Reconceptualising English language learning pedagogies for a South Korean context

A thesis submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

Dimitrios Michael Hadzantonis

PhD by Project

School of Education

College of Design and Social Context

RMIT University

July 2011

Declaration

I certify that, except where I have acknowledged, the work of this project is my solely my own. I have not submitted this work previously, in whole or in part, to qualify for any other academic awards. The content of the thesis is the result of work which I have conducted since the official commencement date of the approved research program.

Dimitrios Michael Hadzantonis

18th July, 2011

Abstract

A number of studies have determined that globally, South Korea has the lowest achievement success in English language learning. South Korea's high expenditure on English education, as well as its low performance on English language competency testing, creates a serious problem for language learners, their employers, and for a country working to emerge from global isolation. Attitudes developed through historical and social enculturation shape the language learning styles of South Koreans, and hence heavily influence Korean learner practices in terms of gaining expertise in the English language.

This study asks how a reconceptualised approach to English language education might be designed to motivate learning in South Korean tertiary contexts. The exegesis for the PhD by Project explores literature on the historical, social, cultural, political and educational influences on English language pedagogy in South Korea, and investigates why and how these influences have affected English language learning. The literature describes the South Korean environment related to English language learning, and presents the theoretical underpinnings of English language learning, which both inform a framework for the preliminary course book. The methodology employs social constructivist theory to develop the conceptual framework for course book materials. I then evaluate and revise the first course book to produce a set of electronic online language learning materials, and the Project concludes with an evaluation of the extent to which the learning materials achieve their objectives, discussing implications and potential directions of the findings from the exegesis.

These materials, or 'product' of the PhD, aim to develop tertiary students' language learning through moving the learners from traditional to more learner-centred pedagogies in the form of electronic online learning materials. Building on earlier English language learning books, the *Speak4yourself* learning materials draw on a Transition theory, where a back and forth transition between transmission and learner-centred pedagogies can support and encourage more effective English language learning than many learners experience at present. Utilizing the immersive qualities of digital technologies, *Speak4yourself* has been designed electronically to facilitate interaction and the further development of communicative competence in the English language for South Korean speakers. Moreover, *Speak4yourself* extends language learning to engage South Korean learners in exploration of, and critical reflection on, cultural identities. This curriculum approach works directly with the enculturation dimensions of Korean language learning, interrogating links between language and identity.

Glossary

ELL	–	English Language Learning
EFL	–	English as a Foreign Language
ESL	–	English as a Second Language
GDP	–	Gross Domestic Product
IELTS	–	International English Language Testing System
KEDI	–	Korean Education Development Institute
L2	–	Second language
OECD	–	Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development
SERI	–	Seoul Educational Research Institute
SLA	–	Second language acquisition
SMOE	–	Seoul Metropolitan Office of Education
TOEFL	–	Test of English as a Foreign Language
TOEIC	–	Test of English for International Communication
VELS	–	Victorian Essential Learning Standards

Table of contents

Chapter 1

Introduction

1.1 Contextualizing the study

South Korean efforts to 'globalise', combined with western attempts to infiltrate the South Korean market, have greatly spurred the growth of English language education in South Korea since the 1970s. However, these efforts, as well as progress by South Koreans to develop communicative competence in the English language, have not reflected the social, economic and political shifts of the 20th century, and those into the 21st century (Section 2.6.2). This indicates a limited development of communicative competence in English by South Koreans, despite the South Korean government injecting prodigious resources into educational schemes and the English language learning industry, far surpassing the efforts of any other country globally (KEDI 2003; SERI 2008). A proliferation of private institutes, mandatory courses for ELL at all levels of education, learning materials, internet resources, expeditions to English speaking regions, and a high level of English-Korean language contact in most sectors of media and advertising, attest to this effort.

I have personally identified inefficiencies of English language education in South Korea throughout my extended experience as an educator and researcher in South Korea, and have witnessed the lack of fit between English language pedagogies and the development of learner communicative competence. I therefore question, as does the literature, why on a global scale of communicative competence in English, South Koreans have progressed inefficiently, despite their extensive efforts (Kim 2006; KEDI 2007). Consequently, observing the struggle of South Koreans to accommodate increasing western cultural impact, I have sought to identify effective elements of English language education, finding that materials and pedagogies teachers draw from do not significantly assist improvement of spoken English in South Korean learners, though more so spoken than written. My concern has subsequently become an investigation of pedagogical and curriculum approaches to

English language education in South Korea, and through my research, I have aimed to develop pedagogies which change the quality of ELL in tertiary settings in the region.

Researchers and educators have not significantly examined influences on language development and achievement for South Korean learners of English (Pae 2008). Consequently, no official identification of pathways aiming to improve English language education in South Korea exists, particularly at the tertiary level. This, in turn, inhibits the development of an effective design of pedagogies for South Korean tertiary ELL. According to Gan, Humphreys and Hamp-Lyons (2004), western perspectives of education dominating research in this domain, and ELL material publishing companies failing to identify unique characteristics of the South Korean market, further impede attempts to improve English language education in South Korea.

My position as a teacher-researcher informs my approach to this ELL phenomenon. Born to Greek immigrants to Australia, and having not yet journeyed to Asia, I chose South Korea in 1998 for what I believed was a strong Northeast Asian traditional cultural element. During my extensive twelve year sojourn in South Korea, I have involved myself in areas such as publishing, translation and editing, teaching tertiary-level social linguistics, social anthropology, and research methods, and participating in many non-academic activities. Through this extensive involvement with South Koreans, I have developed a fluency in the Korean language, which has offered me an insight into salient aspects of English language education in South Korea.

Despite this insight, and as a foreign 'other', I still view South Koreans and South Korean education through western perspectives (Kumaravadivelu 2002). To foreground this bias however, I recognise my own enculturations, and the values, attitudes, and contextual factors which influence my perspective as a researcher. Furthermore, as Banks, Cookson, Gay, Hawley, Irvine, and Nieto (2001) argue, to increase objectivity, researchers and educators such as myself, must inform themselves fully of the contextual factors of the environment in which they conduct the research. I have attempted to adopt this notion to South Korean English language learner enculturations.

1.2 Research questions

This study primarily asks: How might a reconceptualised approach to English language education be designed to motivate learning in South Korean tertiary contexts?

I accompany this with supporting questions, which directly relate to the primary research question, and also scaffold the main investigation. Throughout the research I ask the following secondary questions:

- What concepts and perspectives on ELL currently inform English language pedagogies in South Korean tertiary education, and how effective are those approaches for English language learning?
- How are any problems found in current approaches to ELL in South Korean tertiary education identified and best explained, and in the process, how does identity negotiation become pertinent to locating these problems, as well as to the resolution of these problems?
- Drawing on those explanations, how would they inform the design of a new approach to ELL, including new approaches to the design of learning materials, in South Korean tertiary education? What are the chief features of such an approach?

These questions define the research direction of my study of South Korean tertiary ELL, an area which remains largely uninvestigated, general and incomplete (Pae 2008). These questions also guide the review of the literature, the analysis, the interpretation, as well as the development and critique of the products.

1.3 Outline of the course material products and their development

The course materials for this PhD by Project are *Conversation*, and its revised by-product, *Speak4yourself*, both of which cater to upper-intermediate to advanced level English language learners in tertiary contexts in South Korea, with a greater emphasis on strengthening speaking and listening skills, more than reading and writing. The central tenet of these materials becomes the

transition model (Section 4.2.2) and social constructivism (3.3), where the conceptual framework attempts to integrate different pedagogies to increase English language learning.

1.4 Overview of the study

Throughout the investigation I gather evidence to argue that limitations associated with particular pedagogies frequently inhibit and restrict ELL. I argue that historical, political and sociocultural facets of South Korea, as well as attitudes associated with these facets, also influence and inhibit ELL at tertiary levels. This becomes consonant with suggestions by Pratt-Johnson (2006), who argues that effective pedagogies must consider social and cultural contexts of teaching and learning. To assist this, I argue that ELL requires a negotiation of pedagogies, as well as social identities, both traditional and newly enacted, where language learners in South Korean tertiary contexts must continuously contest and reassess their individual and sociocultural identities to improve language learning. The conceptual framework of this exegesis analyses the language learning environments and approaches without losing the pragmatic emphasis on the nature of interpersonal communication in formal ELL.

The exegesis identifies and questions traditional assumptions that frame ELL and the ways that ELL has become embedded within particular discourses and power relationships in South Korea. The exegesis questions popular ELL theories to broaden its academic scope, while identifying new processes within specific socioeducational contexts, and examines influences on identity within a broader conceptual framework of tertiary education and language learning. I thus position this study within sociocultural, educational, ELL, and identity frameworks, while devising methodologies which increase learning opportunities for tertiary-level English language learners in South Korea. I seek to uncover ideological assumptions embodied in identities that university-level teachers and students enact and adopt in South Korea, and identities with which they integrate into learner communities. Subsequently, I gain a fuller understanding of the formal learning environment (Hall 2002), while examining the discourse socialization process of South Korean students in classroom communities.

