question 1: Descriptive statistics of participants’ self-reported beliefs about English language education in Korea

In the survey questionnaire, twenty-two items concern beliefs about English language education in Korea. Each respondent was asked to read each item and then to respond on a 7 point scale ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (7) with neutral (4) in the middle. The purpose of the descriptive statistics analyses in this section is to reveal how closely the respondents’ beliefs about English language education in Korea align with communication-oriented English language education. The items were randomized when the actual questionnaire was made. To make a more effective presentation of the results, items measuring the same belief categories (i.e. the nature of foreign language learning, the nature of teaching, teaching goals, teaching methods, and teacher roles) were grouped together.

Table 4.1 reports the results. Items C1 to C5 relates to the nature of foreign language learning. Items C1 and C2 concern communication-based foreign language learning and items C3 to C5 relate to foreign language learning that focuses on grammar and vocabulary learning and translating into one’s native language.
Table 4.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Sig</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>It is better to learn a foreign language in real life situation.</td>
<td>5.79</td>
<td>Sig&gt;</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>It is important to engage in authentic language use.</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>Sig&gt;</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3</td>
<td>Learning a foreign language is mostly a matter of learning a lot of grammar rules.</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>Sig&lt;</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4</td>
<td>Learning a foreign language is mostly a matter of translating into one’s native language.</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>Sig&lt;</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C5</td>
<td>Learning a foreign language is mostly a matter of learning a lot of new vocabulary words.</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>Sig&gt;</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Sig> indicates that we reject the contention that the population mean is less than or equal to 4.0.
Sig< indicates that we reject the contention that the population mean is greater than or equal to 4.0.

The respondents somewhat agreed that learning a foreign language in a real life situation is better (M = 5.79) and agreed that engaging in authentic language use is important (M = 6.25). Conversely, they disagreed that learning a foreign language is mainly about learning grammar rules (M = 2.90) and about translating into one’s native language (M = 2.77). They were only slightly positive regarding the importance of learning new vocabulary words (M = 4.46). The results indicate that the respondents’ beliefs about the nature of foreign language learning more closely align with communication-oriented foreign language learning than with grammar and translation focused foreign language learning.

For significance test, the following criteria were applied in this study. One-sided test was used at the significance level of \( \alpha = 0.05 \). If \( n = 194 \), then \( df = 193 \).
Null hypothesis that population mean (\( \mu \)) is equal to 4 was rejected, either if \( t \) observed value is greater than or equal to 1.660, or if \( t \) observed value is lower than -
1.660. Otherwise, the null hypothesis was not rejected. Sig> indicates that t observed value of an item being assessed is above 1.660 and thus the null hypothesis is rejected and that the population mean of that item is greater than the neutral response value of 4. Sig< indicates that t observed value of an item being assessed is below -1.660 and thus the null hypothesis is rejected and that the population mean of that item is lower than the neutral response value of 4. NSD indicates that t observed value of an item being assessed is neither greater than or equal to 1.660 nor lower than or equal to -1.660 and thus the null hypothesis is failed to reject and that the population mean of that item is not significantly different from the neutral response value of 4.

Items C6 to C9 concern the nature of teaching. Items C6 and C7 relate to teacher-centered teaching. Items C8 and C9 concern student-centered teaching. The results are reported in Table 4.2. The respondents somewhat disagreed with the view that teaching is mainly about explaining correct solutions (M = 3.36), while they did agree that teaching is to help students develop solutions to problems on their own (M = 6.00) and to facilitate their learning (M = 6.22). The respondents were neutral about the view that teaching is to transfer knowledge (M = 4.03). The results show that the respondents’ beliefs about the nature of teaching more closely align with student-centered teaching that is supported by the MOE’s communication focused English language education reforms.
Table 4.2

**Beliefs about the nature of teaching**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Sig</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C6</td>
<td>Teaching is all about explaining correct solutions.</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>Sig&lt;</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C7</td>
<td>Teaching is a process of transferring knowledge.</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>NSD</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C8</td>
<td>Teaching is a process of helping students develop solutions to problems on their own.</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>Sig&gt;</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C9</td>
<td>Teaching is a process of facilitating students’ learning.</td>
<td>6.22</td>
<td>Sig&gt;</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Sig< indicates that we reject the contention that the population mean is less than or equal to 4.0. Sig> indicates that we reject the contention that the population mean is greater than or equal to 4.0. NSD indicates that the population mean is not significantly different from 4.

Items C10 to C13 concern beliefs about EFL teaching goals in Korea. Items C10 and C11 relate to communication focused teaching goals, whereas items C12 and C13 concern reading and grammar focused teaching goals. Table 4.3 reports the results.

Table 4.3

**Beliefs about Korean EFL teaching goals**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Sig</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C10</td>
<td>Speaking skills are more important than reading skills.</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>NSD</td>
<td>1.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C11</td>
<td>The goal of English teaching should be preparing students to communicate fluently (listen and speak) in English.</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>Sig&gt;</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C12</td>
<td>The goal of English teaching should be preparing students to read passages in English and translate them into the Korean language accurately.</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>Sig&lt;</td>
<td>1.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C13 In the Korean EFL classroom, grammatical knowledge should be more emphasized than use of English in an interactive way.

*Note.* Sig> indicates that we reject the contention that the population mean is less than or equal to 4.0. Sig< indicates that we reject the contention that the population mean is greater than or equal to 4.0. NSD indicates that the population mean is not significantly different from 4.

---

The respondents somewhat disagreed that speaking skills are more important than reading skills (M = 3.97). They were neutral about the primacy of developing fluency (M = 4.77). They somewhat disagreed that the development of reading and translation skills should be the goal of English instruction (M = 3.52). They disagreed with the primacy of the development of grammatical knowledge over the use of English in an interactive way (M = 2.72). In conclusion, the respondents seem to consider the development of both reading and communication skills to be the primary goals of EFL education of Korea.

Items C14 to C19 relate to beliefs about Korean EFL teaching methods. Items C14 to C16 concern teaching methods that are promoted by the MOE’s reform efforts, while items C17 to C19 relate to the older, traditional teaching methods. The results are reported in Table 4.4.
Table 4.4

**Beliefs about Korean EFL teaching methods**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Sig</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C14</td>
<td>Pair and small group activities between students help improve their English.</td>
<td>5.85</td>
<td>Sig&gt;</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C15</td>
<td>It is important to practice English in real-life like situations.</td>
<td>5.88</td>
<td>Sig&gt;</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C16</td>
<td>Practicing English in communicative activities is essential to eventual mastery of English.</td>
<td>6.15</td>
<td>Sig&gt;</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C17</td>
<td>Practicing grammar patterns is essential to eventual mastery of English.</td>
<td>5.09</td>
<td>Sig&gt;</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C18</td>
<td>Memorizing new vocabulary words is an important part of English learning.</td>
<td>5.73</td>
<td>Sig&gt;</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C19</td>
<td>To repeat and memorize a lot are important strategies in learning English.</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>Sig&gt;</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Sig> indicates that we reject the contention that the population mean is less than or equal to 4.0.

In general, the respondents indicated their support for the teaching methods that promote communication. They somewhat agreed that pair and small group activities help students improve English (M = 5.85) and that practicing of authentic English language is important (M = 5.88). They agreed with the primacy of practicing English in communicative activities (M = 6.15). The respondents, however, also indicated some support for the teaching methods that the MOE discourages. They somewhat agreed that practicing grammar patterns (M = 5.09) and memorizing new vocabulary words (M = 5.73) are important for mastering English. They were only slightly positive about the view that repetition and memorization are important strategies in learning English (M = 4.82). This implies that vocabulary is a special case for them and they might have thought that vocabulary is in part best learned by memorization. In summary, although the respondents seem to consider the teaching methods that promote communication to be important for mastering English, they...
also seem not to disregard strongly the traditional teaching methods such as practicing grammar and memorizing words.

Items C20 to C22 relate to beliefs about Korean EFL teacher roles. Item C20 concerns the Korean traditional view of teacher roles and items C21 and C22 regard teacher roles that the MOE’s reform efforts promote. Table 4.5 shows the results. The respondents agreed with the view of teacher as a facilitator (M = 6.13) and as a resource provider (M = 5.96). They were neutral about the view of teacher as an authority figure (M = 4.13). The results indicate that the respondents’ beliefs about teacher roles more closely align with those the MOE’s reform efforts uphold.

Table 4.5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Sig</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C20</td>
<td>Teachers must establish authority in order to effectively lead a class.</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>NSD</td>
<td>1.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C21</td>
<td>Teachers should facilitate learners to perform tasks and activities by themselves.</td>
<td>6.13</td>
<td>Sig&gt;</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C22</td>
<td>Teachers should play a role as a resource provider.</td>
<td>5.96</td>
<td>Sig&gt;</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Sig> indicates that we reject the contention that the population mean is less than or equal to 4.0. NSD indicates that the population mean is not significantly different from 4.

In summary, the Korean EFL pre-service secondary school teachers’ beliefs about the nature of foreign language learning more closely aligned with communication-oriented foreign language learning than with grammar, vocabulary, and translation focused foreign language learning. Their beliefs about the nature of teaching more closely aligned with student-centered teaching than with teacher-centered teaching. Their beliefs about teaching goals seem rather mixed. As shown in
Table 4.3, the development of both reading and speaking skills seems to be perceived as an important teaching goal. Beliefs about teaching methods seem also rather mixed. As shown in Table 4.4, it appears that not only teaching methods that promote communication but also traditional teaching methods such as practicing grammar and memorizing words are perceived as important. Beliefs about teacher roles closely aligned with a view of teacher as a facilitator and a resource provider rather than as an authority figure. Combining all five belief categories together, the Korean EFL pre-service secondary school teachers’ beliefs about English language education in Korea more closely, but not very strongly, align with communication-based English language teaching ($M = 4.94$, $t = 26.71$, $SD = .49$) and more importantly, some beliefs seem to be contrasting with one another (e.g. beliefs about teaching goals and beliefs about teaching methods). This finding of holding contrasting beliefs needs to be attended in the analysis of the qualitative data.

4.2. Research question 3: Descriptive statistics of participants’ perceptions of the MOE-initiated reforms of English language education

In the survey questionnaire, six items (D1 to D6) concern perceptions of the MOE-initiated reforms of English language education. The items were randomized in the actual questionnaire. The purpose of descriptive statistics analyses in this section is to explore how closely the Korean EFL pre-service secondary school teachers’ perceptions of the MOE-initiated reforms align with communication-focused English language education. A scale value of 7 indicates that perception of the MOE-initiated reform is strongly based on communication-oriented English language education. A scale value of 1 indicates perception of the MOE-initiated reform that is strongly
based on traditional English language education of Korea. Table 4.6 reports
descriptive statistics analyses of the respondents’ perceptions of each of the reform
policies.

Table 4.6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Sig</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D1</td>
<td>It is important to expose students to native speakers of English.</td>
<td>5.88</td>
<td>Sig&gt;</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2</td>
<td>In English class, teachers need to speak English fluently in order to teach effectively.</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>Sig&gt;</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3</td>
<td>It is important to include a section of testing English listening comprehension in the national college entrance exam.</td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td>Sig&gt;</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4</td>
<td>English language education should be included in primary school education, if it is not in kindergarten.</td>
<td>5.23</td>
<td>Sig&gt;</td>
<td>1.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D5</td>
<td>In English class, teachers should use English most of time.</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>NSD</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D6</td>
<td>Students should be able to take an English course depending on their individual proficiency. Mean of the means</td>
<td>5.88</td>
<td>Sig&gt;</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>Sig&gt;</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Sig> indicates that we reject the contention that the population mean is less than or equal to 4.0.
NSD indicates that the population mean is not significantly different from 4.

Item D1 relates to the reform policies such as TaLK and EPIK that employ native English-speaking teachers to help improve Korean English learners’ communicative skills. The respondents somewhat agreed with this reform (M = 5.88).

Item D2 concerns communication-oriented MOE’s reforms that expect Korean EFL teachers to speak fluently in English. The respondents somewhat agreed with this MOE’s expectation (M = 5.75). Item D3 relates to the MOE’s reform that includes a listening test in the national college entrance exam that would otherwise include only grammar, vocabulary, and reading. Item D4 concerns the EEL reform policy that
begins English language education in the primary school. The respondents somewhat agreed with both the inclusion of a listening section in the national exam (M = 5.04) and the inclusion of English language education in the primary school (M = 5.23). Item D5 relates to the TEE reform policy that encourages the use of English as a medium of instruction. The respondents’ perceptions of teaching English in English were rather mixed (M = 4.06). Putting together their perceptions of all six reform policies, the Korean EFL pre-service secondary school teachers’ perceptions about the MOE-initiated reforms of English language education more closely align with communication-based English language education but are not very strongly oriented to communication-oriented English language education (M = 5.30). Mixed perceptions of the TEE reform policy found seem to contradict some of the respondents’ beliefs that are based on communication-oriented English language education. This contradiction needs to be attended to in the analysis of the qualitative data.

4.3. Research question 4: Descriptive statistics of participants’ self-reported implementation of the MOE-initiated reforms of English language education in their practicum

In the survey questionnaire, six items (E1 to E6) concern teaching practice in relation to the curricular reforms promoted by the Korean government. The items were randomized in the actual questionnaire. The purpose of descriptive statistics analyses in this section is to explore how closely the Korean EFL pre-service secondary school teachers’ self-reported implementation of the MOE-initiated reforms of English language education in the practicum align with communication-
focused English language education. A scale value of 7 indicates a teaching practice that is strongly based on communication-oriented English language education. A scale value of 1 indicates a teaching practice that is strongly oriented to the traditional English language education of Korea. Table 4.7 presents descriptive statistics analyses of self-reported implementation of reform policies.

Table 4.7

*Implementation of the MOE-initiated reforms of English language education in practicum*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Sig</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E1</td>
<td>I spoke English for classroom instruction most of time.</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>Sig&lt;</td>
<td>1.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E2</td>
<td>I often used authentic materials that provide genuine and real-life situations.</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td>Sig&gt;</td>
<td>1.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E3</td>
<td>I considered students’ interests when designing lessons.</td>
<td>5.73</td>
<td>Sig&gt;</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4</td>
<td>I often provided pair or small group activities that made the students interact in English.</td>
<td>5.63</td>
<td>Sig&gt;</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E5</td>
<td>I provided tasks appropriate to the students’ proficiency level.</td>
<td>5.53</td>
<td>Sig&gt;</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E6</td>
<td>I often selected learning tasks that engage students in meaningful and authentic language use.</td>
<td>5.11</td>
<td>Sig&gt;</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean of the means</td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td>Sig&gt;</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Sig> indicates that we reject the contention that the population mean is less than or equal to 4.0. Sig< indicates that we reject the contention that the population mean is greater than or equal to 4.0.