The literature review in Chapter 2 observes pedagogies in South Korea, and the enculturations of South Koreans. I investigate Korean traditional teaching of the English language to South Korean tertiary-level students, as well as those concepts that describe learning of English by South Korean tertiary students.

The literature review in Chapter 3 surveys literature relevant to various fields, such as social identity, and ELL methodologies, responding to the question of how a reconceptualised approach to English language education might be designed to motivate learning in South Korean tertiary contexts. I draw from key areas such as the sociocultural, socioaffective, sociocognitive, and educative domains, to develop the conceptual framework, while discussing learner identity, which Dörnyei (2001a) contends becomes a central factor in developing target language competence. I argue that many current methods do not encourage or even allow for a shift from one social context to another. For this I draw on research to support my suggestion that using a transition pedagogy combining various language learning pedagogies, a study of local and foreign sociocultural knowledge, and a comparative study of sociology, may serve to strengthen learning pathways for South Korean tertiary-level learners of English. Subsequently, I describe how elements of different approaches, traditional pedagogies, and an increasingly greater number of more contemporary approaches, can interact and merge. Through my review of the literature, then, I attempt to reconceptualise ELL pedagogies commonly used globally in many ELL environments, to apply them in the *Convernation* (Hadzantonis 2007) and *Speak4yourself* (Hadzantonis 2011) materials. These reconceptualised pedagogies reflect social, cultural, and pedagogical transition, with which students can learn to shift from primary to secondary discourses, as they also shift between identities to facilitate this movement.

The methodology in Chapter 4 explores the framework I have chosen in terms of selecting literature to support development of the course book. A social constructivist approach hence best suits and leads the investigation of ELL research literature to build curriculum concepts. I explain how ELL and social theories inform the general structure, aims, and conceptual framework of the *Convernation* course book.

In Chapter 5, I outline the contribution of the lower-level course books, *Verbomatik* and *Idiomatik*, to *Convernation*, and discuss the intended use of the *Convernation* course book. I discuss the *Speak4yourself* course materials, and how they build from a revision of *Convernation*. Through the course material products of this PhD by project, and their conceptual framework, I argue that specific pedagogies manifested in learning materials can offer a transition between Korean traditional learning and more western interactive pedagogies. Finally, I include a discussion of the *Teacher's manual* and the roles of teachers while using the course materials.

In Chapter 6 I begin by developing a framework for evaluating ELL materials available in South Korea. I then review and discuss the quality of currently popular language learning materials, and the extent to which sound English language learning concepts emerge in these course books. I follow this by evaluating the *Convernation* and *Speak4yourself* course materials according to criteria derived from the principles of English language learning and teaching highlighted in the literature review, as well as according to models by prominent researchers and theorists. I explore the strengths and limitations of the pedagogical approach I argue for in the course materials. Subsequently, I look at the extent to which the aims of the materials are realised according to these criteria, and how the *Speak4yourself* materials accommodate necessary changes in the *Convernation* structure and content. I finally discuss how the *Convernation* and *Speak4yourself* materials address the language assessment requirements in current South Korean English language learning policy.

The conclusion in Chapter 7 summarises the exegesis, and the project as a whole, and looks at themes and issues emerging that I did not envisage at the outset of the study. I consider limitations and implications of the study, and to where it might progress. I reflect on what I learned, in relation to ELL in South Korea, and to the concepts I have explored and developed.

Chapter 2

Literature Review: Pedagogies in South Korea

2.1 Introduction: The South Korean environment

In this chapter, I investigate the influences on English language education within South Korea. I draw from a literature review to examine social, historical, political, economic and pedagogical influences which shape attitudes and approaches to ELL in South Korean tertiary environments. I argue that these attitudes and approaches shape pedagogy, and limit oral communicative competence, as South Korean English language learners have acclimatised to South Korean ELL conventions, which I argue are alone not conducive to oral communicative competence. In this way, I attempt to describe the elements in the South Korean environment that contribute to shaping ineffective pedagogies in ELL, and hence pedagogies that demotivate learning in South Korean tertiary contexts.

2.2 Primary sociocultural factors structuring South Korean social environments

In countries such as South Korea, according to theorists such as Pennycook (1994), political, historical, and sociocultural narratives strongly shape English language learning. Kramsch (2000) suggests that understanding a country's social, political, and historical domains, increases our understanding of language education. Accordingly, Robertson (2005) argues that for South Korea, this learning of English requires a unique methodology, consonant with South Korea's unique environment.

Shin and Han (2000) suggest that the colonial and precolonial narratives of Taoism, Confucianism, and nationalism, characterise a South Korean set of identities (Bowker 2000), and build its religious, political and social environments (Robertson 2002; Adamson 2005).

Confucianist ideology advocates dependency and nurture rather than independence, hierarchy rather than equality, ultimately emphasising mutual obligation of members of a group, more than

individualism (Cheng 1987; Scollon & Scollon 1994). The development of 'self' requires participation of others where an individual must communicate with others 'correctly' in order to maintain positive relations, and without this communication, the nature and social position of the individual cannot improve (Sullivan 2004). Rights and responsibilities of the individual and group manifest themselves in hierarchical relationships, in which, as Sullivan suggests, broad sociohistorical values become unconsciously embedded. Bond and Hwang (1986, p. 215) note that the relationships in Confucianist societies predominantly exist "between sovereign and subject, father and son, elder brother and younger brother, husband and wife, and friend and friend." Adhering to the role responsibilities of each individual produces social harmony, or at least reduces social disharmony (Sullivan 2004). Cheng (1987, pp. 31–32) argues that in Confucianist societies, "one cannot understand an individual unless one understands the network of relations, and one cannot understand the network of relations unless one understands the individual."

Lee (2002) explains that intricate combinations of factors, dominated by Confucianism, influence contemporary South Korean education policy, where Confucianism contributes to all pedagogical intentions and sociocultural constructs, and in turn to contemporary ELL education policy. Furthermore, reverential intentions of Taoism and Confucianism determine South Korean social, familial and educative conduct (Kim 2002; Robertson 2002). These intentions emphasise discretion and inexpressiveness, self-control and social obscurity, while encouraging virtue, reverence, humility, compliance, and hierarchical deference, rendering one virtuous (Bowker 2000). These primary systems have been enforced in education until the present in Confucian Heritage Cultures, producing rigid rules of communication, and strongly appear in ELL in various pedagogical manifestations (Kim 2002; Tu 2002).

Shin and Han (2000) argue extensively that in South Korea, massive state-led and economic reconstructions throughout the second half of the twentieth century were executed and justified under the rubric of nationalism. South Korean nationalism has constrained intellectual life, has weakened self-esteem, and has strengthened class separation (Robinson 2000). Eckert (2000) contends that nationalism in South Korea has become so deeply entrenched in society that it permeates virtually all

modes of historical interpretation and modern thought, emerging as the dominant discursive framework for interpreting events, where any opposition to this challenges social common sense. Furthermore, colonization by Japan, the west, and even North Korea, as well as sudden and massive internationalization in South Korea, have compounded South Korean militancy and xenophobia, and have greatly encouraged nationalism and the creation of the anti-foreign mindset. To complicate this, the growing presence of English has forced South Korea to strengthen its nationalist mindset and foreign resistance (Em 2000), while ironically welcoming foreigners and foreignism (Shin & Han 2000).

2.3 Social, familial and educational hierarchies

In South Korea, social, familial, and educational hierarchies each reinforces the others (Chang 2008). The individual enacts identities that incorporate duty and responsibility, and forms social relationships within each hierarchy, where the importance of individual identity becomes insignificant in relation to the collective society. Pratt (1998a) maintains that the South Korean individual must appear collective and relational, taking appropriate distance from others. Furthermore, responsibility is two-way, but authority is not, as the young must show obedience to elders, particularly to fathers and teachers. In Chang (2008), we see that the worth of the self depends on this, and any deviation suggests the most disrespectful of acts. Familial and educational systems pervade the social fabric, where father/child and educator/learner responsibilities mirror each other (Barron & Arcodia 2002). De Guzman *et al*. (2006) argue that Korean Confucian ideology, which constitutes a hierarchical education system characterised by the unconditional authority of the educator, still evidences itself strongly.

These sociocultural values, family, and peer influences mediate student attitudes and academic achievement in South Korea. Thus, when sociocultural values and moral familial conditions align with learning, students become highly motivated. A strong hierarchical sociocultural narrative characterises South Korean educational identities. Accordingly, students in South Korea act in hierarchical relationships during formal learning, which increases comfort during learning, and hence

alleviates anxiety and stress in the formal learning environment (Lee 2001b), but limits expression. As Lee argues, traditional South Korea 'correctly' distributes responsibility and authority, and this therefore becomes a necessary factor for academic success.

2.4 Recent sociocultural developments in South Korea

Developments in technology and the introduction of foreign culture instigated massive reforms in the second half of the 20th century, and at the start of the 21st century, shaping modern South Korea. After the 1988 Olympic Games, South Korea embarked upon a plan of globalization and construction, and implemented educational reforms (Shin & Robinson 2000), while making great efforts to maintain Confucian and Taoist traditions (Robertson 2002). The Internet, predominantly in English, new technologies, the need for ELL, as well as the 1988 Olympics, concurrently urged over-rapid integration with the English-speaking world, concertedly creating an explosion in English culture and language, through which South Korean nationalist efforts strengthened so to avoid losing tradition. Em (2000) argues that this sudden and massive change, and inability to substantially maintain tradition, strongly affected South Koreans conceptions of western hegemony and encroachment, and provoked anti-western attitudes. This and other factors have contributed to the alienation of English cultures, of western language educators and their pedagogies, and to the segregation of effective ELL from Korean traditional learning methodologies, thus limiting language learner engagement in current ELL practice. I address this limitation through the transition model (Section 4.2.2).

Through this segregating of Korean from western learning styles, tensions arise between foreigners and South Koreans in South Korea, which subsequently influences conceptions of Korean ELL identities. Through the set of South Korean identities, and hence appropriated learning styles, South Koreans aim to differentiate themselves from western learning styles, and hence pedagogically and linguistically position themselves (Bucholtz & Hall 2005) in ways that distance them from the west. Ironically, South Korean traditional learning styles receive influence from styles predominant in the pre-communicative west, such as grammar translation (De Guzman *et al.* 2006).

In addition, competition for global status has affected South Korea in several ways. It has forced South Korean universities to adopt policies and practices, such as affiliating with universities in other countries, particularly native English speaking countries, with the aims of boosting local university status, and sending students to foreign universities for study exchange. While at the foreign university, these students mingle with students from a range of countries in an environment which offers them new learning insights. In those new educational environments, no longer do the constraints of South Korean pedagogies guide these students, but rather the students witness the efforts of other students who desire to negotiate identity, to venture, take risks, and participate in a new 'multilocalised' pedagogy. South Korean students ultimately recognise the significance and commensurability of their identities and heritage to other heritages, thus learning to accept and appreciate other students, from whom they learn much, ultimately encouraging a comparative view of society. Furthermore, in their aim to 'globalise', South Korean universities increasingly invite foreign students, both western and eastern, encouraging South Korean students to accept transition, and to appreciate the value of enacting identities other than their traditional and local ones. Additionally, the desire by South Korean companies such as *Samsung*, *LG*, *Hyundai*, *SK Telecom*, *Daewoo*, *Kia*, and *PnG Korea*, to work with and promote themselves as global companies, has urged these companies to 'train' their employees to become 'Global leaders' (a popular South Korean university slogan). As a result, employees in all areas of South Korean professional practice act in 'western' ways, 'high five' each other, sit side by side with the company manager, and address each other on a first and western name basis. To add to this, foreign companies such as *Apple*, *Microsoft*, and *Sony* have made inroads into South Korea, distributing products for which South Koreans must adopt new conventions, both linguistic and social, and popular in other regions. These facts indicate an attempt to enact a mixture of identities, both for and against integrating with westerners, thus revealing a conflict.

Consequently, South Koreans struggle as promoters of South Korean traditional cultural identity, yet for acceptance as global citizens in a modern era. This has awakened South Korea to the fact that negotiation of language and identity should become a primary focus, and hence has encouraged South Koreans to attempt to develop a type of social level headedness, whereby they

attempt to develop knowledge of both the local and the distant. It has urged South Koreans to move beyond being homogeneously Korean and ignoring foreign environments, realizing the importance of multilingualism, and to welcome entanglements with foreigners, while also accepting others in their community for doing so. A modern South Korean must be 'wise to the world', and must be competent in shifting in and out of spaces within which people from other countries and heritages also shift. In the case of South Korean English language learners, observation of other cultures with which the students can compare themselves facilitates this movement, thus serving as a space for sociocultural growth, and identity negotiation.

2.5 South Korean English language learners

In the following sections I draw on the work of Lee (2001b), who convenes and researches at the University of Cambridge, and at Josai University in Japan, in the fields of French and Korean comparative literature.

Lee (2001b) notes that South Koreans learn English with a strong emphasis on grammar from an early age through to high school and university, with typical class sizes of 60 pupils, making verbal interaction uncommon, if at all possible, and students have not transitioned from small group to large group work, and hence have not learned to interact. South Korean study patterns in secondary schools are still "typically that of spoon feeding followed by learning by heart, and there is still little development of … [the student's] own arguments and ideas (p. 340)". Lee also notes that

> Korean students have little experience of … summarizing evidence and presenting a rational argument. (Indeed it is only very recently that training in logical argument as a specific subject has been incorporated into the school curriculum in an attempt to compensate for a cultural tendency to give priority to emotional rather than rational values). (p. 340)

Many compulsory subjects in high school and the great competition for places in good universities creates much pressure on pupils, resulting in little or no time to read material other than prescribed texts. With little exposure to foreign English media to contextualise the language, language learners "lack cultural background, and this affects their comprehension on English tests of any kind" (Lee 2001b, pp. 340–341; Section 2.6.5). Furthermore, if South Koreans "are able to find the time to see a foreign film, it will be dubbed" (p. 341). In this environment, learning to verbally communicate in

another language becomes almost impossible, so parents arrange private instruction in English for children, where "regrettably, learners often derive little benefit from this, since the techniques used by many [Korean] tutors are [also] those of the traditional schoolroom" (p. 340). Lee adds that the awareness of the need for change is purely theoretical and has not yet been translated into educational improvement (Section 2.6.4) which is encapsulated in this description of the enculturation of South Korean English language learners:

> In Korean schools, the teacher's authority is absolute, and if the teacher should make a mistake, pupils will not draw this to his or her attention. [Hence] … Korean learners are extremely reluctant to speak without being certain that what they say will be correct …. [affecting] participation in class. Any form of exercise that encourages speaking will take some getting used to, but the teacher is likely to find that students are more comfortable … [working privately] … than with self revelatory tasks, especially those involving interaction with the teacher in a plenary situation. To be corrected by a teacher in front of one's Korean fellow students is humiliating. Although pupils are expected to, and usually do, concentrate, they are not expected to show that they are paying attention by looking up at the teacher. On the contrary: eye contact is regarded as rude. (pp. 340–342)

However, in foreign settings with international groups of learners, and where their language learning performance differs, South Korean learners "do not feel that [they are] … in competition with fellow students" (p. 342). Similarly,

> [t]he [foreign] teacher may feel that Korean students should adopt other mores of English speaking societies – but this is not a process that can be rushed. The fluency of the native speaker language teacher, and indeed, of many European non-native speakers of English, will be found overwhelming [by the Korean learner]. [In such situations] Korean students value [language tactics such as] the considered pause – both because [they] give them more time to process what they have heard, and because this is sympathetic to their own culture, in which a measured style of speech, with many pauses, is a sign of thoughtfulness, and of consideration for the interlocutor. (p. 342)

Until this point, I have argued that the elements of language socialization in South Korea are such that Korean students become enculturated into particular learning styles, which they require, at least in part, in all areas of their ongoing and higher education, including in ELL. This follows from Park (2000), who notes that salient sociocultural norms and values, in particular social peer pressure, have an impact, be it frequently negative, both in and out of formal interactive learning environments.

Lee argues for the strong cultural pressure on South Koreans to speak in an unhurried manner, and without facial mobility or gesture, during which they may appear unmoved. South Koreans and Korean society regards anything more expressive as unacceptable, and their apparent woodenness or impassivity to native speakers of English signifies composure to Koreans. Furthermore, certain

expressions which appear irrelevant to others may indicate distinct emotion or intention to South Koreans, contributing to intercultural misunderstanding, and hence emerges an inhibition to interact in another language.

The academic styles of South Korean students also present themselves clearly. South Korean language environments predominantly employ memorization perseverance strategies (Lee 2001b). In learning vocabulary in English in South Korea, students heavily focus on spelling and phonics to facilitate internalization of linguistic elements, with the hope of developing verbal communicative competence. They rarely question or critique themselves, their work, or their teachers, avoid oral negotiation, and refrain from criticizing or contextualizing the new language. According to Bohn (2004), these students appear highly compliant, quiet, shy, and inexpressive, which stems from a desire by South Koreans to appear virtuous, reverential, compliant, non-offensive, and non-confrontational to other students and educators, in accordance with traditional Korean culture (Lee 2001b; see Section 2.2).