Item E1 relates to the TEE reform policy. The respondents’ use of English as a medium of instruction seems to be limited. They somewhat disagreed that they taught English in English (M = 3.29). Items E2 and E6 concern authentic English language teaching. It seems that the respondents had made efforts but not much to engage students in learning authentic English language. They somewhat agreed that they often used authentic materials (M = 4.94) and that they often engaged students in learning tasks that promote authentic English language use (M = 5.11). Items E3 and
E5 relate to student-centered instruction. The respondents seem to have made some but not much effort to provide student-centered instruction. They somewhat agreed that they considered students’ interests when designing lessons (M = 5.73) and that they provided tasks appropriate to students’ proficiency level (M = 5.53). Item E4 concerns communication-focused English language teaching. The respondents somewhat agreed that they often provided pair or small group activities for students to interact in English (M = 5.63). Putting together the self-reported teaching practices related to the MOE-initiated reforms, the Korean EFL pre-service secondary school teachers’ self-reported implementation of the reforms in the practicum more closely aligns with communication-based English language education but is not very strongly oriented to communication-focused English language education (M = 5.04). Low implementation of teaching English in English and of authentic materials use seems to contradict some of the respondents’ beliefs that are based on communication-oriented English language education. This contradiction needs to be attended to in the analysis of the qualitative data.

4.4. Research question 5: Relations between participants’ self-reported beliefs and their perceptions of and self-reported implementation of the MOE-initiated reforms

A Pearson product-moment correlation was run to determine the relations between Korean EFL pre-service secondary school teachers’ beliefs about English language education in Korea and their perceptions of the MOE-initiated reforms of English language education. Table 4.8 presents the results.
Table 4.8

**Correlation between beliefs about English language education and perceptions of the MOE-initiated reforms**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Beliefs with Perceptions</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>.143</td>
<td>.047</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is a correlation between the respondents’ beliefs about English language education and their perceptions of the MOE-initiated reforms. However, because of the small value of the sample correlation ($r = .143, n = 194, \ p = .047$), the strength of the correlation in the population is concluded to be weak.

A Pearson product-moment correlation was run to determine the relations between Korean EFL pre-service secondary school teachers’ beliefs about English language education in Korea and their self-reported implementation of the MOE-initiated reforms of English language education in the practicum. Table 4.9 presents the results.

Table 4.9

**Correlation between beliefs about English language education and implementation of the MOE-initiated reforms**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Beliefs with Implementation</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td>.493</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is no significant correlation between the respondents’ beliefs about English language education and their self-reported implementation of the MOE-initiated reforms ($r = .068, n = 103, \ p = .493$).

A Pearson product-moment correlation was run to determine the relations between Korean EFL pre-service secondary school teachers’ perceptions of and self-
reported implementation of the MOE-initiated reforms of English language education.

The results are shown in Table 4.10.

Table 4.10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceptions with Implementation</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.071</td>
<td>.478</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is no significant correlation between the respondents’ perceptions of and their self-reported implementation of the MOE-initiated reforms \( r = .071, n = 103, p = .478 \). In summary, there is no significant correlation between Korean EFL pre-service secondary school teachers’ beliefs about English language education in Korea and their perceptions of and self-reported implementation of the MOE-initiated reforms of English language education.

In the survey questionnaire, the respondents were also asked to indicate their experience as English learners in the secondary school and the training they received at their teacher education program. In the following section, I will discuss the findings. Six items in the survey questionnaire (B1 to B6) explored the Korean EFL pre-service secondary school teachers’ experiences as English learners in the secondary school. These items were randomized in the actual questionnaire. Table 4.11 presents descriptive statistics analyses of experiences as English learners.
Table 4.11

*Experiences as English learners in the secondary school*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Sig</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>My secondary school English teachers often designed activities to have us interact in English with peers and or teachers.</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>Sig&lt;</td>
<td>1.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>English learning in my secondary school was mainly grammar-focused.</td>
<td>5.77</td>
<td>Sig&gt;</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3</td>
<td>The language that my secondary school English teachers used in the classroom was mostly Korean.</td>
<td>6.30</td>
<td>Sig&gt;</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4</td>
<td>My secondary school English teachers put much emphasis on rote learning of words.</td>
<td>5.93</td>
<td>Sig&gt;</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B5</td>
<td>My secondary school English teachers put much emphasis on reading skills.</td>
<td>6.01</td>
<td>Sig&gt;</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Sig> indicates that we reject the contention that the population mean is less than or equal to 4.0. Sig< indicates that we reject the contention that the population mean is greater than or equal to 4.0.

The respondents somewhat disagreed that their secondary school English teachers often designed activities to have them interact in English with peers and or teachers (M = 3.25). In contrast, they somewhat agreed that English learning in their secondary school was mainly grammar-focused (M = 5.77). They agreed that their secondary school English teachers taught mostly in the Korean language (M = 6.30) and that their teachers put much emphasis on rote learning of words (M = 5.93) and on reading skills (M = 6.01). These results indicate that the Korean EFL secondary school pre-service teachers’ experiences as English learners align with the older, traditional EFL education of Korea that puts much emphasis on grammar, vocabulary, and reading learning.

In the survey questionnaire, six items (F1 to F6) concern training that the Korean EFL pre-service secondary school teachers received at their teacher education
program in relation to the MOE-initiated reforms. Table 4.12 presents descriptive statistics analyses of each training item related to the reforms that the respondents received.

Table 4.12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Sig</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F1</td>
<td>My teacher education program promoted flexibility in using different teaching approaches to meet different students’ needs and interests.</td>
<td>5.35</td>
<td>Sig&gt;</td>
<td>1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F2</td>
<td>I received adequate training in using various learning activities that make the students interact in English.</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>Sig&gt;</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F3</td>
<td>I received adequate training in teaching English in English.</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>Sig&gt;</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F4</td>
<td>I received adequate training in using learning tasks that Promote authentic language use.</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>Sig&gt;</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F5</td>
<td>In many of the courses that I took, a variety of communication-centered English language opportunities were included (e.g. debating in English in class, group presentation in English).</td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td>Sig&gt;</td>
<td>1.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F6</td>
<td>I received adequate training in using and adapting authentic materials for English language teaching.</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>Sig&gt;</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Sig> indicates that we reject the contention that the population mean is less than or equal to 4.0.

The respondents somewhat agreed that their teacher education program promoted student-centered teaching that considers different students’ learning needs and interests (M = 5.35). Training in interactive English language teaching seems to not have been adequate for the respondents. Their responses were mixed about receiving training in interactive English language teaching (M = 4.55). Similarly, training in teaching English in English and authentic language teaching seems to have been perceived as inadequate by the respondents. Their responses were mixed about receiving training in teaching English in English (M = 4.42) and about receiving adequate training in using learning tasks that promote authentic language use (M =
4.72) and about receiving adequate training in using authentic English learning materials (M = 4.67). The respondents seem not to have had many opportunities to develop their fluency in English. They were neutral about that courses they took included various opportunities to communicate in English (M = 4.91). In summary, the results indicate that the Korean EFL pre-service secondary school teachers did not receive adequate training with respect to the MOE-initiated curricular reforms in their teacher education programs.

4.5. Summary of chapter 4

This chapter discussed results of the quantitative analysis. The chapter provided answers to research questions 1, 3, 4, and 5. The results of the quantitative analysis include the following findings. First, the respondents reported that they hold some beliefs that resonate with communication-oriented English language education that emphasizes spoken communicative competence and skills, student-centered teaching, authentic language use, interactive language learning, fluency, and facilitation of learning. They also reported that they hold other beliefs that resonate with the older, traditional English language education of Korea that emphasizes grammar, vocabulary, and reading learning. Taken as a whole, the respondents’ beliefs about English language education in Korea largely more closely, but not very strongly, align with communication-oriented English language education. The respondents’ holding of beliefs that contrast with one another (e.g. beliefs about Korean EFL teaching goals that consider the development of both reading and communication skills to be important) needs to be more fully explored in the qualitative data analysis.
Second, the respondents were somewhat positive about the MOE-initiated reform policies such as employing native English-speaking teachers, communicative language teaching that requires teachers to speak fluently in English, the inclusion of a listening test in the national college entrance exam, and the inclusion of English language education in primary school. Their perceptions of teaching English in English were mixed. All things taken together, the respondents indicated a weak support for the MOE’s communication oriented reforms of English education. The mixed perception of the teaching English in English policy seems to contradict some of the respondents’ reported beliefs that are based on communication-oriented English language education. This contradiction needs to be more fully explored in the qualitative data analysis.

Third, the respondents’ self-reported implementation of the MOE-initiated reform policies in the practicum seems to be limited. They somewhat disagreed with their use of English as a medium of instruction. They somewhat agreed with their often engaging students in authentic language learning and with their provision of student-centered instruction and of learning activities that promote interaction in English. The respondents were neutral about their frequent use of authentic materials. Taken together, the respondents reported having not fully implemented the MOE-initiated curricular reforms in the practicum. This low extent of implementation of the reforms in general and especially the low degree of implementing the teaching English in English policy and authentic materials use seem to contradict some of the respondents’ reported beliefs that are based on communication-oriented English
language education. This contradiction needs to be attended to and to be fully explored in the qualitative data analysis.

Fourth, no significant correlation was found between the respondents’ reported beliefs about English language education in Korea and their perceptions of and self-reported implementation of the MOE-initiated reforms of English language education. In the qualitative data analysis, special attention needs to be paid to any possible causes of this absence of significant relations.

Fifth, the respondents indicated that their experiences as English learners in secondary school were based on the older, traditional EFL education of Korea that puts much emphasis on grammar, vocabulary, and reading learning. The respondents’ experiences as English learners in secondary school that are based on Korean traditional EFL education and their reported beliefs that are based on communication-oriented English language education seem to contrast with one another. This mismatch needs to be attended to and to be fully explored in the qualitative data analysis.

Sixth, the respondents indicated that at their pre-service teacher education program, they did not receive adequate training with respect to the MOE-initiated curricular reforms. More training seems to be needed with emphases on designing lessons that consider different students’ learning needs and interests, interactive English language teaching, using English as a medium of instruction, authentic language teaching, and developing fluency in English. Based on this finding, I can make a logical supposition that this lack of training may provide one possible explanation for the abovementioned gap between the respondents’ reported beliefs
that are based on communication-oriented EFL education and their low degree of implementation of communication-oriented MOE’s curricular reforms of Korean EFL education. However, reasons and explanations for such a gap needs to be more fully explored in the qualitative data analysis.
Chapter 5: Qualitative Results

In this chapter, results of the qualitative data analysis are presented. This chapter provides answers to research questions 1, 2, 3, and 4. In chapter 6, results of the analyses of the quantitative and the qualitative data will be synthesized and discussed. The purpose of the analysis in this chapter is to explore how closely Korean EFL pre-service secondary school teachers’ beliefs about English language education in Korea and their perception and implementation of the MOE-initiated reform about English language education align with communication-oriented English language teaching. The qualitative data in the present study includes interviews with ten interviewees and answers to one open-ended question in the survey questionnaire. In presenting and discussing themes, I related the discussion to relevant research questions. I provided detailed discussion of themes with specific illustrations, quotations, and different perspectives of the interviewees. Table 5.1 presents the finalized fourteen themes that were identified in the analysis of the interview data. These themes are subsumed under four categories such as ‘beliefs about English language education in Korea’, ‘beliefs sources’, ‘perceptions of the MOE-initiated reform policies’, and ‘impediments to the implementation of the MOE-initiated reform policies’.
Table 5.1

Themes identified in the interview data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Beliefs about English language education in Korea</td>
<td>(a) significance of authentic language education in Korea (b) significance of developing communication skills in spoken English (c) importance of grammar and reading (d) importance of providing interactive language learning opportunities (e) teacher’s role as a facilitator and/or a resource provider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Beliefs sources</td>
<td>(a) experience as English learner as a positive or negative model (b) experience in English speaking countries (c) practicum experience (d) pre-service teacher education program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Perceptions of the MOE-initiated reform policies</td>
<td>(a) importance of early English language education reform policies (b) negative perception of teaching English in English (c) ineffectiveness of native English-speaking teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Impediments to the implementation</td>
<td>(a) lack of adequate training in communicative language teaching of the MOE-initiated reform policies (b) test-driven English language education of Korea</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.1. Research question 1: Beliefs about English language education in Korea

The interview data provided in-depth information of and elaboration on the beliefs about English language education that the Korean EFL pre-service secondary school teachers have. The analysis of the interview data reveals five emergent themes. They are a) significance of authentic language learning, b) significance of developing communication skills in spoken English, c) importance of grammar and reading, d) importance of providing interactive language learning opportunities, and e) the
teacher’s role as a facilitator and a resource provider. In the following section, each theme will be discussed in detail.

Significance of authentic language learning. Most interviewees reported the importance of authentic language learning for a primary reason that most Korean students learn English mainly depending on textbooks that lack authentic language inputs. In the interviews was often noted making use of movies, TV soap operas, and TV talk shows for teaching students authentic English language. Keun Hee particularly discussed how to engage students in authentic language learning by using multimedia:

Instead of inviting students to watch a TV talk show that they wouldn’t comprehend, choose …the movie, The Avengers, for example. There are many discussion and debate internet sites where native speakers of English share their opinions regarding the movie. Some people say Iron Man is better and other say they prefer Captain America. Students can read what native speakers of English wrote … Incorporating such internet sites into classroom learning not only makes learning interesting but also exposes students to authentic language.

In order to make learning interesting and to make students more engaged in learning, it is important that teachers put students’ interests into consideration when they select authentic language materials, as Min Ah noted:

Teachers should first learn about their students’ interests … what they, the teachers, think interesting and fun would not necessarily by interesting and fun for their students.
For these pre-service teachers, not only students’ interests but also their proficiency level needs to be an important consideration for all teachers in selecting authentic learning materials. Min Ji recollected her high school listening class in which the teacher used various authentic materials. She noted that the teacher had to but failed to consider varied levels of students’ English proficiency and prepare authentic learning materials accordingly:

One drawback about that listening class was that only those who were advanced in English actively participated in class. Those who were not remained silent when doing group works for example and were very passive in learning just following other actively participating students. I wish that the teacher also prepared easier listening materials that would encourage more participation from those who were not advanced.