Accustomed to repetitively using vocabulary to aid learning, South Korean English language students experience difficulty when attempting to use language in communicative contexts without adequate 'repetitive learning' preparation. Lee argues that traditional school vocabulary learning in South Korea inclines students to use Korean/English word lists, suggesting the predominance of both repetitive learning and grammar translation techniques. Park (2000) conducted a one-year ethnographic study of South Korean adult learners of English in Seoul, finding strong evidence of inhibitions in interaction during formal language learning. The study indicates that South Korean sociocultural, institutional, psychological, and linguistic enculturations affect the success of interactive ELL without specific interventions. Subsequently, these language learners should apply vocabulary both grammatically and pragmatically, where teachers should simultaneously concentrate on form and meaning, resulting in a focus-on-form approach (Section 3.6).

Lee (2001b) also describes the Korean language as rich in vocabulary used to convey respect and self effacement. South Korean students experience embarrassment or confusion when searching

for equivalent English forms during verbal interaction, and words that do not express the same respect, greatly influenced by the fact that Korean grammar has far less ambiguity than English, while syntactic structure is far more rigid in Korean than in English. Consequently, the students experience anxiety when speaking English, contributing to their hesitation when using a language in which they are inadequately prepared for verbal interaction, accentuated by the importance they place on syntax (p. 339).

2.6 English language learning in South Korea

In this section I explore literature on English language learning in South Korean elementary, secondary, and tertiary schooling in order to better conceptualise South Korean English language learning. The enculturation of students at each level of schooling, in and out of classroom contexts, affects learner attitudes, performance, and styles, which extend from socioeconomic, sociohistorical, and pedagogical constraints, and subsequently shape English language pedagogies. This amounts to a strong language socialization (Lantolf & Thorne 2009; Section 3.2).

2.6.1 South Korean educational traditions

Influences on ELL in South Korea include Korea's long-term internal and external struggle for emancipation from oppression, the need for socioeconomic status, the struggle for gender rights, and efforts for economic reform. South Korea also continues to struggle to maintain global competitiveness by attempting to strengthen its national identity. Furthermore, in light of a lack of natural resources, education and technology have become the flagship for South Korean national identity. To undermine these influences, the sociohistorical and socioeconomic issues I discussed in Sections 2.2, 2.3, and 2.4, have regulated language education in South Korea from its outset. These influences have induced assessment-oriented and teacher-centred environments in South Korea, rather than encouraging interactive techniques in language learning (Cheung 2000; Oka 2004), and have enculturated a certain type of language learner, generally through emphasizing a need for social identity. Social identity manifests itself in educational prestige as another influence in South Korea. This comes as traditionally, eastern and Confucianist heritage cultures highly value educational

15

prestige and accomplishment, where to fail is to alienate oneself from the social fabric that creates a collective identity. To succeed in traditional South Korean society, one needs to meet all Confucian heritage cultural obligations, centralised in education (Chen, Warden & Chang 2005).

According to the OECD (2007), in most Asian countries, learning constitutes a one-sided transmission process, occurring through the medium of books and teacher pedagogies (Chang 2008), as teachers act as language user models and students copy. These educational settings value the transmission of knowledge where students tend to regard teachers as the authority and source of knowledge (Gu & Schweisfurth 2006; Hu 2002). If teachers err, or admit fallibility or ignorance, students lose respect for the teachers (Kowalski 2002), whereas compliance has many benefits. Triandis (1977, p. 157) suggests, that "[c]onformity to another is another technique of ingratiation", describing the efforts of students in CHC educative environments. Many theorists and investigators, such as Razmjoo and Riazi (2006), argue that in these expository and teacher-dominated pedagogies, still predominant in modern education, teachers interpret, analyse and elaborate on their knowledge, delivering sequenced and mediated doses of this knowledge through repetition, and prioritizing memorization. Similarly, Robertson (2005) notes that South Korean classrooms, until the beginning of the 7th National Curriculum in 2002, explicitly emphasised 'rote' learning for ELL. Lim and Griffith (2003) suggest that teachers focus on transmission, accumulation and internalization, over creation, construction, and experiential application, as students aim to score highly on written standardised tests. According to Hellsten and Prescot (2004), students still expect these methods, and teachers still deploy them, allowing little or no opportunity to develop learner competence and verbal interaction (Robertson 2005). Yu (2001) agrees, contending that South Korean language teachers exclude oral skills and critical thinking from curriculum, perpetuating the mechanical nature of learning by frequently administering irrelevant study themes, which is not conducive to oral communicative competence. Consequently, Asian countries need a new breed of scholar-educators who actively draw on affective dimensions of learning which counter mechanical learning (Wong 2004). Furthermore, Pae (2008) and Oka (2004) describe traditional ELL in South Korea as a combination of grammar-translation and audiolingualism (discussed below). Rubdy (2009) discusses the concept of cultures of

passivity, in which teachers mistrust what their students know about the target language and teach from a position of authority. The relationship with students is unequal in this one way transmission, encouraging attitudes of fear of questioning the authority of the teacher, and those in power in society, developing a culture of passivity, and in direct opposition to the culture of autonomy. Rubdy contends that in these instances, creativity and innovation become suppressed, and students feel subjected to authority. This passivity is associated with teacher-centred language learning where students unproductively engage in mimicry, memorisation and repetition, where the interaction is formulaic, and meaning making does not occur collaboratively.

Practical constraints in South Korean educational environments, such as class size, time, low educator income, work overload, and lack of training, leave little concern for development of effective content. Pae (2008) emphasises that time constraints encourage one-way transmission to large numbers of learners, despite the deployment of a great number of native English speakers to all South Korean ELL classrooms. The traditional grammar-translation and audiolingual methods popular in the pre-communicative eras of language learning become consonant with these constraints and facilitate the traditional pedagogies of South Korean educators (Li 1998), allowing the teachers continued authority, planning and control. This method, according to Lim and Griffith (2003), allows the teachers to maintain face in a teaching environment where they have minimal communicative competence in English. Clearly in this case, the language teachers embed their native cultural elements in English language instruction (Diaz-Rico 2004).

As noted in Sections 2.5 and 2.6, in order to reach A-level standards in an educational system that wholly endorses grammar translation and non-verbal practice (Oka 2004), South Korean language learners direct many resources toward grammar-based standardised tests, increasing the use of grammar-translation in ELL. In their analysis of South Korean education and how teachers administer pedagogies of English, Kim and Choi (1999) describe the effect of these modern English pedagogies. They stipulate that English education in South Korea mixes non-negotiable oral and grammatical methods, where teachers become the centre of the formal learning environment and become responsible for all tasks. The students adopt mechanical drills using grammar-translation or

audiolingual methods. Whether spoken or written, students continue to resort to grammar as a central framework for learning. Teachers do not introduce discourse-level instruction but adhere to pedagogies with sentence-level writing centered on translation. A central goal then becomes to develop speech automaticity in very short, almost single word, everyday structures, rather than to manipulate language creatively and independently for longer discourse.

Lim and Griffith (2003) maintain that the sole use of these Korean traditional pedagogies discourages individuality, fulfilment of personal needs, and self-expression, constraining expression of emotions in students. Richards and Rogers (2001) also argue that this English language instruction alone is not conducive to effective development in language communicative competence, and requires additional methodologies to bridge the language learning gap. Ellis (2005) argues that these pedagogical methods alone inhibit development of communicative ability and are not conducive to creativity, ultimately failing to develop critical thinking, problem-solving skills, negotiation, and hence become highly ineffective for broad language development. Though in South Korea these academic methods limit communicative ELL and reduce independent learning initiatives, Yoon (2004) argues that communicative language learning can benefit from grammar instruction, which Nunan (1988, p.40) labels as an important 'notional functional' approach. This contributes to the argument that these methods alone, as discussed in Sections 2.6.4 and 3.2, become ineffective for development of verbal communicative competence, but in part may constitute an effective technique for the development of communicative competence in another language for the South Korean tertiary-level student.

Language learning becomes an issue when South Korean tertiary students experience interpersonal exposure prior to developing language competence which is socially acceptable (Jung 2000). Despite being at a level of language adequate for *Conversation* and *Speak4yourself*, speakers still need to practise prior to interaction and interpersonal engagement, calling for an integrated approach (Sections 3.2, 3.5, 3.6, 3.8, and 4.2.2), and hence calling for a transition model (Section 4.2.2).

South Korean English language teaching comprises predominantly general and non-specialist Korean teachers, not competent in the language and untrained for communicative teaching (Li 1998). The SERI website (SERI 2007) reported on June 11, 2007, that the number of specialist English teachers nationwide, in comparison to non-specialist teachers, is disproportionately small. Butler (2004) notes that such teachers have little confidence in teaching and assessing speaking, and are inadequately equipped, with few English language South Korean teachers in Seoul able to deliver satisfactory elementary oral English instruction. Furthermore, SERI (2007) reports that South Korean teachers still conduct English courses almost exclusively in Korean. In an extensive study of university students of English in Seoul, Shin (2001) argues that the lack of satisfaction in ELL becomes rooted in the poor quality of South Korean teacher education by English departments and English Education departments of universities. Shin describes that staff and curriculum of English departments appear too theory-oriented rather than practice-oriented, and oppose western communicative styles, thus limiting appropriate education for English teachers. South Korean students lose respect for teachers who have low competence in the English language, and who avoid language negotiation, crucial for development of language learner competence. An effective language teacher has competence in drawing from cultural knowledge, using the language through the four language skills, and can reduce anxiety in the formal learning environment. When teachers lack socio-affective capacity, learning loses efficacy, hence limiting development of learner communicative competence. South Korean teachers thus require pedagogies and materials that aid their low competence in English. Shin concludes that South Korean student and teacher views of effective education differ, where students dislike the solely Korean traditional teaching approaches teachers offer. The current Korean set of language pedagogies thus appears to fail to engage these students and to expand their ELL education.

The South Korean language learning environment should thus balance form and meaning, without which language learning becomes constrained, and hence students and teachers in South Korea must aspire to integrate a focus-on-form (Section 3.6) approach.

2.6.2 English language learning efficiency in South Korea

Despite huge investments in ELL in South Korea, the level of English language competence is in a parlous state. A 2003 Korean Government Information Agency report, which ranked South Korea 110th worldwide in the TOEFL (Jerch 2004), indicates that the gap between investment in learning and language competence reflects a crisis in the Korean English-teaching industry, compounded by the government's inept response to enormous public demand (SERI 2008).

A large scale audit by the Korean Educational Development Institute (KEDI 2003), presented South Korea as having the lowest success in learning English on a global scale, and the Hong Kong Political and Economic Risk Consultancy rated South Koreans as having the lowest English communicative competence across Asia (SERI 2008). Two nationwide South Korean surveys, one by the Seoul government in 2003 (Cho 2007), and one by SERI in 2006 (SERI 2008), ascertained that 75% of Korean learners of English surveyed admitted to a lack of communicative competence. In 2005 South Korea lagged behind all East Asian countries in luring global companies; Hong Kong and Singapore had drawn 1,167 and 350 regional headquarters respectively, whereas South Korea attracted only 11, spurred by the fear by foreigners unable to communicate with South Koreans (SERI 2008).

There is also an increasing dissatisfaction with ELL education and movements of English language students toward private education, while the South Korean government attempts to curb and centralise the growing need for English education. An investigation by one of South Korea's four main broadcasters, Munhwa Broadcasting (Jeon 2006), which looked at the expenditure of South Koreans on ELL, reported that in terms of money, time and effort, South Korea greatly surpasses all other countries. To the completion of tertiary level study, this amounts to approximately 15,000 hours of ELL per person, exacerbating national expenditure (Kim 2006). SERI (2007) reports that, in 2006, South Korea as a nation spent $US 15.6 billion on domestic English study, $US 7 billion on English private institutes, and $US 7 billion on standardised testing, which accounts for 2% of the GDP. In addition, according to Choi (2008, p. 42), the amount for English testing for 2008 was in the vicinity

of $US 100 billion. Per capita, this total is more than twelve times the expenditure of Japan (Cho 2007, p. 42). In 2004, the South Korean government distributed stipends of $US 30 billion for tuition and living to South Koreans studying in America (Kim 2006, pp. 44–45). According to MEST (South Korean Ministry of Education, Science and Technology) (2008), the government budgeted $US 270 million for projects in 2008, with the aims of annual increase, to expand ELL in the education system, in order to 'curb increasing private education expenses', and to centralise English education.

Pennycook and Coutand-Marin (2004) maintain that, as English acts as a gatekeeper which amplifies socioeconomic distinctions and cultural encumbrances, socioeconomic motives strongly compel South Koreans to learn English. Students spend money on methods and resources which are ineffective for the development of their oral communicative and pragmatic competence, such as those on the internet, ineffective self-study materials, and 'quick-learn' resources. These students use cheaper, more available teachers, less competent in communicative English, requiring them to spend much more money in the long run, and methods and items not conducive to developing communicative competence in English (Robertson 2002).

These factors emphasise the low efficiency of ELL in South Korea; an inefficiency far surpassing other countries (Kim 2006; IELTS 2008). Salient then becomes the need for effective language learning materials designed to incorporate pedagogies alternative to those currently available. Furthermore, the inefficiency in ELL in South Korea would create a greater demand for materials claiming to, and having substantiated that claim to, address ELL inefficiency.

2.6.3 Western education in South Korea

South Korean learners of English experience difficulty when interacting with western teachers who have different requirements from theirs, and who employ pedagogies which differ from those of South Korean teachers. Hellsten and Prescot (2004) argue that non Korean-national, western teachers of English equip themselves with modern pedagogical tools, skills and models, yet, as Oka (2004) notes, these teachers have little conception of South Korean local communication methods and mores.

According to Hall (2002), various conflicts arise in cross-cultural education, rendering the methodologies of the foreign educators incompatible with learning needs of South Korean students.

Not unexpectedly, South Korean English language learners often perceive western English teachers as inconsiderate, ignorant and disrespectful of local South Korean culture and students, incompetent as teachers, as having little interest in developing their expertise as teachers and developing pedagogies that effectively engage the students (Han 2002). These perceptions weaken student-teacher relationships, and spur ineffective ELL, pushing students to revert to Korean traditional methods. The employment of strictly western methodologies by western teachers increases the conception by South Korean students of imperialism, and has a pronounced effect on student attitudes. Pratt-Johnson (2006) notes that to change the quality of ELL, and to increase learning opportunities, western teachers must gain socioeducational knowledge of South Korea and, as Brown (2007) contends, they must understand and integrate Korean traditional pedagogies into their own. This directly links to the intentions of the *Conversation* and *Speak4yourself* conceptual framework.

Incorporating pedagogies that are foreign into their own presents both South Korean and non-South Korean teachers of English with difficulty. Teaching English to tertiary-level students in South Korea has many constraints where, like Korean-national teachers of English, foreign-national teachers of English have many restrictions placed upon them. The foreign teachers must frequently follow a set curriculum. They often arrive in South Korea with little to no experience in teaching, although institute owners and universities expect them to perform under conditions that require them to manage learning environments with expertise. Newly arrived teachers in South Korea feel alienated and can develop anti-Korean attitudes, hence distancing themselves from South Koreans, where these foreign teachers frequently revert to their 'foreign' pedagogies. Language institutes, not accustomed to the effects of sudden exposure of South Korean students to interactive contexts, encourage and require these western teachers to employ interactive techniques but without adequately preparing students. This may also have an adverse effect on the teachers' perception of the ELL environment in South Korea.

Ahn (2003) notes that English language teaching throughout South Korea does not utilise the principles of intercultural language teaching (Section 3.2), which the 7th National Curriculum otherwise postulates (KEDI 2007). The strict maintenance of traditional pedagogies perpetuates power imbalance between students and teachers in South Korean education (Barron & Arcodia 2002), and contributes to the suggestion of a need for transition materials that combine Korean traditional and interactive learning methods. To effect change then, amongst other factors, proponents of South Korean ELL would benefit by changing attitudes toward the usefulness of non-traditional pedagogies during language learning, toward identity issues and ethnicity, and thus, to the integration of traditional and non-traditional methods in ELL.

2.6.4 Attempts to advance the South Korean education system

A shift from purely traditional methods to incorporate more pragmatic methodologies in South Korean ELL seems to be occurring very gradually, if at all. The dominance of traditional ELL pedagogies in countries such as South Korea over forms that encourage and incorporate oral communicative interaction inhibits change (Razmjoo & Riazi 2006). Yoon (2004) suggests that despite directing huge effort and many resources at the policy level toward the success of interactive methods, this inhibition remains. The communicative method, in ways strongly advocated by western educators of English, appears to be strongly at odds with South Korean socio-educative expectations, with deep resistance to its use since its introduction in South Korea, which has led to calls for alternatives such as a context-based approach (Hymes 1971; Wilkins 1976; Bax 2003; see Section 3.6).

South Korean teachers of English also admit that they find purely grammar-translation courses ineffective, and native English teachers find strictly communicative programs ineffective (Lee 2002). Moreover, the low quality of English language teaching in South Korea, according to Choi (2008), forces many language learners to allocate their strained education budgets to private institutes. This allocation, sources such as SERI (2005; 2008), as well as Ahn (2003), argue, reinforces hardcore authoritarian pedagogies not conducive to the development of verbal communicative competence

(Section 2.6.1; Section 2.6.2). Transmissive approaches, lack of resources, and overpopulated classrooms, limit opportunities for students to meaningfully interact with one another, suggesting that, alone, or without the students receiving adequate cognitive preparation through traditional methods, the communicative method proves to be highly inadequate for countries such as South Korea (Razmjoo & Riazi 2006). Policies which advocate negotiation in the target language in classrooms in South Korea, such as 'English only' (Chou 2004), and which the government has attempted to implement at the classroom level (KEDI 2007), thus appear to be highly flawed.