In short, most interviewees reported holding the belief that learning authentic English language is important for Korean EFL students for a primary reason that English learning of Korean students is mostly relied on textbooks that lack authentic language inputs. Some mentioned making use of such authentic learning materials as movies, TV soap operas, TV talk shows, and multimedia. Others offered cautions that teachers need to consider students’ various proficiency levels and interest, when providing authentic learning materials. These findings indicate that the interviewees’ beliefs about authentic language learning are largely consistent with the MOE reform efforts that encourage the use of authentic language learning materials in English language teaching.
Significance of developing communication skills in spoken English. One of the most oft-mentioned goals of English language education in Korea reported by the interviewees was the development of communication skills in spoken English, as exemplified by Hyo Jung here:

We need to teach English which students can use but in Korea in my opinion it’s all about teaching to the test. What’s the use of learning English for 10 years? We can’t even speak a word of English when we go abroad. In fact, I myself also can’t speak in English fluently. Is there any point in learning English then? We should learn English language to be able to speak. As with Korean language, we need to learn English language so that we can communicate with others.

Hyo Jung’s remark implies that developing students’ communication skills as an educational goal has not been successfully achieved and grammar and reading focused English lesson appears to be a reason. Both Joo Hee and Yoo Na noted that too much time of English class is devoted to teaching and learning of grammar and reading. They indicated that teachers should put first providing English class that helps students learn the language they can use.

The primacy of English language learning as the means to communicate seems to become more evident when considering the English learning context of Korea that has little English language input. Min Ah remarked:

Unlike an ESL context where English is provided not only in the classroom but also outside the classroom, for Korean students, little opportunity exists for exposure to the English language outside the classroom, unless they
themselves exert special efforts to get it. To compensate for this
disadvantaged English learning environment, teachers should provide as many
learning tasks and activities as possible that will encourage students to
communicate with one another in English.

What is important in developing students’ communication skills is that students
experience meaningful English language learning, as Tae Yeon noted:

I once had an opportunity to examine an English textbook used in Philippines.
I was very much impressed by the way the textbook was designed and
organized. The textbook seemed to be very useful for learning how to think
like a native English speaker. I wished we also had English textbooks like that
in Korea. I really wish students could learn English that they can use in real
life.

Although the interviewees considered developing students’ communicative
competence as an important goal of English language education, not all of them seem
to have the same level of support for that goal. Keun Hee, for example, pointed out
that not all students should be required to be fluent in English:

Not all students are to become an English teacher nor are all of them to
immigrate to English speaking countries. Not all students need to be fluent in
English. Korean English learners just need to be able to do basic
communication in English. Developing basic skills of communication in
English should be required for all students but not more than that.

Offering a warning against giving too much emphasis on fluency in English, Min Ji
blamed social pressure for the need to become fluent in English, which only makes
“Koreans agitated about their lack of fluency”. She noted that making all Korean students attain fluency in English is just waste of money and time.

In summary, all the interviewees reported holding the beliefs that the development of Korean English learners’ communicative competence in spoken English should be a teaching goal of EFL education in Korea. This educational goal appears to have been not much achieved and teachers’ putting priority on teaching grammar and reading seems to cause the problem. Korean EFL learning context where there is little English input outside the classroom enhances the need for teachers to provide students with necessary instructional support for developing communicative competence and teachers need to ensure meaningful English language learning for students in their effort to develop students’ communication skills. Some interviewees, although they believed in the necessity of developing communication skills, still offered caution against putting too much focus on fluency. These results show that the interviewees’ reported beliefs about EFL teaching goals in Korea are largely aligned with efforts of the MOE to reform English language education which is to become more communication-oriented, but that some have reservations.

*Importance of grammar and reading.* One prevalent view held among the interviewees is that developing grammar and reading comprehension skills is of importance for Korean EFL students. All the interviewees commonly indicated one major reason for their belief in the importance of developing grammar and reading skills: the heavily reading and grammar-focused English tests in Korea. One typical response is as follows:

In Korea, one major purpose of English language education is to prepare students for the national college entrance exam. A large part of the English section in this exam
tests test takers’ grammar and reading competences. Thus, to be successful in this exam, it is important for students to develop competence in grammar and reading.

However, there seems to be also other added value aspects regarding the importance of grammar. Grammatical knowledge may help students develop fluency in spoken English in that with grammatical knowledge, they might be more freely accurately able to express their thought, as Min Ah pointed out:

Without receiving frequent explanations of grammatical forms, just learning daily English expressions may still help students improve speaking skills to some degree, but if students also acquire grammatical knowledge along with oral language, it would greatly benefit them because they won’t anymore need to stick only to the limited number of formulaic expressions they learned but they will be more freely accurately able to make sentences with grammatical knowledge.

Being well equipped with the grammar may also have affective influences on students’ fluency in speaking in a positive way. Yoo Na noted that grammatical knowledge gives students more confidence in speaking: “When students are very knowledgeable about grammar, they become unafraid of speaking in English because the grammar knowledge they have will give them confidence that the sentences they speak are grammatically correct.” The benefit of having sound grammatical knowledge, however, does not seem to be limited only to developing fluency. Acquiring grammatical knowledge seems to be considered as a vital part of English language learning. Hyang Ki indicated that when it comes to learning English language, grammatical knowledge is an essential element. Moreover, when it comes to teaching grammar, language learning context seems to be an important consideration in deciding how to teach grammar. Min Ji pointed out that in a context where the target language is taught and
learned only in class, explicit teaching of grammar is necessary: “In an ESL context, English learners can easily pick up grammatical knowledge in everyday life context. Unfortunately, this is not the case in Korea. In the EFL context like Korea where English is provided pretty much only in the classroom, grammar should be taught in an explicit manner.

The heavy emphasis on reading in the national college entrance English exam seems to influence how teachers teach, as Da Som emphasizes:

Due to the national college entrance exam … an English teacher of my senior year at high school taught us lots of test taking strategies. For example, when we have a reading question asking us to find a main topic or theme, the teacher taught us to read the first and last sentences of each paragraph or to look for a sentence starting with the word, ‘however’. We practiced in this way … learning how to apply reading tactics. This teaching to the test also seems to narrow teaching materials. So Youn expressed her concern about exposing students only to a narrow range of readings:

Because the English section of the national college entrance exam contains only a narrow range of reading passage, mostly academic texts and passages, students’ reading experience at schools is limited only to those particular forms of readings. While a large part of their English learning is devoted to improving their reading skills, the reading skills we are talking about here are very narrow. I am wondering how many of them ever get chances to read novels in English? I think that even for those who scored high on the college entrance English exam reading novels in English would be very challenging.

In the interviews, some raised the importance of increasing vocabulary knowledge in relation to enhancing reading proficiency. Acquiring a large number of vocabulary words is
fundamental for improving reading comprehension, as Joo Hee noted: “Vocabulary knowledge is always proportional to reading competence.” When considering the importance of increasing students’ vocabulary knowledge, how to effectively teach vocabulary may be an important decision for teachers. Teachers’ experience as English learners seems to influence this instructional decision making, as Keun Hee noted:

As an English learner, I found reciting a list of words to be effective. When I read words in context which I recited beforehand, I felt like my knowledge and comprehension got extended. I not only knew the meanings of those words but also learned about their usage, how to use those words in context. So, as an English teacher, I want to adopt both: teaching vocabulary words in context and encouraging students to recite single words in isolation.

In summary, all the interviewees reported holding the beliefs that the development of grammar and reading comprehension competences is important for Korean EFL students for the major reason that standardized English tests in Korea are heavily reading and grammar focused. Additional views on the importance of grammar were shared. Some indicated that grammatical knowledge helps students develop fluency. Others stressed that acquiring grammatical knowledge is an essential part of English language learning. The need for explicit teaching of grammar in Korea was noted. Some indicated the importance of vocabulary knowledge in developing reading skills and a positive learning effect of reciting single words in isolation as well as of learning words in context. These findings show that the interviewees’ reported beliefs about the importance of teaching and learning of grammar and reading largely resonate with the older, traditional EFL education of Korea that puts much emphasis on
vocabulary, grammar, and reading learning, but that some of the interviewees see problems with teaching to the test.

Importance of providing interactive language learning opportunities. Most of the interviewees believed that providing an interaction-rich language learning environment is an important responsibility for English teachers in Korea. Hyang Ki’s remark was typical:

Providing an interactive language learning environment for students is critical.

Engaging them in interactive language learning activities is an important job for English teachers in Korea.

The importance of providing learning opportunities in which language learners can actively interact with one another seems to become even more important when considering the typical Korean school environment where large class sizes are very common, as Keun Hee indicated:

The current average class size at secondary schools in Korea is over 30 or 35. It’s not a very desirable environment for language education. For a single teacher, it’s almost impossible to have one on one interaction with students in such large classes. So, it’s important to involve students in language learning that encourages them to interact with one another.

Such interactive language learning may offer students the opportunity to learn from each other’s speech, as some interviewees explained:

According to my experience as an English learner, I found interactive language learning to be helpful. For example, when interacting with my peers that had better English proficiency, I could learn their speech patterns or word choice. Interacting with those peers who were less proficient was also beneficial in that I became more
conscious about errors that my less proficient peers made and not to repeat the same errors (Yoo Na).

Joo Hee also noted the same advantages of interactive language learning as Yoo Na.

In the interviews were also noted things to consider when providing interactive language learning opportunities. Teachers need to put into consideration learners’ affective factors. Yoo Na, while she indicated her support for interactive language learning for its positive learning effect, noted that for some students interacting with more fluent peers may cause stress and anxiety and thus lead to inhibited speech. Teachers therefore need to create a classroom atmosphere encouraging a ‘low affective filter’. When putting students in pairs or collaborative groups, teachers may need to consider how close they are. Min Ah noted that when putting students together for pair work, it is important to pair up two close friends together: “If a pair of students are not close friends, feeling awkward they do not really interact with one another”.

In short, most of the interviewees reported holding the belief that Korean EFL teachers should provide interactive language learning opportunities with their students. Some interviewees indicated a belief in a positive learning effect of interactive language learning. Others brought attention to language learners’ affective aspects that teachers may need to consider when providing interactive language learning activities. These results indicate that the interviewees’ reported beliefs about the provision of interactive language learning opportunities are largely consistent with the MOE’s reformatory efforts of English language education.

Teacher’s role as a facilitator and a resource provider. Most interviewees believed that Korean EFL teachers’ primary roles should be to facilitate students’ learning and provide resources that will assist their learning. Keun Hee’s and Yoo
Na’s quotations are indicative of what numerous interviewees said over the course of the interviews. Keun Hee noted:

Since students bring into the classroom unique, diverse prior experiences and knowledge with them, teachers, rather than transmitting knowledge, should help students, on the side, create meaning and knowledge.

Yoo Na remarked:

Teachers need to provide useful instructional resources such as web sites, readings, and instructional materials. Providing a resource-rich learning environment is an important responsibility of teachers.

When teachers play a role as a facilitator or a resource provider, they may positively affect their students’ learning, as some interviewees explained:

When teachers serve as a guide for students’ learning, avoiding directly providing students with solutions or right answers, they motivate students to take charge of their own learning. When students take control over their own learning, I believe that they really make an improvement in their learning (Joo Hee).

Keun Hee noted that when teachers provide a variety of learning materials, in doing this, they foster opportunities for self-directed learning by students.

In the interviews were also noted things to consider when teachers provide learning resources. Teachers need to put into consideration students’ learning needs and interests. Da Som noted that if various information and materials related to English language learning that teachers provide are to motivate students to learn, such learning resources should match students’ interest and meet their learning needs.
To be able to serve as a guide for students’ learning and to provide learning resources that match students’ interest and meet their learning needs, it may be fundamental that teachers need to know their students well. Min Ah noted that to play a role as a facilitator of learning or a resource provider, teachers are required to know their students well: “Teachers should learn what their students’ learning styles are like, what they’re interested in, and what their levels of comprehension are”. The first step for teachers to get to know their students seems to build rapport with them. So Youn noted: “Although developing good relationships with students takes much effort and time, I put priority on building good relationships with students. Thanks to this, I came to know better my students.” She further noted that building rapport with students is fundamental for effective teaching and learning.

In summary, most interviewees indicated holding the belief that the primary roles of Korean EFL teachers should be to facilitate students’ learning and to provide learning resources. Some interviewees indicated a belief that teachers’ playing a role as a facilitator or a resource provider, may positively affect their students’ learning. Others brought attention to students’ learning needs and interests that teachers may need to consider when providing learning resources. Some noted that serving as a guide for learning and as a provider of learning resources, it is fundamental for teachers to know their students well and that building rapport with students can be the first move for teachers to get to know their students. These findings point to the conclusion that most interviewees’ reported beliefs about the EFL teacher’s role in Korea resonate with the MOE’s support for student-centered learning in contrast to teacher-centered learning.
5.2. Research question 2: Sources of beliefs

Both the interview data and an open-ended question in the survey questionnaire addressed sources of Korean EFL pre-service secondary school teachers’ beliefs about English language education in Korea. The analysis of both the interview data and the open-ended question identified four sources of beliefs: a) experience as English learner as a positive or negative model, b) practicum experience, c) pre-service teacher education program, and d) experience in English speaking countries. The analysis of the open-ended question will be discussed first and followed by the discussion of the interview data.

In the survey questionnaire, the respondents were asked to list sources of their beliefs about English language education in Korea. As shown in the table 5.2, among the four beliefs sources, the respondents indicated experience as English learner as either positive or negative model most often (105 times) followed by education received at pre-service teacher education program (49 times), practicum experience (46 times), and experience in English speaking countries (17 times).

Table 5.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Beliefs sources</th>
<th>Frequency of listing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experience as English learner as positive or negative model</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education received at pre-service teacher education program</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practicum experience</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience in English speaking countries</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the following section, the interview data will be discussed. Each beliefs source will be discussed in detail
Experience as English learner as a positive or a negative model.

Interviewees’ experience as English learners regardless of whether it was positive or negative seems to be a significant source of their beliefs about English language education in Korea. Some recollected their learning experience as a positive model. Teaching methods that are supported by government-initiated reform were often considered as a positive model. Hyo Jung recollected as a positive model her experience of communicative language learning activities that encouraged interaction among students:

In English class in my high school, I experienced jigsaw reading and group debating … thanks to this learning experience … I came to think that adopting the communicative language teaching approach when teaching English reading is not impossible.

Joo Hee recollected as a positive model one of her high school English teachers’ teaching that used lots of authentic materials. This teacher used authentic materials such as an Obama speech, BBC news, and TED talks. These learning experiences considered as a positive model may have a strong influence on those who had these learning experiences as a classroom teacher in the future. Both Hyo Jung and Joo Hee expressed that they want to adopt the same teaching methods as those used by their teachers, when they become a classroom teacher.