The South Korean government has allocated many resources to improve English language teaching in elementary and secondary schools, including compulsory educator training, materials development and, from 2007, placing native English-speaking educators in every ELL classroom around the country (MEST 2008). However, while teachers are now being recruited from native speaking countries, there is no particular emphasis on professional experience or skill, and many recruits have only recently graduated from various Bachelor degrees and not from Educational backgrounds. This predominance of teachers with limited experience requires materials which aid and guide teachers well, and ones which assist students to contribute to curriculum, where a participatory pedagogy requires input from all members of a learning community, and where students receive the opportunity to assist teachers. Such becomes the case with *Convernation* and *Speak4yourself*, as I argue in Chapters 3 and 4.

2.6.5 Testing

In line with a currently popular campaign, 'No English, No job', competence in English has become imperative for employment in Asia, urging exponential growth of the English language teaching industry. This imperative places great importance on testing and a need for measurement on a large scale. Many factors indicate that despite the MEST (2008) intentions for socioeducational change, modern South Korean education remains unchanged from its traditional roots, which according to Crozier (2002) has foundation in two government tests: the national *Kohshih* standardised written examination and the *KSAT*. The national *Kohshih* examination, which the

government administers for entrance into tertiary courses and government positions, influences all education. Preparation for this exam, and other similar South Korean exams, constitutes a formidable obstacle to analytical learning. Thus, according to Choi (2008), pedagogies for all South Korean education are test-driven, not learner-driven, and up to 2002, virtually all educational exams for matriculation mirrored the other of the two tests, the *KSAT*. The *KSAT* does not include speaking and writing components, and even after intense moderation, has not conformed to the communicative requirements stipulated in the current national curriculum.

The university entrance exam has emerged as one of the most influential factors determining the social institution to which students gain acceptance in South Korea. Norris-Holt (2001) reminds us that in Northeast Asian countries such as Japan and South Korea, the structure of university entrance exams highly influences educational and social values, which determine the institution to which students gain acceptance. The structure of the exam forces schools and teachers to educate students in a manner which will prove most beneficial for their exam performance. Therefore, secondary school education focuses on sitting such entrance exams, and hence incorporates a rigorous test of grammatical competence in the English language, requiring students to translate complex passages, and to acquire extensive vocabulary and grammatical structures. The exams do not focus on speaking and listening skills, and schools have no motive to prepare students for something not examinable. Choi (2008) notes that the increasing use of standardised tests in South Korea, which have become a requirement for university entrance, graduation and employment, and more so social status, controls learning styles and careers, and enforces pedagogical paradigms and methods. Teachers focus on preparing learners to perform well on these entrance examinations, but these exams prove to be highly ineffective in testing communicative competence in a language. They emerge as a rigorous test of English grammatical structure, as well as grammar translation. Norris-Holt (2001) contends that these tests do not measure speaking and listening skills of language learners, and hence educational institutions see no need to prepare students for oral interaction. Furthermore, a high percentage of both junior and senior high school students identify the major reason for studying English as achievement in examinations such as the *Kohshih*.

According to MEST (2008), approximately 2.7 million South Koreans took English proficiency tests in 2006, with 76% taking foreign-developed exams such as the TOEFL, TOEIC, and IELTS, while concurrently taking local English tests. The Samsung Educational Research Institute (SERI 2006) reported that South Korea is the major global consumer of the TOEFL, representing 18.5% of the worldwide testing population in 2005. Furthermore, the TOEIC accounts for the largest proportion of the English testing market in South Korea, which approximated 47.1% in 2005 (SERI 2005), forcing colleges, universities, and companies to accept it as the main test of language competence. In 2004, 1.8 million people took the TOEIC in South Korea (Korea Daily Newspaper 2005, in Choi 2008, p. 43), rising to 1.9 million in 2007 (Choi 2008).

The South Korean government agreed to spend 21.5 billion Korean won ($US 23.32 million) between 2008 and 2011 to develop a new, government-administered test, adding to the already massive expenditure on English education. The intentions of the test include: comprehensiveness of all required language testing content, international recognition of a suitable measure of test-taker verbal communicative abilities, and enhancement of domestic capacity for English education and assessment. The intentions also include reducing agency of and dependency on foreign English proficiency tests such as the TOEIC, the TOEFL, and the IELTS, and improving the level of English education nationwide. The online test planned to measure competence in the skills of speaking, listening, reading and writing. Pertinent at this point then becomes the question of 'how effective online testing is'. My recent discussions with the Seoul National University Department of Education (2011, personal communication) indicate that although the test was developed, it has been discontinued, and the government has not indicated that a new test will be produced. No other information was provided.

The average TOEIC scores of South Koreans are at an extremely low level on a global scale (SERI 2005). This average includes the performance by South Korean teachers of English, which indicates that English education in Korea is highly substandard. SERI (2006) reported that South Korea scored 103rd among the 148 countries in 2005 in the IELTS and scored in the lowest 25 % of all countries in 2006. IELTS (2008) global rankings indicate that South Korea has consistently fallen

between 18th and 20th, whereas in western environments, South Korean learners of English achieve significant increases after much less intense formal language instruction (Woodrow 2006).

Choi (2008) argues that the perpetual push to improve on consecutively low test scores has forced the market for English testing to far outweigh that of all other languages combined and has dramatically expanded markets for English language testing institutes and university courses. However, the focus is almost solely on preparing students for standardised writing tests. For example, the Dong-a Ilbo newspaper online, *Early English fervor: when should we start studying?* (September 3, Hong 2003), the Hankyoreh newspaper online, *Making Seoul a republic of English?* (April 25, Kim 2004), as well as other frequent reports in Korean media, contend that all South Korean English language teachers prepare students for standardised writing tests. According to other sources, such as Choi (2008), the Hankookilbo Newspaper (2005), and the Jungang Daily newspaper (2005), even those who score substantially on standardised English tests in South Korea demonstrate a significant discrepancy between their test scores and oral communicative competence in English. Lee (2001a) attributes this to students developing test-taking strategies rather than oral communicative competence, and hence not consolidating their communicative competence in the English language.

2.6.6 Current English language learning policy in South Korea

According to the Korean Education Development Institute (KEDI 2007), the intentions of MEST, through its 7th National Curriculum, first implemented in 2002 and currently still in use, include that English education in South Korea cultivates creative, autonomous, and self-driven learners who communicate competently. Accordingly, the ministry aims to tailor an education system to student capabilities, aptitudes and career development, and to ensure expanded autonomy for local sectors and schools in curriculum formation and operation.

Kwon (2000) discusses the history of policy changes and modifications in English education in South Korea, where the government has aimed to produce more effective and productive language education. These include the introduction of elementary school English as a regular school subject in

1997, the influx of native-speaker teachers, and the 6th and 7th National Curriculum, which stipulate incorporating a communicative element into the formal language learning environment and language classroom. Moreover, South Korean universities have been increasing the number of their already compulsory English discussion courses, with great resistance from students who believe that additional classes of quality similar to those at present, are not conducive to developing their communicative competence. This additional instruction has not met the needs of students to contextualise the language effectively so as to develop verbal communicative competence (Koo 2005). This lack of effectiveness of additional instruction results in English language learners flooding private institutes and private education, exacerbating the already astronomical expenditure on English education.

Thus, many factors restrict students from opportunities to use adequate practical English needed to develop communicative competence. The aims of South Korean educative administrating bodies which I discussed through this section, as well as the government campaign for globalization, have affected English curriculum, as well as assessment policies at the theoretical and design levels, but not at the practical level (Pae 2008). Furthermore, classroom reality has fallen short of policy aims, as the professional practice of English language teaching has remained inadequate for South Korea's development, and as schools continue to enforce ineffective methods to develop communicative language teaching. Yoon (2004) notes that this follows on from micromanagement policies, lack of resources, and lack of intent to realise the pragmatic possibilities of education department policy.

2.7 Summary

In this chapter I described the social and educational circumstances surrounding South Korean tertiary learners of English. I argued that exposure of these students solely to traditional language learning methods is not conducive to the development of oral communicative competence, which also appears to be the case with sole use of western methods. The use of only one learning method even adversely affects learning the English language by creating anti-foreign sentiments,

through which these language learners reject the English language and associated cultures. I thus argued that these language learners would greatly benefit by negotiating the boundaries of conventional language learning methods to begin to become critical of their social and cultural locations, by questioning who they are socioculturally, and by negotiating identity, learning content, and pedagogy. This investigation by students should not end at self reflection, but should also become part of their learning development. The reflection of this chapter on the South Korean ELL environment informs a reconceptualised approach to English language education, summoning a deeper discussion of ELL theory in Chapter 3.