Others recollected their learning experience as a negative model. Teaching methods related to the Korean traditional way of English language teaching were often considered as a negative model. Learning based on the grammar translation method and the audiolingual method was commonly identified as a negative model.
Keun Hee’s quotation is indicative of what other people said over the course of the interviews:

In my secondary schools, some English teachers heavily used grammar translation and audiolingual methods … they adopted only teaching methods that …made it easy to control students … during most of class time, we remained silent.

Heavy reliance on learning by memorization was also reported as a negative model, as Min Ji indicated:

In my middle school, we were asked to recite an entire reading text in the textbook. We had to go to the front, standing in front of the teacher and to recite. The teacher checked individually how accurately we recited.

Those who shared learning experiences that were considered as a negative model commonly identified such learning experiences as very discouraging and expressed strong resistance to teaching practice regarded as a negative model.

In short, interviewees’ experience as English learners regardless of whether it was positive or negative appears to be a significant source of their beliefs about English language education in Korea. Some recollected their English learning experience as a positive model. Others recollected their English learning experience as a negative model. Learning experience that was reported as a positive model often related to communication-oriented language learning such as authentic language learning and interactive language learning. Learning experience that was reported as a negative model often related to the Korean traditional way of English language teaching such as grammar translation method, audiolingual method, and heavy
reliance on memorization. Interviewees expressed resistance to such teaching practices that they considered as a negative model.

Practicum experience. Interviewees’ practicum experience seems to have a strong influence on their beliefs about English language teaching in a way that this experience reinforces some beliefs they have or makes them compromise their beliefs. Observing a mentor teacher’s teaching reinforced belief in the feasibility of implementing communicative language teaching, as Hyo Jung noted:

When watching my mentor teacher teach, I thought that ‘this is what communicative language teaching should look like’. Teaching in English, she began class with small talk. At first, I thought this small talk was very simple, not important, but later I realized that she related this small talk to the lesson topic of the class … drawing on students’ personal experience … very smooth transitions between activities … used various activities, pair, individual, and group work. I thought that communicative language teaching could be implemented in this way.

Observing a mentor teacher’s teaching appears to not only affect pre-service teachers’ beliefs but also their teaching practice. After observing her mentor teacher’s solely grammar translation method based teaching that made students very bored, not paying attention to the teacher, Min Ji became more aware of the importance of student participation in class and as a result, came to give priority to student participation and made efforts to make students’ voluntary participation take place when she taught.

However, it is not always the case that practicum experience reinforces pre-service teachers’ beliefs in a positive way. Pre-service teachers’ beliefs appear to be
sometimes challenged by students and thus they come to compromise their beliefs and teaching practice. Interviewees’ beliefs and teaching practice that advocate communicative language teaching were often challenged by students. So Youn’s quotation is indicative of what other people said over the course of the interviews:

I couldn’t teach much speaking … It was very difficult to motivate students to participate in speaking activities. Students often asked me, ‘Can we just speak in Korean?’, ‘Don’t we need to cover the textbook chapter?’, ‘Don’t we need to study reading passages?’, ‘Why don’t we prepare for the college entrance exam?’

In So Youn’s case, students’ priority of preparing for the national college entrance exam that is reading and grammar focused was a primary reason of their resistance to learning speaking. Other interviewees also identified students’ lack of motivation and varied range of proficiency levels as an obstacle to their attempted teaching efforts.

However, it is not only students that challenge pre-service teachers’ beliefs that support communicative language teaching. Mentor teachers often frustrated pre-service teachers’ attempted teaching effort to apply communicative language teaching. Tae Yeon shared her experience of teaching authentic language that was very discouraging:

The verb, ‘go’, has many meanings. It means not only ‘depart’ but also many other things like ‘to be in motion’ and ‘to become’. I wanted students to learn language and the way of thinking of native English speakers … But, my mentor teacher distorted my lesson plans, saying that we do not have time to waste … I had to stick only to grammar and vocabulary words in a textbook.
One day … I taught various greeting expressions such as ‘What’s up’ and ‘How’s it going’ … My mentor teacher’s feedback on my teaching was really shocking. She said that I shouldn’t have taught those greetings because on the exam, for example, students get confused looking for ‘What’s up’. It should be ‘How are you’ and ‘I am fine, thank you’ as a response.

In summary, practicum experiences seem to have a big impact on the interviewees’ beliefs about English language education. Some reported that observation of their mentor teacher’s teaching reinforced their belief in the importance of communicative language teaching and student participation in class. Others reported that their beliefs and teaching practices that support communicative language teaching were often challenged for various reasons such as students’ priority of preparing for the national college entrance exam, students’ lack of motivation, varied levels of proficiency among students, and a mentor teacher’s disapproval. Interviewees’ different practicum experiences appear highly influential in that this experience either reinforces beliefs that they had and thereafter related teaching practice or makes them compromise their beliefs and thus related teaching practice.

*Pre-service teacher education program.* Most interviewees indicated that their pre-service teacher education programs were influential in forming their beliefs about English language education in Korea. What professors at the teacher education programs emphasized and taught appear to influence the formation of pre-service teachers’ beliefs about how the English language should be taught. Many interviewees commonly noted that professors in their teacher education programs emphasized the need for and the importance of communicative language teaching and
thus they came to adopt the same stance as their professors toward communicative
language teaching. As Yoo Na states:

Professors very much emphasized communicative language teaching … they
always said that the most popular current approach to EFL teaching is
communicative language teaching. In classes, they very much emphasized the
word ‘communicative.’ …they often encouraged us to adopt this teaching
approach … Thus, I came to believe that communicative language teaching
should be adopted in the Korean EFL context.

What interviewees learned in specific courses appears to also influence their view on
how to teach English language. Learning about content based language teaching in
the English teaching methodology course, Da Som came to think that this teaching
approach can be very useful for Korean English learners. Min Ji reported that she
came to have a more extended view about assessment and evaluation after taking the
assessment course. Hyang Ki that believed in the importance of group works for
learning activities noted: “Although what I experienced as an English learner and my
practicum experience are influential, what I has learned in my pre-service teacher
education program influenced my beliefs most.”

In short, most interviewees indicated that the education they received at their
pre-service teacher education program was influential in forming their beliefs about
English language education in Korea. Many reported that they came to develop the
belief in the importance of communicative language teaching because their professors
put much emphasis on this teaching approach. What was learned in specific courses
also influenced interviewees’ view on how to teach English language.
Experience in English speaking countries. All the interviewees that reported having experienced English speaking countries by traveling, studying, or having an internship indicated that such experiences were influential in forming their view on how English should be taught and learned in Korea. Experiencing frustration with speaking in English seems to be often resulted in the realization of the importance of developing speaking skills. Tae Yeon shared an anecdote that tells her frustration with speaking in English:

One day, I went to a shopping mall to buy a pair of shoes. I asked about shoe sizes, but no one understood my English. Even after ten some years of learning English in Korea, I still couldn’t communicate in English. That was very disappointing … what’s the point of learning English for such a long period of time if I can’t even make a simple sentence asking about shoe sizes.

Keun Hee vividly remembered an embarrassing moment while flying to California:

In the airplane, I got so thirsty and wanted to ask for some water. But when I was going to ask for water, I couldn’t say it in English. Some words came into mind but I couldn’t make a complete sentence. I got so confused if I should say some water or some waters or if I should say in a formal way like ‘can I have a cup of water?’ It was shocking that I couldn’t even ask for water.

Not only frustrating experiences with speaking in English but also positive experiences with speaking in English seems to affect forming a view on English language education. Hyo Jung as a young English learner encountered an eye-opening moment during her trip to Saipan with her family:
Staying at a resort, one morning after having breakfast, I wanted to take a walk along a road towards a swimming pool attached to the resort … I had to ask a guard … It was a moment when I, for the first time in my life, communicated in English in real life … I can’t recall exactly what I said then … The guard understood my question and replied to me. I was so excited. It was an eye-opening moment that I realized the purpose of the learning English … for communication.

Learning experience in an English-speaking country appears to result in the realization of the importance of authentic language learning in real life situations, as Keun Hee, who attended a high school in America for a year, indicated:

In school, when my classmates eat some snacks, they sometimes ask me if I want some. They simply ask, ‘you want one?’ They don’t always say ‘do you want to eat one?’ … I came to think that learning a language in real life situations is most ideal.

Experience of learning environment of American school also appears to affect forming a view about how English language should be taught in Korea. Tae Yeon that had an opportunity to work as a teaching assistant with primary school students in one Christian school in Orlando doing her one-month teaching internship became very impressed by the resource rich learning environment of this school and the interactive learning that took place in the class. She noted:

I was so surprised that there were MacBook and many other resource books in the classroom … When the class reads stories, the teacher facilitated students’ understanding by constantly conversing with them, asking questions like
‘Why do you think a king got killed?’ or ‘What would you do in such a situation?’ It was very interactive … text-book and memorization-based English learning is a problem in Korea.

In short, experiences in English speaking countries seem to be a major source of interviewees’ beliefs about English language education in Korea. Such experience appears to influence forming beliefs in the importance of developing speaking skills, authentic language learning in real life situations, providing a resource rich learning environment, and interactive language learning.

5.3. Research question 3: Perceptions of the MOE-initiated reform policies

The interview data addressed Korean EFL pre-service secondary school teachers’ perception of the MOE-initiated reforms of English language education. The interview data provided in-depth information of and elaboration on how the respondents perceive reform policies promoted by the Korean government. Three themes emerged from the interview data analysis: a) the importance of early English language education, b) a negative perception of teaching English in English, and c) the ineffectiveness of native English-speaking teachers. In the following section, I will discuss each of the themes in detail.

Importance of early English language education. All interviewees reported to have a positive perception of the Early English Learning (EEL) policy that specifies the introduction of English education in primary school. Some reported that starting English education in school from third grade is appropriate, while others expressed a preference to start English education earlier. Those who considered starting in third
grade iterated that other subjects had a higher priority in the earlier grades. Hyo Jung exemplifies this, noting there are more important things to learn:

   It is unnecessary to teach English language to first or second graders since there are more important things to learn for that period. Rather than learning a new language, building an upright character and forming a good studying attitude and adjusting to a new school life are priorities in the first two years of primary school.

On the other hand, for those who expressed a preference to starting earlier than third grade, sounding like a native English speaker is an important consideration. To acquire native like pronunciation, it is important to get children exposed to English earlier than third grade, as Keun Hee noted:

   Although I learned English from third grade, I think it might be a good idea to start earlier especially for learning English language sound. The younger one learns English the more one sounds like native speaker of English … I think this early exposure to the English language to be very important.

This early exposure to the English language appears to have other advantages besides acquiring native like sound. Min Ji who attended a kindergarten where English was a medium of instruction commented that “this early start of English education helped me acquire English naturally.” To make this natural acquiring of language take place, it seems important not to push children to learn English. Min Ah that also started English early noted: “It was fun experience for me. I didn’t feel I study a language. I didn’t feel pressure to learn English … thanks to this stress-free learning … this new language came naturally into my daily life.” She believed that “there is a gap between
those who are exposed to English at a very early age and thus acquire it naturally and those who learned it as a subject to study at school” and that for the latter it is very hard to close the gap.

Regardless of when to start English education, either from third grade or earlier than third grade, what seems to matter is how to teach it. Tae Yeon recalled that English teacher in her primary school just made students memorize words and expressions in the textbook. Yoo Na claimed that instead of learning vocabulary words and grammar, there must be more opportunities for primary schoolers to interact with native English-speaking teachers. The need for interaction with the teacher, however, does not appear to be limited only to the interaction between primary schoolers and native English-speaking teachers. Lack of interaction with teachers also often takes place in English class taught by Korean teachers. Hyang Ki reported that her Korean English teachers just played videos of orally narrated children’s stories. Just watching videos in English does not bring about meaningful learning of English. Hyang Ki noted: “Most students couldn’t even read the English alphabet and just watching some videos didn’t do much good.”

In sum, all interviewees reported to have a positive perception of the introduction of English education in primary school. Some of them reported that they considered third grade as an appropriate time to start English education, and others expressed their preference to start English education earlier than third grade. For the former, before third grade, learning a new language is secondary to building an upright character, forming a good studying attitude, and adjusting to a new school life. For the latter, acquiring native like pronunciation and natural acquiring of
English are primary advantages of early start of English education. No matter when to start English education, how to teach and learn English is more important. Some interviewees pointed out that memorizing words, learning grammatical rules, and watching videos in English without interaction with the teacher would not do much good for primary schoolers’ meaningful learning of English.

Negative perception of teaching English in English. Most interviewees reported a negative perception of the policy of teaching English in English (TEE). Students’ low English proficiency was a major reason for their objection to the use of English language as a medium of instruction. Hyo Jung’s quotation is representative of what other people said over the course of the interviews:

I initially prepared lessons in English and taught in English, but had to switch to the Korean language in the middle of the lesson because students didn’t understand and couldn’t follow the lesson and thus didn’t pay attention and lost interest in the lesson.

However, it is not only when lessons are taught in English that students fail to follow the lesson. Students’ lack of interest in learning English appears to be common among Korean EFL learners regardless of which language is used as a medium of instruction. Tae Yeon along with some others noted that most students they experienced in their teaching practicum were not interested in learning English, and that even when they taught the lesson in the Korean language, students did not follow the lesson.
The teaching English in English policy may not have a positive impact upon English learning of most Korean students. Min Ah was very doubtful about the effect of teaching English in English:

“I don’t know how much it will help students improve speaking and listening skills. Only about ten percent of the class would understand and others just stare blankly at me. Almost no one responds in class.”

Thus, when teaching the lesson in English only, to help students understand the lesson, teachers need to make efforts such as “speaking slowly and changing vocabulary according to students’ level”.

Not only students’ inability to comprehend the lesson in English but also teachers’ inability to teach the lesson in English was identified as a reason for the reported negative perception of the teaching English in English policy. Yoo Na’s quotation is indicative of what other people said over the course of the interviews:

“Not all English teachers are well-equipped to teach English in English … I also do not have confidence in teaching in English.”

In short, most interviewees reported having negative perceptions of the teaching English in English policy. The students’ inability to understand the instruction taught in English and the teachers’ lack of competence to teach English in English were identified as major causes for the reported negative perception of the policy. Some were doubtful about the effect of teaching English in English upon students’ English learning. Others indicated the need for teachers to make efforts to make the lesson taught in English more accessible to students such as speaking slowly and changing vocabulary according to students’ level.
Ineffectiveness of native English-speaking teachers. Most interviewees reported holding a common perception about employing native English-speaking teachers: Native English teachers do not make a significant contribution to the growth of Korean English learners’ communicative skills. Poor teaching practice by native English teachers seems to be a primary reason for the interviewees’ negative perception. So Youn pointed out the lack of opportunities for students to speak in English:

- The native English teacher at my practicum site did nothing but play a video. She just played the Simpsons. Students … just watched it over and over, and learned some songs and that’s all.

- Providing students opportunities to speak in English is important, but how teachers guide students to speak seems to matter. Keun Hee observed that the native English teacher at her practicum site gave students many opportunities to speak in English but in a way that they speak using only fixed expressions such as ‘What’s your hobby?’ and ‘What’s your name?’. Keun Hee noted: “The native English teacher could have drawn on students’ personal life and experiences and encouraged them to express themselves more freely.” Although it is important to avoid putting too much restriction in guiding students’ speaking activities and instead make them express more freely, even when students are given opportunities to discuss freely, facilitating discussion by the teacher appears to be necessary. Min Ji recollected her ineffective learning experience with a native English teacher:
The native English teacher I had in my high school … He just threw us
discussion topics and left everything to us. He didn’t facilitate discussion. He
didn’t make any efforts.

Learning from native English teachers does not seem to directly result in
Korean students speaking English accurately. Hyang Ki noted that native English
teachers do not usually provide corrective feedback, thus, unless students make great
effort to learn about correct forms and usage and to self-correct their English, they
would just repeat using wrong words and wrong sentences.

Native English teachers’ evaluation method also do not appear to contribute to
improving Korean English learners’ speaking skills. Both Min Ji and So Youn
indicated that native English teachers they experienced evaluated students’ speaking
skills based on memorization. Students often recited a dialogue script for the test. So
Young noted that “it is not a speaking test but a memory test.”

In addition to the poor teaching practices by native English teachers, some
interviewees indicated that a large class size restricts the students and the teacher
from interacting freely with one another. Others indicated that students do not take
the native English teacher’s class seriously since speaking skill is not texted on the
national college entrance exam.

In short, most interviewees reported having negatively perceived employing
native English teachers to help improving Korean English learners’ communicative
skills. Poor teaching practice by native English teachers was the most oft-mentioned
reason for the interviewees’ negative perception. Poor teaching practice included the
lack of opportunities for students to speak in English, the lack of appropriate guiding
of speaking activities, the lack of corrective feedback, and evaluation method
discouraging developing speaking skills. Other reasons included large class size and
the minor importance assigned to speaking in exams and tests.

5.4. Research question 4: Impediments to the implementation of the MOE-initiated
reforms

The interview data provided in-depth information of and elaboration on
Korean EFL pre-service secondary school teachers’ implementation of the curricular
reforms that the Korean government promoted. The interviewees reported
impediments to their implementation of the reforms. The analysis of the interview
data identified two emergent themes: a) lack of adequate training in communicative
language teaching, and b) test-driven English language education in Korea. Each
theme will be discussed in detail in the following section.

Lack of adequate training in communicative language teaching. Most
interviewees hold the view that they lack adequate training in communicative
language teaching. One of two most oft-mentioned training issues that interviewees
reported their program needs to improve regards developing pre-service teachers’
fluency in English. Curricula of pre-service teacher education programs are primarily
pedagogy-focused. Yoo Na’s quotation is indicative of what numerous interviewees
said over the course of the interviews:

The program seems to assume that students are already equipped with fluency
in English at the time they enter the program. We’re not. In secondary
schools, English learning is all about the preparation for the national college
entrance exam. And in college, the curriculum mainly focuses on English
language pedagogy and doesn’t really give us many opportunities to develop fluency in English. Without developing good speaking skills while in college, I don’t know how we can implement communicative language teaching when we become a classroom teacher.

To develop pre-service teachers’ fluency in English, it appears important for pre-service teacher education programs to provide more courses that are offered in English. Both Min and Joo Hee noted they had very little exposure to spoken English since there were very few courses that were taught in English. Not only getting students exposed to spoken English but also providing them opportunities to speak in English is important. Some interviewees indicated the need for more English conversation courses. When offering English conversation courses, it appears important to provide English conversation courses each year of college. Hyo Jung noted: “English conversation courses were offered only in the first and second years. In junior and senior years, we hardly have opportunities to speak in English.” Although more English conversation courses need to be offered, the focus and the quality of these courses also seem to matter. Joo Hee noted:

- I wish I learned more practical English than just phonics since it was an English conversation course. I wish I learned more expressions that native English speakers use. I wish that the instructor gave me more feedback on my English so that I would know what to improve … more detailed feedback is needed. The instructor just said, ‘you did a better job than last semester’ or ‘you’ve become more confident in speaking than last semester’.
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In addition to offering courses discussed above, pre-service teacher education programs may need to enhance their graduation requirement in a way that sound English speaking skills are required for graduation. Keun Hee related the lack of fluency among her colleagues to her program’s graduation requirement. English proficiency tests required for graduation from her program do not include the speaking section.

Another oft-cited training issue that interviewees reported their program needs to improve regards teaching practical methodology about communicative language teaching. Communicative language teaching was often learned only as theory in their programs. Joo Hee’s reply is representative of what others said over the course of the interviews:

To be able to do communicative language teaching when we become a classroom teacher in the future, there must be more practical training regarding how to apply communicative language teaching that we learned as theory to actual classroom teaching.

Some interviewees provided specific examples of the lack of training. Hyang Ki, for example, although she learned that authentic language learning is important in communicative language teaching, felt sorry that she did not learn much about how to include it into lesson plans. Training regarding how to meet students’ different learning needs also seems to be needed. Hyo Jung found teaching mixed levels of students very challenging. Although she learned that level differentiated teaching is important, she did not know how to do it. She wished that she had learned specific ways to do it at her teacher education program. For Yoo Na, adapting learning
materials for mixed ability classes was trouble. She noted: “I learned that learning material adaptation is important but I had almost no opportunity to try it out.”

In short, most interviewees indicated the lack of training in communicative language teaching as a hindrance to the implementation of communication-oriented reform. One of the most oft-mentioned training issues regards developing pre-service teachers’ fluency in English.

To develop pre-service teachers’ fluency in English, pre-service teacher education programs need to offer more courses taught in English that get pre-service teachers exposed to spoken English and give them opportunities to speak in English, and in which they learn practical English and need to enhance graduation requirement in a way that sound English speaking skills are required for graduation. Another training issue regards the lack of teaching practical methodology of communicative language teaching. Some indicated the need for training regarding how to include authentic language learning into lesson plans and how to meet students’ different learning needs.

*Test-driven English language education of Korea.* Most interviewees identified test-driven English language education of Korea as the biggest impediment to the implementation of communication-oriented reform policies. Hyo Jung’s response is indicative of what numerous people said over the course of the interviews:

> Students need to do well in the national college entrance exam to enter prestigious universities and then to be able to get a good job and good life. This is a life goal for many of them … the primary goal of English education in Korea is to prepare students to do well on the national college entrance
exam that heavily focuses on grammar and reading. This test-driven English language education is the largest hindrance to implementing communicative language teaching in Korea … I feel that the exam is everything.

Without changing this exam, successful implementation of communication-oriented reform policies seems very unlikely. Min Ji noted that even if teachers want to adopt communicative language teaching approach and teaching strategies, this exam system discourages them from trying out new methods.

To successfully implement educational reform, it is critical that policy makers should first think carefully about readiness in terms of the reality of schools and education and provide the reality allowing the reform to take place, as So Youn noted:

Policy makers blame the teachers for students’ poor speaking and writing skills. They blame that teachers lack English competence. They don’t see the educational reality that makes it impossible to improve students’ communication skills. Despite this reality, they just force the teachers to make students fluent … when policy makers set up communicative language teaching as a motto of the reform, they also should have provided the reality that allows the reform to take place. Without providing it, they give teachers false hope that communicative language teaching is possible.

Hyo Jung also pointed out the same lack of careful consideration of educational reality by policy makers as So Youn. To make reform policies in which the reality of schools and education is fully considered, it may be inevitable that policy makers turn to teachers to learn about realities of schools and the feasibilities of reforms. Da Som
noted that there must be opportunities for both policy makers and teachers to come
together and exchange ideas and opinions.

In addition to test-driven English language education, in the interviews were
also noted other impediments to the implementation of communication-oriented
reform. Some interviewees pointed out the classroom atmosphere of Korea that favors
conformity as a hindrance. Keun Hee’s remark was typical:

There is a very strong tendency among students to match their behaviors to
the group norms and thus to avoid being excluded. Korean students, in
general, do not voluntarily express their opinion during class. If a student
expresses his or her opinion or answers a question, other students in the class
think this student shows off. This is a unique classroom culture of Korea that
favors conformity. This classroom atmosphere hinders communicative
language teaching.

Min Ji further noted that this culture pervades across primary schools through high
schools and is unlikely to change. Others (e.g. Joo Hee and Min Ah) also identified a
large class size as a hindrance to the implementation of communicative language
teaching. The large number of students in one class, about forty, prevents active
communicative interaction among students and the teacher.

In short, test-driven English language education seems to be the biggest
impediment to successful implementation of communication-oriented reform policies
in Korea. To fully implement communicative language teaching, it seems necessary
to change the current national college entrance exam that puts a heavy emphasis on
grammar and reading. Policy makers should promote educational reform in which the
realities of schools and education are fully considered. To be able to promote such educational reform, it is inevitable that policy makers turn to teachers, and hear from them and learn about the realities of schools and education. The unique classroom culture of Korea that favors conformity with group norms and a large class size also seem to make communicative language teaching more difficult.

5.5. Summary of chapter 5

This chapter presented results of the qualitative analysis based on ten interviewees’ data gathered from interviews and responses to an open-ended question in the survey questionnaire. The chapter provided answers to research questions 1, 2, 3, and 4. The results of the qualitative analysis can be summarized as follows. First, the interviewees’ beliefs about English language education in Korea are largely based on communication-oriented English language education but with some beliefs that are more based on traditional Korean English language education. They largely believed in the significance of developing communication skills in spoken English, the importance of providing interactive language learning opportunities, the teacher’s role as a facilitator and a resource provider, and the significance of authentic language learning. However, they also believed in the importance of grammar and reading learning. The interviewees indicated heavily reading and grammar focused English tests in Korea as a primary reason for their beliefs in the significance of grammar and reading learning. Thus, this implies that although the interviewees reported holding beliefs of teaching goals that resonate with the traditional EFL education of Korea, this does not necessarily mean that they supported the traditional EFL education of Korea that puts emphasis on grammar and reading learning.
Second, the qualitative data analysis identified four major sources of beliefs. First, the majority of the interviewees reported that their experiences as English learners were influential in the development of their beliefs. They reported such learning experiences as interactive language learning and authentic language learning as a positive model, while they reported their learning experiences with the Korean traditional way of English language teaching such as grammar translation method, audiolingual method, and heavy reliance on memorization as a negative model. They reported that they developed their beliefs against such teaching practices which they considered as a negative model. Second, all the interviewees that experienced English speaking countries reported that such experience influenced the development of their beliefs. They developed beliefs in, for example, the significance of developing speaking skills, authentic language learning in real life situations, providing a resource rich learning environment, and interactive language learning. Third, the majority of the interviewees reported that their practicum experience was influential in developing their beliefs. Interviewees’ different practicum experiences were influential in that these experiences either reinforce beliefs that they had and thus related teaching practice or make them compromise their beliefs and thus related teaching practice. Some reported that observing their mentor teacher’s teaching reinforced their beliefs in the importance of communicative language teaching and student participation in class. Others reported that their beliefs and teaching practices that support communicative language teaching were often challenged for such reasons as students’ priority of preparing for the national college entrance exam, students’ lack of motivation, varied levels of proficiency among students, and a mentor
teacher’s disapproval. Fourth, most interviewees indicated that the education they received at their pre-service teacher education program was influential in forming their beliefs. Professors often influenced in developing interviewees’ belief in the importance of communicative language teaching. What was learned in specific courses also influenced interviewees’ view on how to teach English language. The survey respondents also identified the same four sources of beliefs in their responses to an open-ended question that asked them to list sources of their beliefs about Korean EFL education.

Third, the interview data analysis identified the interviewees’ perceptions about some of the MOE-initiated reforms and this analysis indicates that their perceptions of the reforms are mixed. All interviewees positively perceived the introduction of English education in primary school. This perception is consistent with their beliefs in importance of developing communicative skills. However, the majority of interviewees reported having negative perceptions of teaching English in English for reasons such as students’ inability to understand the instruction taught in English and teachers’ inability to teach English in English. Most interviewees also reported having negative perceptions of employing native English teachers for reasons such as poor teaching practice, large class size, and the minor importance assigned to speaking in exams and tests. This finding indicates that the interviewees’ perceptions of the MOE’s communication-oriented reforms are mixed and that their negative perceptions often result from constraints of educational realities and not necessarily from their beliefs. The constraints of educational realities identified in the interview data provide some explanations for a mismatch between communication-
oriented beliefs of Korean EFL education reported and negative perception of or a weak support for the communication-oriented MOE reforms of Korean EFL education.

Fourth, the interview data analysis identified two major impediments to implementation of the MOE’s curricular reforms. First, most interviewees reported the lack of training in communicative language teaching. Specifically, they indicated a need for developing their fluency in English and learning the practical teaching methodology of communicative language teaching. Second, most interviewees identified the test-driven English language education of Korea as the biggest hindrance to successful implementation of the MOE-initiated reforms. This implies that to fully implement the communication-oriented reforms, it is necessary to change the current national college entrance exam that puts a heavy emphasis on grammar and reading.
Chapter 6: Summary of Findings and Implications

This research was undertaken to investigate Korean EFL pre-service secondary school teachers’ beliefs about English language education in Korea and their perceptions and implementation of the MOE-initiated reforms to improve English language education. This chapter integrates the quantitative and qualitative results reported in prior chapters. This is followed by implications that the current study provides. Implications are made for four areas: 1) implications for future research; 2) implications for reform agents; 3) implications for Korean EFL teacher education programs, teacher educators, and specialists; 4) implications for EFL countries. This chapter concludes with a summary of discoveries and inferences and contributions of this study.