Chapter 3

Literature Review: Language Learning Theory

3.1 Introduction: Theoretical underpinnings for English language learning

In this chapter I first discuss strategies and their importance to language learning. I proceed to argue that through a localised and sociopragmatic approach, students can learn, and teachers can teach the English language in alternative ways. I then discuss the importance of social theory in English language learning. I discuss English language learning theory, and how its cognitive, affective. and social constructs can affect language learning and communicative competence. All these elements contribute to the theoretical underpinnings of alternative pedagogies that constitute the *Convernation* course book and its by-product *Speak4yourself*, across a number of dimensions, including transition and participatory pedagogies.

In contrast to Chomsky's 'linguistic competence' (Chomsky 1965), and coining the term 'communicative competence', Hymes (1972) contended that language emerges as a sociocognitive phenomenon, where we should view syntax and language forms as meaning resources that learners vary in specific contexts. Contending that language teachers must emphasise sociolinguistic competence, linguistic competence, discourse competence, and strategic competence, Canale (1983) defined communicative competence to include

> [t]he underlying systems of knowledge and skill required for communication. Knowledge refers here to what one knows … about the language and about other aspects of communicative language use; skill refers to how well one can perform this knowledge in actual communication. (p.5)

This performance of language and skill develops through social interaction, negotiation, and assimilation of others' speech during communication (Canale & Swain 1980).

Communicative competence motivates my descriptions throughout the study, as I investigate the effective pedagogical pathways of English language learners. The references to communicative language competence involve all four skills: reading, writing, speaking and listening. Furthermore, Barron (2003) defines sociopragmatic competence as

the knowledge of the linguistic resources available in a given language for realizing particular illocutions, knowledge of the sequential aspects of speech acts and finally, knowledge of the appropriate contextual use of the particular languages' linguistic resources. (p. 10)

Sociopragmatic competence involves an ability to adjust speech strategies appropriately according to different social variables, such as social dominance and distance between participants in a conversation, and participant roles in communication (Harlow 1990, p. 328).

Throughout the study I adopt the term 'ELL' in order to emphasise the agency of the students as learners, rather than to distance the language from the language learner by using English language teaching. Using the terms ESL and EFL, as I discuss in this chapter, refutes reappropriating English for localised and contextual use, and hence against social constructivism.

3.2 Socioaffective strategies to English language learning

Theorists such as Ellis, Basturkmen and Loewen (2001) note the importance of strategies in ELL, which Wenden and Rubin (1987, p.19) define as "sets of operations, steps, plans, routines used by the learner to facilitate the obtaining, storage, retrieval, and use of information." Scarcella and Oxford (1992) define target language learning strategies as

actions, behaviors, steps, techniques [or thoughts] – such as seeking out conversation partners, or giving oneself encouragement to tackle a difficult language task – used by students to enhance their own learning. (p. 63)

Hsiao and Oxford (2002) find that effective ELL strategies promote learner autonomy, proficiency, and self-regulation, and, according to Macaro (2006), develop confidence and motivation. Investigating South Korean learners of English, Park (1999b) found that interactive learning strategies significantly affect language competence, and vice versa, where the stronger the linguistic and pragmatic competence, the more willingly learners adopt western interactive strategies. Oxford (1990) provides a detailed description of strategies which I discuss below, including cognitive, affective and social strategies, and which become significant to my course book conceptual framework.

Lefkowitz and Hedgcock (2006) emphasise that in ELL, social variables such as socioeconomic class, as well as affective factors such as anxiety, govern the use and construction of socioaffective strategies. Diaz-Rico (2004) defines socioaffective strategies as actions language

learners employ to regulate emotion and motivation, and hence to interact effectively. These strategies decrease student and target language culture distance, and increase learner agency (Chou 2004), which is integral to language development (Gardner *et al.* 2004; Macintyre 2007), reinforcing Schumann's theory (1978) that social and socioaffective distance of language learners from the target language group affects their language learning capacity.

Socioaffective strategies promote negotiation of social identity, increase cooperative learning, and increase students' access to information. Furthermore, according to Dörnyei (2005), they reduce feelings of inferiority, and create, maintain and moderate suitable internal and external learning climates. They increase learning by facilitating empathy among members of a learning community, facilitating gradual membership of language learners into communities, hence minimizing anxiety. English language learners such as those in South Korea, according to Chou (2004), have not yet learnt to effectively employ these strategies.

The list of accepted socioaffective strategies is extensive but includes the following: Language learners should exert their agency, and interpret, express, and control their learning, to negotiate and overcome errors, and hence develop autonomy. Participants should shape language form for their own purposes, localizing and situating learning, and students should supplement their learning with their own content.

Language socialization also constitutes a socioaffective strategy. Language socialization suggests both socialization through language and socialization to learn and use language, where novices acquire knowledge of communities, social order, and systems of belief through exposure to and participation in language-mediated interaction (Ochs 1986). Language learners benefit greatly through language socialization, during which they should learn to negotiate their identities for effective language learning, contributing to learner autonomy. I define learner autonomy as an ability to individually select appropriate learning pathways that facilitate the development of communicative competence. Some conceptions of learner autonomy may ignore the cultural embeddedness of autonomy (Schmenk 2005), as well as specific cultural backgrounds such as that of South Korea,

32

paramount to a form of 'culture-blindness'. Accordingly, teachers should not enforce foreign methods of learning which ignore traditional South Korean individual methods of learning, pertinent to the conceptual framework of the course material products (Section 4.2; Schmenk 2005). Maintaining intercultural communication (Section 5.3.3), English language teachers in South Korea would benefit by gradually and increasingly encouraging learner autonomy whereby they gradually increase learner agency (Schmenk 2005), as members of learning communities of practice, thus limiting anti-foreign conceptions.

Researchers and theorists from the time of Ausubel (1978), through to that of Bruner (1996), and to the present with Lantolf (2007), have argued that materials effective for learning, and hence for developing verbal communicative competence, require contextual significance, suggesting language learner self-representation, but focusing both on student culture and target culture mediation. Language learners must make salient this self-representation, to reappropriate target language culture symbolic capital. However, as language produced during formal ELL frequently follows learning material cultural norms (Lefkowitz & Hedgcock 2006), teachers and trends encourage students to adopt English 'native' speaker linguistic, pedagogical and social norms, reducing this self-representation. I argue against this reduction as the aim of ELL, but for mediation between the English language and learner culture, reinforcing sociolinguistic competence (Guzman *et al*. 2006). Subsequently, language learners should master new social norms, attitudes, and mannerisms appropriate for discourse, but should not comply with tacit norms and rules administered by 'native' speaking western educators. This learning intention includes developing localised and contextualised versions of English, which I expand on below in this chapter.

ELL research aims to increasingly situate learning in its immediate social, as well as sociocultural contexts, contributing to language socialization (van Lier 2004; Lantolf 2007). This socialization should focus on identity and negotiation (Section 3.3), through an increasing awareness of language as self- and group-representation, and hence social identity. Furthermore, developing localised and contextualised versions of English also supports language socialization, which would assist to reduce anti-foreign attitudes. Subsequent to my argument for the current educational

33

environment in South Korea (Section 2.6), through language socialization, South Korean tertiary-level English language learners can greatly benefit by employing a relevant social context, hence reducing the conception that English language is encroaching on student enculturations (Kim & Margolis 2000).

This language socialization and locally appropriating English calls for orienting ELL to a 'globalisation from below' (Canagarajah 2005). In this way, students reclaim their local identity and voice, to strengthen democratic relationships, while focusing on their community histories and cultures (Bhatt 2005; Canagarajah 2005), where their marginalised voices speak (Canagarajah 1993). Park (1999b) argues that, despite this need for locally appropriating English, South Korean learners of English receive an overabundance of western pedagogy. This is evident in the predominance and compulsory requirement of South Korean tertiary-level English 'conversation' courses, where ELL pedagogies seek to abandon Korean traditional educational methods at the curricular level.

South Korean English language student conceptions of learning differ from those of English 'native' speaker educators (Lee 2001b), which raises the question of why Korean learners should be encouraged to adopt only western cultural codes of conduct to learn English. A response to this lies central to the course book frameworks in Section 3.3. Diaz-Rico (2004) suggests that being forced to adapt to foreign learning methods leads students to stereotyping of and animosity toward the English native speaker, facilitating anti-foreign attitudes, strengthening national identity, and spurring a rejection of English-speaking cultures. Consequently, Lee (2001b) argues that English language learners in South Korea avoid engaging in interactive methods, promoting social distance, which, Dörnyei (2001b) insists, is not conducive to development of communicative competence. Consequently, a pedagogical compromise is required.