6.1. A combined review of the quantitative and the qualitative results

This section provides a combined review of the quantitative and the qualitative results, and is organized under five important themes that are related to five research questions: 1) Beliefs about English language education in Korea; 2) Beliefs sources; 3) Perceptions of the MOE-initiated reforms of English language education; 4) Self-reported implementation of the MOE-initiated reforms of English language education; 5) Relations between beliefs about English language education in Korea, and perceptions of and self-reported implementation of the MOE-initiated reforms of English language education.
6.1.1. Self-reported beliefs about English language education in Korea

This section reviews the quantitative and the qualitative results regarding research question 1: What self-reported beliefs do Korean EFL pre-service secondary school teachers have about English language education in Korea? Beliefs about English language education in Korea include five belief categories: 1) Beliefs about Korean EFL teaching methods; 2) Beliefs about the nature of foreign language learning; 3) Beliefs about Korean EFL teaching goals; 4) Beliefs about Korean EFL teacher roles; 5) Beliefs about the nature of teaching.

Beliefs about Korean EFL teaching methods. The respondents’ beliefs about Korean EFL teaching methods appear rather mixed (M = 4.37), having some beliefs more closely aligned with communication-oriented English language education and other beliefs more closely aligned with Korean traditional English language education. The respondents agreed that practicing English in communicative activities is essential to eventual mastery of English (M = 6.15), and somewhat agreed that pair and small group activities between students help improve their English (M = 5.85), and that it is important to practice English in real-life like situations (M = 5.88). In general, they indicated their support for the teaching methods that promote communication. On the other hand, they also indicated some support for the teaching methods that communicative language teaching discourages. The respondents somewhat agreed that practicing grammar patterns is essential to eventual mastery of English (M = 5.09), and that memorizing new vocabulary words is an important part of English learning (M = 5.73). They were neutral about the view that to repeat and memorize a lot are important strategies in learning English (M = 4.82).
Likewise, interview results also reveal that interviewees’ beliefs about Korean EFL teaching methods are mixed. Interviewees indicated their support for teaching methods that are aligned with both communication-oriented English language education and traditional English language education. The majority of the interviewees reported holding the belief that Korean EFL teachers should provide interactive language learning opportunities with their students and some interviewees further indicated a belief in a positive learning effect of interactive language learning. Most interviewees reported holding the beliefs that exposing Korean EFL students to authentic language materials is critical mainly due to the lack of authentic language outside classes. Some interviewees further shared specific ways to incorporate multimedia materials into classroom instruction and others pointed to the importance of considering students’ various proficiency levels and interests when providing authentic materials. Interviewees, however, also indicated a belief in the importance of practicing grammar patterns for its positive effect on increasing fluency in English speaking and therefore is vital in learning the English language overall (e.g. Min Ji, Hyang Ki, Min Ah, and Yoo Na). The importance of increasing vocabulary knowledge was also surfaced in the interviews. Interviewees indicated beliefs that vocabulary knowledge is fundamental for enhancing not only students’ reading skills but also their English proficiency overall, and that reciting a list of words is an effective way of learning vocabulary words in that if a teacher teaches vocabulary words in context, the number of vocabulary words taught will not be extensive (e.g. Joo Hee, Keun Hee).
Synthesizing the quantitative and qualitative results, it can be drawn that the study participants’ beliefs about Korean EFL teaching methods seem to be mixed, and that not only teaching methods that promote practicing English in communicative activities such as pair and small group activities, and practicing English in real-life like situations using authentic language materials but also traditional teaching methods such as practicing grammatical patterns and memorizing vocabulary words appear to be perceived as important teaching methods. However, the respondents’ reported beliefs in the importance of memorizing vocabulary words (M = 5.73) seem to conflict with their reported lack of support for repetition and memorization as important strategies in learning English (M = 4.82). One possible explanation is that in general the respondents do not support repetition and memorization as important learning strategies but vocabulary learning is a special case for them. Repetition and memorization are important learning strategies for vocabulary learning because of (a) test-driven culture that is very focused on extensive vocabulary knowledge and (b) EFL learning environment in which learners have very few hours exposed to English input, but have to learn many vocabularies.

*Beliefs about the nature of foreign language learning.* The respondents’ beliefs about the nature of foreign language learning more closely but not very strongly aligned with communication-oriented foreign language learning than with grammar, vocabulary, and translation solely focused foreign language learning (M = 5.18). They somewhat agreed that it is better to learn a foreign language in real life situations (M = 5.79), and agreed that it is important to engage in authentic language use (M = 6.25). On the contrary, they disagreed that learning a foreign language is
mostly a matter of learning a lot of grammar rules ($M = 2.90$), and that learning a foreign language is mostly a matter of translating into one’s native language ($M = 2.77$). Their responses were mixed about the view that learning a foreign language is mostly a matter of learning a lot of new vocabulary words ($M = 4.46$). The respondents’ reported support for authentic language learning resonate well with their reported beliefs about Korean EFL teaching methods, discussed above, that practicing English in real-life situations is important, and that exposing Korean EFL students to authentic language materials is critical. Synthesizing the respondents’ reported beliefs about the nature of foreign language learning and about Korean EFL teaching methods further implies that although the respondents acknowledge the importance of grammatical and vocabulary knowledge, they do not agree that learning a language is mainly about learning grammar rules or new vocabulary words.

Beliefs about Korean EFL teaching goals. The respondents’ beliefs about Korean EFL teaching goals seem rather mixed ($M = 4.62$), having some beliefs more closely aligned with communication-oriented English language education and other beliefs more closely aligned with Korean traditional English language education. The respondents somewhat disagreed that speaking skills are more important than reading skills ($M = 3.97$), and that the goal of English teaching should be preparing students to read passages in English and translate them into the Korean language accurately ($M = 3.52$). They disagreed that grammatical knowledge should be more emphasized than use of English in an interactive way in the Korean EFL classroom ($M = 2.72$). Their responses were mixed about the view that the goal of English teaching should be preparing students to communicate fluently in English ($M = 4.77$).
Correspondingly, results of interview analyses also reveal that interviewees’ beliefs about Korean EFL teaching goals are mixed. All the interviewees reported holding the beliefs that developing students’ communicative competence in English should be a teaching goal of EFL education in Korea. Interestingly however, they also reported holding the beliefs that developing grammar and reading skills is important for Korean EFL students. They indicated that the major reason for holding these beliefs is that standardized English tests in Korea are heavily reading and grammar focused. Thus, this implies that although the interviewees reported holding beliefs of teaching goals that are oriented to the traditional EFL education of Korea, this does not necessarily mean that they supported the traditional EFL education that is characterized as heavy emphasis on grammar and reading learning on the basis of what they consider educationally appropriate, but only on what they consider pragmatically necessary.

The synthesis of the quantitative and the qualitative results suggests that the study participants’ beliefs about Korean EFL teaching goals appear to be mixed, and that the development of both reading/grammar skills and speaking skills seems to be perceived as an important teaching goal, and that grammatical knowledge seems to be perceived as important but not more than reading and speaking skills. The respondents’ reported lack of agreement with the importance of developing students’ reading and translation skills (M = 3.52) discussed above, however, seems inconsistent. This inconsistency appears to have been caused by the inclusion of the phrase in the questionnaire, ‘translate them into the Korean language accurately’. Given their reported disagreement with the importance of translating into one’s native
language in foreign language learning (M = 2.77), it seems logical to assume that the respondents agreed that developing students’ reading skills but not translation skills is important. The finding that the respondents were neutral about preparing students to communicate fluently in English (M = 4.77) seems also inconsistent. This inconsistency might have been caused by the word, ‘fluently’ in the statement. While interviewees indicated the necessity of developing communication skills, they still offered caution against putting too much focus on fluency (e.g. Min Ji, Keun Hee, and Da Som). One possible explanation for the inconsistency, thus, is that the respondents believed in the importance of developing communication skills but had reservations against requiring students to be fluent in English.

Beliefs about Korean EFL teacher roles. The respondents’ beliefs about Korean EFL teacher roles are more closely, but not very strongly, aligned with communication-oriented English language education (M = 5.31). They agreed that teachers should facilitate learners to perform tasks and activities by themselves (M = 6.13) and somewhat agreed that teachers should play a role as a resource provider (M = 5.96). Their responses were mixed about the view that teachers must establish authority in order to effectively lead a class (M = 4.13). Correspondingly, results of interview analyses also reveal that interviewees’ beliefs about Korean EFL teacher roles more closely align with those that the MOE reform efforts uphold. The majority of interviewees indicated their beliefs that the primary roles of Korean EFL teachers should be to facilitate students’ learning and to provide learning resources. They did not consider teachers as an authoritative figure that has a control over students’ learning. Most interviewees indicated that students should take a more active role in
their learning, and that teachers need to create a learning environment in which they provide their students with appropriate guidance and feedback and rich resources. However, it is worthwhile to point out that although interviewees reported that they did not consider teachers as an authoritative figure controlling students’ learning, the respondents appear not to strongly disagree with establishing authority by teachers to effectively lead a class. One possible explanation of this inconsistency is that some respondents believe that teachers need to establish authority to effectively manage a class, not to control what and when and how students learn. Combining results of the quantitative and the qualitative results points to the conclusion that the study participants’ reported beliefs about the EFL teacher’s role in Korea largely resonate more with the MOE’s support for student-centered learning in contrast to teacher-centered learning.

*Beliefs about the nature of teaching.* The respondents’ beliefs about the nature of teaching more closely but not very strongly align with student-centered teaching than with teacher-centered teaching (M = 5.20). They agreed that teaching is a process of helping students develop solutions to problems on their own (M = 6.00) and that teaching is a process of facilitating students’ learning (M = 6.22). However, they somewhat disagreed that teaching is all about explaining correct solutions (M = 3.36). Their responses were mixed about the view that teaching is a process of transferring knowledge (M = 4.03). The respondents’ reported views of teaching as a process of helping students develop solutions to problems on their own and as a process of facilitating students’ learning resonate well with their reported beliefs about Korean EFL teacher roles that are characterized as facilitator of students’
learning and resource provider. On the other hand, it is also worthwhile to point out that they did not strongly disregard the views that teaching is all about explaining correct solutions and is a process of transferring knowledge.

Combining all five belief categories together, the respondents’ beliefs about English language education in Korea more closely, but not strongly, align with communication-based English language education (M = 4.94). One of the salient findings is that some beliefs the study participants hold contrast with one another. Beliefs about Korean EFL teaching methods and beliefs about Korean EFL teaching goals are the examples. They reported holding beliefs that are oriented to both communication-based English language education and the older, traditional English language education in Korea for each of these two beliefs categories. Their reported beliefs about Korean EFL teaching goals that more closely align with the traditional English language education resulted mainly from the influence of high-stakes English tests in Korea such as the national college entrance exam that is heavily reading and grammar focused. Thus, this implies that they do not necessarily support the traditional EFL education of Korea that puts emphasis on grammar and reading. Their reported beliefs about Korean EFL teaching methods oriented more to the traditional English language education resulted from their own experience of how they were taught, such as practicing grammar patterns and memorizing vocabulary words.

Another salient finding is that although largely aligning more closely with communication-oriented English language education, the remaining three beliefs categories do not very strongly align with: beliefs about the nature of foreign language learning (M = 5.18, in the range of 4 through 7), and beliefs about nature of
teaching (M = 5.20), and beliefs about teacher roles (M = 5.31). Therefore, the study participants’ reported beliefs that contrast with one another, and their beliefs found that were identified as not very strongly aligning with communication-oriented English language education seem to add up to the conclusion that their reported beliefs do not very strongly align with communication-based English language education.

6.1.2. Beliefs sources

This section reviews results regarding research question 2: What are the sources of Korean EFL pre-service secondary school teachers’ beliefs about English language education in Korea? The interviews and responses to an open-ended question in the survey questionnaire provided data regarding beliefs sources. Analysis of these two qualitative data sets identified the same beliefs sources. First, most interviewees indicated that their experiences as English learners as an either positive or negative model were influential in developing their beliefs. As a positive model, they reported such learning experiences as practical English learning, interactive language learning, and authentic language learning, while a negative model relates to the Korean traditional way of English language teaching such as drilling, repetition, and memorization. Learning experiences related to the negative model were reported to lead them to develop their beliefs against such teaching practices. This seems to provide an explanation for a mismatch between survey respondents’ reported experiences as English learners that are based on the traditional EFL education of Korea and their reported beliefs that are based on communication-oriented English language education. Second, all the interviewees that had experiences in English
speaking countries indicated that such experiences influenced developing their beliefs in, for example, the significance of developing speaking skills, learning authentic language, and interactive language learning. Third, most interviewees indicated that their practicum experience was influential in the development of their beliefs, and that teaching experience in practicum either reinforced beliefs that they had and thus their teaching practice (e.g. observing a mentor teacher’s teaching that is teacher-centered actually reinforced their opposite beliefs in the importance of student participation in class and teaching accordingly) or forced them to compromise their beliefs and thereafter their related teaching practice (e.g. attempts to teach speaking discouraged by students’ lack of motivation and varied range of proficiency levels among them). Fourth, most interviewees indicated that education received at their pre-service teacher education program was influential in forming their beliefs and teaching practice (e.g. developing beliefs oriented to communicative language teaching because of professors’ emphasis on the need for and importance of communicative language teaching, and learning much of theory regarding communicative language teaching, but lack of practical methodology and opportunity to try it out).

Correspondingly, responses to an open-ended question in the survey questionnaire that asked respondents to list beliefs sources identified the same beliefs sources as those the interviewees identified: ‘experience as English learners as either positive or negative model’ (105 times) followed by ‘education received at pre-service teacher education’ (49 times), ‘practicum experience’ (46 times), and ‘experience of English speaking countries’ (17 times). The synthesis of the interview
data and the survey data suggests that experience as English learners, ‘education received at pre-service teacher education program’, ‘practicum experience’ and ‘experience of English speaking countries’ are four major beliefs sources of the respondents. One thing worthwhile to point out is that the reported frequency of each beliefs source in this study does not necessarily indicate each beliefs source’s extent of influence in the formation of the respondents’ beliefs. Likewise, the interview data that addressed beliefs sources also does not tell to what extent each beliefs source influences the development of the respondents’ beliefs.

6.1.3. Perceptions about the MOE-initiated reforms of English language education

This section reviews the quantitative and qualitative results regarding research question 3: How do Korean EFL pre-service secondary school teachers perceive the MOE-initiated reforms of English language education? The respondents’ perceptions of the MOE-initiated reforms about English language education more closely align with communication-oriented English language education but are not strongly oriented to it (M = 5.30). They somewhat agreed with employment of native English-speaking teachers (M = 5.88), and the need for Korean English teachers to be fluent in English (M = 5.75), and inclusion of a section of testing English listening comprehension in the national college entrance exam (M = 5.04), and inclusion of English language education in primary school education (M = 5.23), and level-differentiated English language education (M = 5.88). On the other hand, their perceptions were mixed about the use of English as a medium of instruction (M = 4.06). In contrast to other reform policies, their weaker support for teaching English
in English draws attention and it seems not quite consistent to their reported beliefs in
the importance of developing speaking skills.

Interview data also revealed how they perceive reform efforts by the MOE. Their perceptions of the reforms seem rather mixed. All interviewees positively perceived the introduction of English language education in primary school: some indicated acquiring native-like pronunciation as a major advantage of starting English education early in primary school, while others, based on their own learning experience, provided cautions against English language education in primary school that is characterized as learning grammatical rules, memorizing words and expressions, and lack of interaction. Their positive perception of beginning English language education in primary school seems to resonate well with their reported beliefs in the importance of developing communicative skills. However, they negatively perceived the reform policy, teaching English in English, for such major reasons as students’ inability to understand the instruction taught in English, and teachers’ lack of proficiency for using English as a medium of instruction. Putting together both the quantitative and qualitative data that addressed the use of English as a medium of instruction, thus, suggests that the study participants’ lack of strong support for the teaching English in English mandate is in part due to the lack of English proficiency of both students and teachers. The majority of interviewees also negatively perceived employing native English teachers for various reasons such as poor teaching practice, large class size, and the minor importance assigned to speaking in exams and tests. From these interview results, therefore, it can be drawn that interviewees’ negative perceptions of some reform policies result from
constraints of educational realities discussed above and not necessarily from their beliefs.

Qualitative data and quantitative data seem to complement each other well in that the interview data added more depth and breadth to the understanding of the study participants’ perceptions of the MOE-initiated reforms. The synthesis of these two data sources indicates that the study participants have reservation about the MOE reforms, and that their reservation seems to relate more to constraints of educational realities abovementioned that hinder such reform efforts, rather than to their beliefs.

6.1.4. Self-reported implementation of the MOE-initiated reforms of English language education

This section reviews the quantitative and qualitative results regarding research question 4: What is Korean EFL pre-service secondary school teachers’ self-reported implementation of the MOE-initiated reforms of English language education in their practicum? The respondents’ self-reported teaching practice in practicum in relation to the MOE-initiated reforms about English language education more closely align with communication-oriented English language education but are not strongly oriented to it (M = 5.04). They somewhat agreed that they often selected learning tasks that engage students in meaningful and authentic language use (M = 5.11), and they expressed a little lesser agreement about how often they used authentic materials that provide genuine and real-life situations (M = 4.94). Based on what they reported, it seems that the respondents had made efforts but not much to engage students in learning authentic English, and this seems to be inconsistent to their reported beliefs in the importance of authentic language learning. They somewhat agreed that they
considered students’ interests when designing lessons (M = 5.73), and that they provided tasks appropriate to the students’ proficiency level (M = 5.53). This indicates that the respondents had made some but not much effort to provide student-centered instruction. The respondents somewhat agreed that they often provided pair or small group activities for students to interact in English (M = 5.63) but somewhat disagreed that they spoke English for classroom instruction most of time (M = 3.29). This indicates that there was not much communication in English in classes they taught. Quantitative results, taken as a whole, indicate that the respondents’ self-reported implementation of curricular reforms initiated by the MOE seems to be rather limited, and therefore implementation of curricular reforms in the respondents’ practicum has fallen short of expectations by the MOE.

The interview data provided more in-depth information for and elaboration on the implementation of the curricular reforms by the MOE. The interviewees reported two major impediments to their implementation of the curricular reforms promoted by the MOE. Most interviewees reported the lack of training in communicative language teaching. They specifically indicated a need for developing their English fluency and teaching practical methodologies of communicative language teaching in relation to authentic language teaching, and preparing lessons catering to students’ different learning needs. Quantitative data also confirms the lack of training reported by the interviewees. The survey respondents indicated that at their pre-service teacher education programs they did not receive adequate training in practical methodology in relation to interactive English language teaching (M = 4.55), and teaching English in English (M = 4.42), and authentic language teaching (M = 4.72), and did not have
adequate opportunities to develop their English fluency (M = 4.91). Therefore, both the qualitative and quantitative results illustrate that the study participants did not receive adequate implementation training with respect to the MOE-initiated curricular reforms in their teacher education program. The other major impediment the interviewees identified is test-driven English language education of Korea. High-stakes English language exams and tests that are heavily grammar and reading based hinder successful implementation of communication-oriented reform policies in Korea. In addition to the two major impediments, other hindrances identified are the classroom atmosphere of Korea that favors conformity, attitude of mentor teachers, and large class size.

The synthesis of the results that (a) the respondents’ self-reported implementation of curricular reforms initiated by the MOE in practicum was rather limited, and that (b) there is some mismatch between their self-reported implementation of the reforms and their reported beliefs, and that (c) they did not receive adequate training related to curricular reforms by the MOE in their pre-service teacher education programs, and that (d) test-driven English language education of Korea was identified as a major hindrance to the curricular reform by the MOE suggests that the study participants’ low degree of implementation of curricular reforms by the MOE does not necessarily result from their beliefs, and that their low degree of implementation of curricular reforms may result in part from the impediments such as the lack of training in communicative language teaching, high-stakes English tests that are grammar and reading based, and large class size.
6.1.5. Relations between self-reported beliefs about English language education in Korea and perceptions of and self-reported implementation of the MOE-initiated reforms of English language education

This section reviews results regarding research question 5: What is the nature of relations between Korean EFL pre-service secondary school teachers’ self-reported beliefs about English language education in Korea and their perceptions of and self-reported implementation of the MOE-initiated reforms of English language education? The respondents’ beliefs about English language education in Korea are not significantly correlated to their perceptions of the MOE-initiated reforms ($r = .143$) and with their self-reported implementation of the MOE-initiated reforms of English language education ($r = .068$). There is also no significant correlation between the respondents’ perceptions of and self-reported implementation of the MOE-initiated reforms of English language education ($r = .071$). The lack of significant correlation between the respondents’ beliefs and their perceptions ($r = .143$) seems to confirm the suggestions made earlier that the respondents’ rather reserved perceptions of the MOE-initiated reforms seem to relate more to constraints of educational realities abovementioned that hinder such reform efforts, rather than to their beliefs. The lack of significant correlation between the respondents’ beliefs and their self-reported implementation ($r = .068$) also seems to confirm the suggestions made earlier that the low degree of implementation of curricular reforms by the respondents does not necessarily result from their beliefs but may result in part from the impediments such as the lack of practical training in communicative language teaching, and large class size, and high-stakes English tests that are heavily grammar
and reading focused. Therefore, it can be concluded that the relations between the study participants’ beliefs about English language education in Korea and their perceptions of and self-reported implementation of the MOE-initiated reforms contain inconsistency and the reasons behind this inconsistency seem to be complex, and that constraints of educational realities of Korea such as students’ low English competency, teachers’ lack of English fluency, poor teaching quality of native English teachers, and large class size, and impediments to the implementation of the MOE’s communication-oriented reforms such as inadequate practical training in communicative language teaching, and grammar and reading focused high-stakes English tests seem to provide in part explanations for the inconsistent relations.

6.2 Implications of the results and findings

The results and findings of the current study provide a range of implications not only for a successful implementation of Korean MOE’s reform efforts to improve English language education but also for other EFL countries that have undertaken similar reforms to Korea’s. This section will discuss specifically four implications: 1) implications for future research; 2) implications for reform agents; 3) implications for teacher education programs and Korean EFL teacher educators and specialists; 4) implications for EFL countries.

6.2.1. Implications for future research

This study points to possible areas that deserve further research attention. The present study finds that mentor teachers and students at practicum sites influence pre-service teachers’ beliefs about teaching and teaching practice in a way that pre-
service teachers’ interaction with mentor teachers or students either reinforces some beliefs that pre-service teachers have and thus their teaching practice or leads them to compromise some of their beliefs and thereafter their teaching practice. These findings indicate that mentor teachers and students are also important players to consider for successful implementation of the MOE reform initiatives. Thus, future research might also pay attention to mentor teachers’ and students’ beliefs about Korean EFL education and how they think of the reform policies and mandates, and explore how beliefs of mentor teachers and students and their perceptions influence or interact with pre-service teachers’ beliefs and perceptions and finally their relevant teaching practice.

This study identifies four major beliefs sources of Korean pre-service EFL teachers. However, it is unknown which belief source is most influential in comparison to the others. Such more in-depth understanding of the beliefs sources would help us better understand pre-service teachers’ beliefs and more importantly would provide us with useful suggestions about how we need to act on pre-service teachers’ beliefs, if necessary. For example, if experience of English speaking countries is the most influential source of beliefs for Korean pre-service EFL teachers to enforce CLT-oriented beliefs, Korean EFL teacher educators would need to encourage their students to experience English speaking countries by creating opportunities for, for example, participating in exchange student programs or experiencing teaching an internship in abroad. Therefore, to effectively work on pre-service teachers’ beliefs, future research might pay attention to possible dynamics among the four beliefs sources.
A longitudinal study as a form of future research might also be useful in that we can establish an understanding about how Korean pre-service EFL teachers’ beliefs, perceptions, and teaching practices develop over time in the government-led reform contexts. For example, it might be a worthwhile undertaking as future research to investigate Korean pre-service EFL teachers’ beliefs and perceptions they have when they enter teacher education programs, and to explore their beliefs, perceptions, and teaching practice at the time they complete the programs, and some years after they start teaching as in-service teachers. It would be very informative to explore how pre-service teachers’ beliefs, perceptions, and teaching practices change during and after programs and what causes such change. This line of research may assist teacher educators with a better preparation of teacher candidates for the classroom in reality (Buel & Beck, 2015).

The current study only focuses on self-reported data. Future research, thus, might also employ classroom observation and video analysis which explore what actually happens in classroom teaching and learning. Given that no studies have examined teachers’ beliefs related to language learning in Korea, it might be a worthwhile undertaking as future research to explore Korean pre-/in-service EFL teachers’ beliefs in relation to language learning connected to the MOE initiatives focusing on self-reported data, classroom observation, and video analysis.

6.2.2. Implications for reform agents

If the MOE reform policies are to be implemented as planned, policy makers need to turn to Korean EFL teachers, who are significant players of the reform initiatives in the field. If not accepted by them and reflected in their classroom
teaching, any reform initiatives would not be accomplished as planned. Policy makers, therefore, need to attend to Korean EFL teachers to learn about how they perceive reform policies, and what constraints or hindrances prevent them from implementing them, and to take any necessary measures accordingly. However, this study reveals that Korean policy makers need to make more efforts to learn about realities of schools and the feasibilities of reforms they promote by hearing from teachers, that is, the practitioners on the sites. Hyo Jung noted:

Reform policies sound great, but are not very realistic. Problem is that policy makers do not know educational realities. They do not know how far those policies they make are from the realities of schools. They, as always, without considering realities of schools, just issue policies and mandates, and ask teachers to follow whatever they make.

Teachers’ voices have been silenced and suppressed in the development and issuance of reform policies and this seem to validate the need for an active partnership between policy makers and Korean EFL teachers. One way to establish this partnership is that municipal and provincial offices of education arrange joint sessions where policy makers can attend and hear and learn from pre- and in-service teachers realities of schools and teachers’ perceptions of reform policies.

The present study indicates that heavily grammar and reading focused English tests and more importantly the national college entrance exam are among the major hindrances to successful implementation of the MOE reforms. Although the MOE has attempted to include a communicative component (i.e. incorporating listening tasks) in the national college entrance exam, it seems that this attempt has not been very
successful in motivating both teachers and students to teach and learn English in a more communicative way. Hyang Ki, one of the interviewees, noted:

Listening tasks in the college entrance exam are easy. There is a workbook, from which 100 percent of the questions are taken. You just need to practice all the questions in the workbook and then you can get all the questions correct in the exam … Listening tasks in the college entrance exam doesn’t seem to accurately measure one’s communicative competence … to be honest, I don’t think it’s meaningful.

Min Ji, another interviewee, further described how listening was usually taught in class:

There was no homework for listening. There were no instructions for listening. Since there are listening tasks in the college entrance exam, in high school we just listened to dialogues in English and solved listening comprehension questions in a workbook. Teachers usually did nothing but playing CDs that accompanied the workbook … we had to study listening on our own. Teachers didn’t do a comprehension check, nor give instruction of pronunciation or accent. There was no instruction about why it’s correct or wrong.

Both interviewees’ comments indicate that the MOE has failed to achieve the intended effects of incorporating listening tasks in the exam in teaching and learning in classrooms. Thus, the pressing need for the MOE is to change the national college entrance English exam to become a more authentic assessment of test-takers’ communicative language competence. In other words, it should be an urgent priority
for the MOE to make high-stake English tests towards the direction that the MOE reforms pursue.

Poor teaching practice by native English teachers reported in this study seems to validate the need for stricter screening of applicants in the recruitment of native English teachers. The minimum requirements for the EPIK teachers, for example, being a citizen of one of the seven English speaking countries such as Australia, Canada, Ireland, New Zealand, South Africa, U. K., and U. S. A. with a Bachelor’s degree, do not automatically translate into guaranteed quality teaching in the classroom, since those teachers that apply for teaching in Korea tend to lack the necessary training in English education (Y. Lee, 2015). The pedagogic experiences of teachers, both native and Korean English teachers, as a result, are often unsatisfactory (Cho & Kang, 2013). The current minimum applying requirements need to be enforced in a way that unqualified native English teachers that lack teaching qualifications will be prevented from applying for the position. To provide Korean English learners with high quality teaching of English by native English teachers, it is necessary that when screening applicants, recruiting agencies subject applicants’ job qualifications to more scrutiny to determine which, if any, applicant is best qualified for the position, both for pedagogical skills and formal knowledge of English, in addition to native English-speaking skills.

6.2.3. Implications for teacher education programs and Korean EFL teacher educators and specialists

Among its many implications, this study establishes the importance of revising pre-service teacher education programs, such that the programs are
appropriately designed to prepare and train Korean EFL pre-service teachers according to the curricular reform by the MOE. The study participants indicated that they received inadequate training for communication-oriented teaching at the teacher education program they attended. They specifically pointed to the lack of opportunities to develop speaking skills, and to learn practical English and practical (contrary to theory-oriented) teaching methods with connection to communication-oriented language teaching. Based on the findings and results of the present study, blame for the study participants’ low degree of implementation of the curricular reforms can be placed in part on their pre-service teacher education programs for having not fully prepared them to teach according to the curricular reforms. Korean pre-service EFL teacher education programs, therefore, should be encouraged to revise their curricula in a way that the programs offer more classes related to oral and practical English, and create more opportunities that will effectively improve pre-service teachers’ English proficiency in the input-limited English learning context of Korea, and offer more practical courses related to communication-oriented EFL teaching methods, which pre-service teachers can easily use in classroom teaching.

This study also establishes the importance of strengthening in-service teacher education programs for Korean in-service EFL teachers. In the current study, it is revealed that the traditional Korean English education is still prevalent. The study participants’ experiences as English learners aligned with the traditional EFL education of Korea that puts much emphasis on grammar, vocabulary, and reading learning, and the instruction by teachers they observed at their practicum sties were often characterized as teacher-centered, grammar and reading focused. These findings
point to the need for developing professional development programs for in-service teachers, which will give them opportunity to improve their teaching to be more compatible with the direction of the MOE reforms. Yook & Lee (2016) note that in-service teacher education programs with practical curricular help bring changes in classroom teaching. Therefore, there is a need to develop practical training programs for Korean in-service EFL teachers that will help them deal with the curricular innovation and change of methodology and to encourage them to make serious commitments towards investing time and efforts to attend such training programs regularly.

Pre-service teacher educators need to create frequent opportunities over the course of their programs for pre-service teachers to externalize their beliefs and perceptions. It is important to provide frequent opportunities that will raise awareness of pre-service teachers’ beliefs, examining if they retain any beliefs that are conflict with what the MOE reforms promote and if necessary, to help and guide them to develop beliefs that are compatible with the direction of the reforms. Teacher educators also need to raise pre-service teachers’ awareness of the reform policies and mandates. This is an important responsibility of L2 teacher education (Johnson, 2009). It is important to equip them with better knowledge of the reforms (e.g. intention and motivation driving the reforms) so that pre-service teachers develop more positive perceptions of the reform and thus become more motivated to adopt it.

Korean EFL teacher educators and specialists need to engage in the development of theories and methods more appropriate to the Korean context. Researchers provide cautions against EFL countries’ blind adoption of
communicative language teaching (CLT) theories and methods developed in non EFL contexts and note that the adaptation and innovation of CLT according to local educational contexts is required (e.g. Butler, 2011; Koosha & Yakhabi, 2013; Littlewood, 2013). To develop CLT theories and methods suited to the EFL realities in Korea, it is important to recognize various levels of constraints: for example, constraints at the societal-institutional level such as grammar and reading focused curricular and high-stakes exams, and input limited EFL context of Korea, and constraints at the classroom level such as classroom culture favoring conformity with group norm, large class size, and lack of fluency of students and teachers. To successfully implement CLT, Korean EFL teacher educators and specialists need to take the EFL realities of Korea into consideration and explore how to best achieve contextually embedded adaptations of CLT and as a result to affect Korean students’ English learning.

6.2.4. Implications for EFL countries

The results and findings in this study provide implications for other countries in the EFL context such as China, Hong Kong, Japan, Iran, and Turkey, which share some aspects regarding English language education similar to Korea. First, English is the primary foreign language to learn for education and other needs, and is taught as a compulsory subject in public schools in these countries (Butler, 2011; E. Kim & Jeon, 2005; Rahimi & Naderi, 2014). Second, these countries have made fundamental reforms in English language education by adopting communication-oriented language education. China implemented a new curriculum reform in 2001, applying communicative language teaching (CLT) in primary and secondary school English
education (H. Zhang, 2014). Hong Kong adopted CLT officially in its syllabus, in primary school English curriculum in 1997 and in secondary school English curriculum in 1999 (Chan, 2014). In Japan, communication abilities were at the forefront of the national curriculum of foreign language education introduced in 1999 (Butler & Iino, 2005). In the mid-2000s, the Iranian government developed new English language curricular and syllabi that encourage more communication-oriented English language education (Jaffari, Shokrpour, & Guetterman, 2015). Similarly, Turkey in late 1990s and mid-2000s made two major reforms that are more communication-oriented English curricula (Uysal & Bardakci, 2014). Third, these countries have struggled for language teaching reform and often faced hurdles caused by local educational conditions such as the prevalence of traditional English teaching that focuses on grammar and reading learning, teacher and textbook-centered learning, rare opportunities to use English outside the classroom, overcrowded classes, the lack of authentic language learning materials, low English proficiency of students and teachers, English exams and tests that are based on grammar and reading, the lack of adequate teacher training, and hesitation in the use of English language (Nishino, 2012; Muhammad, 2016; Ozsevik, 2010; Rahimi & Naderi, 2014; Wang & Cheng, 2009). EFL countries, not only those countries abovementioned but also those in other international contexts, that emphasize heavily English language, government-led English curricular reforms, and local educational conditions similar to Korea may receive advantages and benefits from what the present study has found and discussed.
6.3. Conclusion

The primary purpose of the current research is to investigate Korean EFL pre-service secondary school teachers’ self-reported beliefs about English language education in Korea and their perceptions of and self-reported implementation of the MOE-initiated reforms to improve Korean English language education, and their beliefs sources, and how the three constructs, beliefs, perceptions, and implementation, are related with one another. The results of the survey and interviews address these research foci. First, the beliefs held by the pre-service teacher participants were largely more closely aligned with communication-oriented language education, which has been promoted by the MOE in its reform efforts, but some beliefs were based on Korean traditional English education primarily due to high-stakes English tests in Korea. Second, major sources of the teacher participants’ beliefs were their experience as English learners, education they received at pre-service teacher education program, and their experience at practicum and in English speaking countries. Third, the teacher participants’ some beliefs that are based on communication-oriented language education led them to perceive some of the MOE reforms positively, but taken as a whole, they did not perceive the MOE reform policies and mandates very positively but with some reservation primarily due to constraints of educational realities/local educational conditions. Fourth, the teacher participants’ self-reported implementation of the MOE curricular reforms in practicum was rather limited primarily due to external impediments such as lack of training in communicative language teaching and test-driven English education. Fifth, there were no coherent relations but rather gaps and mismatches among the three
constructs, the pre-service teacher participants’ beliefs and perceptions and teaching practice (i.e. implementation of the curricular reforms).

The results and findings of this study lead to the following inferences that the relations formed between the pre-service teacher participants’ self-reported beliefs about English language education in Korea and their perceptions of and self-reported implementation of the MOE-initiated reforms are highly complicated and contain inconsistent aspects, that is, there are gaps and mismatches among the three constructs (e.g. a mismatch between some pre-service teachers’ communication-oriented language education beliefs and their lack of use English as a medium of instruction), and that such gaps and mismatches can be explained at least in part by constraints of local educational conditions/realities such as students’ low English proficiency, teachers’ lack of English fluency, poor teaching quality of native English teachers, large class size, inadequate practical training in communicative language teaching, and grammar and reading based high-stakes English exams and tests. Johnson (2009) notes that it is important for L2 teacher education to uncover and resolve any contradictions that result from the clash between macro-structure such as educational reform policies and L2 teachers’ teaching practices (p. 77).

The current study makes some valuable contributions. First, this study satisfies research needs identified in the literature review chapter in that to my knowledge, it is the first study that investigated Korean EFL pre-service teachers’ beliefs in relation to their perceptions and teaching practice in the context of educational reforms, and that included a relatively large sample in contrast to previous studies targeted Korean EFL pre-service teachers, which are qualitatively
oriented case studies that include few subjects, and that identified sources of Korean EFL pre-service teachers’ beliefs and examined the impact of the sources upon their beliefs, and that explored Korean EFL pre-service teacher education programs’ adequacy of training in connection to curricular innovations. Another valuable contribution is that this study contributes to the understanding of the feasibility of the educational reforms and curricular innovations promoted by the Korean government, and the results, findings, and inferences drawn from this study might effectively guide Korean EFL pre-service teacher education programs, EFL teacher educators and specialists, and reform agents in their efforts to promote and adopt the MOE educational reforms by providing practical recommendations and making concrete suggestions and guides about what measures they need to take. Some examples of such recommendations and suggestions are stricter screening of applicants in the recruitment of native English teachers, contextually embedded adaptation of CLT, reinforcement of in-service teacher training with practical curricular, arrangement of joint sessions for both policy makers and EFL pre- and in-service teachers, and revision of curricular for EFL pre-service teachers with more classes related to oral and practical English. I believe that the results, findings, and inferences of this study together with implications it provides will better equip Korean EFL pre-service teachers, teacher educators and specialists, teacher education programs, and reform agents for the common goal, successful implementation of the MOE-initiated educational reforms to improve English language education.
Appendices

Appendix 1: Survey questionnaire

Section A: Please respond to the following questions either by putting ✓ or writing a numeral in an appropriate slot.

Background Information

1. Name: __________________ Email:___________________

2. Gender/Age: Male _______ Female _______ Age: _______

3. College/University: _____________________________

4. Academic year:
   Undergraduate: Freshman _____ Sophomore _____ Junior _____ Senior _____

5. Teaching practicum:
   (a) Have you completed the practicum requirement?   Yes ____   No ____

   (b) If yes, identify the educational level and length of your teaching.
   (Example) middle school, 4 weeks    _____________________________

Section B. Please read each statement and indicate the number that best reflects your experience as an English language learner in the secondary school. Indicate your agreement or disagreement with the following statements by circling your response using this scale:

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Strongly Disagree Somewhat Disagree Neutral Somewhat Agree Agree Strongly Agree

For example, if you strongly disagree to the following statement, you circle the number 1 as shown in the example below.

(Example) All EFL teachers must be native speakers of English.  SD SA  ① 2 3 4 5 6 7
1. English learning in my secondary school was mainly grammar-focused.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

2. My secondary school English teachers put much emphasis on reading skills.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

4. The language that my secondary school English teachers used in the classroom was mostly Korean.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

5. My secondary school English teachers often designed activities to have us interact in English with peers and or teachers.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Section C. Please read each statement and circle the number that best reflects your opinion as a Korean EFL pre-service teacher.

Part I.

1. It is better to learn a foreign language in real life situation.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

2. It is important to engage in authentic language use.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

3. Learning a foreign language is mostly a matter of learning a lot of grammar rules.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

4. Learning a foreign language is mostly a matter of learning a lot of new vocabulary words.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

5. Learning a foreign language is mostly a matter of translating from one’s native language.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Part II.

1. Teaching is a process of facilitating students’ learning.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
2. Teaching is a process of transferring knowledge.

3. Teaching is all about explaining correct solutions.

4. Teaching is a process of helping students develop solutions to problems on their own.

Part III.

1. Speaking skills are more important than reading skills.

2. The goal of English teaching should be preparing students to read passages in English and translate them into the Korean language accurately.

3. In the Korean EFL classroom, grammatical knowledge should be more emphasized than use of English in an interactive way.

4. The goal of English teaching should be preparing students to communicate fluently (listen and speak) in English.

Part IV.

1. It is important to practice English in real-life like situations.

2. Pair and small group activities between students help improve their English.

3. Practicing English in communicative activities is essential to eventual mastery of English.

4. Memorizing new vocabulary words is an important part of English learning.

5. Practicing grammar patterns is essential to eventual mastery of English.
6. To repeat and memorize a lot are important strategies in learning English.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Part V.

1. Teachers should facilitate learners to perform tasks and activities by themselves.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

2. Teachers must establish authority in order to effectively lead a class.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

3. Teachers should play a role as a resource provider.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Section D. Please read each statement and circle the number that best reflects your opinion as a Korean EFL pre-service teacher.

1. In English class, teachers need to speak English fluently in order to teach effectively.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

2. English language education should be included in primary school education, if it’s not in kindergarten.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

3. It is important to expose students to native speakers of English.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

4. In English class, teachers should use English most of the time.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

5. Students should be able to take an English course depending on their individual proficiency.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

6. It is important to include a section of testing English listening comprehension in the national college entrance exam.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Section E. Please read each statement and circle the number that best reflects your practicum practices. If you have not completed practicum requirements, please do not respond.

1. I spoke English for classroom instruction most of the time.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
2. I often used authentic materials that provide genuine and real-life situations.  
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

3. I often selected learning tasks that engage students in meaningful and authentic language use.  
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

4. I often provided pair or small group activities that made the students interact in English.  
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

5. I provided tasks appropriate to the students’ proficiency level.  
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

6. I considered students’ interests when designing lessons.  
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Section F. Please read each statement and circle the number that best reflects education that you have received in your teacher education program.

1. In many of the courses that I took, a variety of communication-centered English language opportunities were included (e.g. debating in English in class, group presentation in English).  
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

2. I received adequate training in using and adapting authentic materials for English language teaching.  
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

3. My teacher education program promoted flexibility in using different teaching approaches to meet different students’ needs and interests.  
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

4. I received adequate training in using learning tasks that promote authentic language use.  
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

5. I received adequate training in teaching English in English.  
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

6. I received adequate training in using various learning activities that make the students interact in English.  
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Section G. Please respond to the following question.

1. What are the sources of your beliefs about English language education in Korea?
Appendix 2: Interview guide

*Experience as an English language learner*

1. Briefly describe your English language learning experience in the secondary schools.

2. Do you think that your English language learning experience in the secondary schools has influenced on your beliefs about English language education in Korea? If so, describe how.

*Beliefs about English language education in Korea*

1. What do you think are important goals of English language education in Korea?

2. Describe how English language education should be taught in Korea.

3. What is the role of the teacher?

*Sources of teachers’ beliefs*

What are the sources of your beliefs about English language education in Korea?

Explain how they influenced your beliefs.

*Korean MOE-initiated reforms*

1. Are you familiar with the MOE’s efforts to improve English language education? If so, (a) Describe some of the reforms and how you think of them.

2. What do you think of employing native English-speaking teachers to teach in Korean public schools?

3. What do you think of teaching English in English?

*Teaching practicum experience*

1. Reflect on your experience in teaching practicum.

(a) Describe your overall perspectives on teaching practicum.
(b) Describe teaching methods, activities, and materials you used.

(c) If you had any difficulties with teaching, describe what they are.

(d) If your answer is yes to (c), do you think that your teacher education program could have better prepared you with regard to such difficulties? If so, describe how.

(e) How much do you think your teaching in practicum reflected reforms put forth by the Korean MOE? If you did not put reforms into practice much, what are impediments?

*Teacher education program*

1. Describe your experience at your teacher education program.

(a) Has your teacher education program promoted a particular way of English language teaching?

(b) Describe how your teacher education program has prepared you to be an English language teacher.

(c) Do you think that your teacher education program could have better prepared you? If so, describe how.
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