Student attitudes and conceptions toward language learning heavily influence their learning (Gan, Humphreys & Hamp-Lyons 2004), where multiple, interrelated issues including, identity and power underpin learner attitudes. Morita (2004) argues that students resist participation in various ways when they perceive themselves as marginalised, silenced, or certain roles or identities imposed on them, consequently accepting or alienating the target language group, which strengthens or

weakens their ego boundaries. Canagarajah (2007) insists that successful learners cross these ego boundaries, and negotiate and reconstruct new identities more amenable to interaction, involving their ongoing social positioning, both inside and outside of formal learning environments (Gatbonton, Trofimovich & Magid 2005). This crossing and negotiating surfaces in Schumann's acculturation model (1978), in which he argues that "social and psychological integration of the learner with the target language group" (p. 29) becomes imperative for language learning. Building on Schumann's model, Firth and Wagner (2007), argue that in continuously negotiating their identities, successful language learners acculturate to the target language group, permeating sociocultural ego boundaries, thus summoning the *Language ego permeability hypothesis* (Hudson & Bruckman 2002), which Hall (2002) also defines as affecting language socialization (see above).

Lafford (2007) maintains that language learner positive attitudes towards the target language culture, on which ELL success depends, promote identity negotiation, and depend on learner access and willingness to integrate with target language networks. According to Masgoret and Gardner (2003), this engagement and identity negotiation become deeply social, spurring the negotiation of elements of the native and target cultures. Though language learners may and should draw from their sociohistorical roots to understand new cultures, ELL frequently alters learner identities (Block 2007; Canagarajah 2007). Similarly, language learners become agents of social representation and language learning through shifting social identities, as they negotiate and enact new memberships in language learning communities (Larsen-Freeman 2007). These memberships can and frequently do position the language learners as organisers or enactors of new roles, and hence involve various levels of participation.

Clément, Baker and MacIntyre (2003) observe that compromising native identity conflicts with language learners' attempts to defend concrete and rigid traditional identities, such as in South Korea. Bohn (2004) argues that this renders English language learners taciturn to the foreign 'other', leading to ethnic affirmation and anti-foreign sentiments, thus impeding ELL (Dörnyei & Csizér 2005), as is the case in South Korea. Chung (2006) argues that South Koreans are globally the most insular: xenophobic, suspicious of foreignism, and inclined toward orthodoxy, rather than

demonstrating social compromise and flexibility. Similarly, as Sorensen (2000) contends, questions of culture become interlaced with issues of power, representation, and identity in South Korea, whose history suggests a continuous struggle for liberation and national identity, producing cultural mores ingrained in the attitudes of South Koreans, particularly in education (Chapter 2). Morita (2004) argues that language learners should actively participate in deconstructing power relations, to position themselves favourably, which assists identity negotiation. Historical narratives and discourses have imposed these identities, thus marginalizing language learners and restricting their participation. Furthermore, not accounting for, and not allowing for negotiation of sociocultural and contextual differences can largely demotivate learners. Morita argues that language learners can and do define comfortable identities through their learning and social histories, but also via negotiation. As Diaz-Rico (2004) suggests, schooling involves education-specific enculturation, and ethnocentricism, and curtails understandings of foreign culture, hence reducing intercultural communication, which South Korean ELL accentuates.

Enculturation and its influence on learning another language should be conceptualised within a broader framework of ELL. This suggests that we need to understand changes in South Korean education within the context of the sociopolitical situation of a highly oppressive history, coupled with a western hegemony which has compelled South Korea to exchange many resources for a new set of English foreign identities. Consequently, identity issues and language socialization assume a central position in ELL, as learning the English language, South Koreans fear losing their cultural identities (Yim 2003).

According to studies by Murray (2005), Kim (2003), and Park (2005), South Korean learners of English eagerly invite English speaking cultures into their own, while later rejecting them as the South Korean learners become demotivated when they realise that ELL challenges traditional identities. Rejection emanates from the introduction of pedagogies that encourage discarding of tradition without adequate preparation to use other foreign methodologies. An alternative to conceptions of discarding tradition requires the students to use language pedagogies and content base which draw from both the native and target cultures, and which reflect on cross-cultural comparisons.

Subsequently, drawing from these two cultures enriches learners by providing an expanded set of personal and cultural identities. As Diaz-Rico (2004) notes, this enables students to maintain identity roots in their native culture while developing English language and cultural competence, hence encouraging a negotiation of the two cultures, and a formation of a new negotiated set of identities.

Consequently, to construct and reinforce social identities, language learners align or distance themselves from mainstream practices and pedagogical norms, accommodating to the group whose identity language learners seek (Clément, Baker and MacIntyre 2003). Perceptions of taking on 'false' foreign identities when interacting with 'native' speakers influences language learner unwillingness to compromise identity. This becomes apparent in the selection of linguistic forms as language learners marshal linguistic strategies, and alter communicative patterns, to include sarcasm and cute speech patterns, through deliberate subversion of desired speech norms (Gee 2005). Furthermore, communicative pattern changes become evident through emphasising the 'native' accent while speaking English (Gatbonton *et al*. 2005), as students fear criticism by peers for sounding 'foreign', affecting classroom dynamics.

To avoid failure, Diaz-Rico (2004) argues, students employ defence mechanisms such as task avoidance, attributing failure to lack of effort rather than to inability, and self-handicapping (Covington 1992), during which, students adopt comical and sardonic attitudes in the presence of peers, subverting their own efforts (Bohn 2004). As students reduce effort, they attribute lack of performance to intended failure. Similarly, self-protection involves appearing 'cute', an intentional display of weakness whereby learners simplify speech and compromise ability, hence lessening the expectation of peers. This appears frequently in South Korean language learning environments (Murray 2005), where these defence mechanisms may include code switching or shifting from language to language, at both the intra and inter sentential levels, to compensate for language incompetence.

In South Korea, Murray (2005) and Park (2005) maintain that fear of criticism and ridicule during exposure to peers and teachers stems from enculturation, and hence from South Korean

primary social influences (Section 2.2), where South Korean learners of English experience a greater reduction in self-confidence than other groups. To minimise injury to ego and self-confidence in interactive environments, these students also avoid premature discursive negotiation (Kim 2000a; 2000b) and engage in other defense mechanisms, reducing group interactivity and cohesion, while subsequently and concurrently experiencing increasing anxiety.

People only see learning a new language as a gain if they recognise, understand, and value the socially-situated identities and activities that recruit the social language, and if they believe they can meaningfully employ these activities (Gee 2001a). ELL becomes heavily connected to identity issues as language learners avoid identities which represent a certain loss. Dörnyei (2001a) argues that socialization toward the target language group frequently represents a dissociation from, and even opposition to, learner lifeworlds. To counter conceptions of identity loss, language learners should thus recognise the existence of multiple socially-situated identities (Gee 2001b), governing their motivation, and hence interaction with members of the target language community, thus facilitating development of native-like linguistic competence in English (Dörnyei 2001a).

Individual identity loss, pertinent to the social requirements of Confucianism, and highly influenced by the shame indoctrination, presents one of the most prominent issues in South Korean English language socialization. The fear of losing this identity evidences itself when language learners fear shame towards peers and educators, and lack self-esteem (Gatbonton *et al*. 2005), which contributes to high anxiety and demotivation (Dash 2003). Language competence failure also results in shame, and language learners hence resort to defense mechanisms such as avoiding risk taking. Bang (1999) reports that South Korean language learners understand the importance of risk-taking in developing oral communicative competence, but personal, affective, socio-cultural, and course-related identity factors modify risk-taking, ultimately impeding their language learning progress.

To avoid this modification, intercultural communication becomes vital (Diaz-Rico 2004). For example, what most English as a primary discourse speakers may see as openness and expressiveness during learning, becomes effusiveness and verbosity in the Korean cultural context (Lee 2001a).

Furthermore, westerners may perceive the authoritativeness prevalent in Korean contexts as anger or an aggressive personality.

To compound issues with intercultural miscommunication, foreign teachers quickly adopt popular and fashionable research-informed and western ELL methods, partly due to insufficient training; methods which they should not assume are compatible with South Korean learning enculturations. Native English speaking teachers in Seoul need only a Bachelor's degree, and no experience in teaching. Consequently, the prevailing ignorance of South Korean socioculture in ELL by foreign teachers cannot be disregarded. Western as well as eastern English language educators in South Korea generally do not recognise the significance of identifying intercultural differences during language teaching, evident as South Korean students and western educators frequently experience great differences in cultural communication. Lee (2001a) suggests that in ELL, explicitly considering intercultural communication in a language classroom would greatly assist teachers, where much more effective communication would require interlocutors to become more sensitive to – perhaps even more appreciative of the values of – one another's speech styles (p. 342). This again suggests locally contextualised pedagogies (Section 3.3; Section 3.4).

The need for culture-language mediation presents an attempt to reduce the perception of English as a vehicle of cultural encroachment which would otherwise contribute to language learners increasing their negative attitudes toward target language groups. This becomes pertinent in the case of South Korean tertiary-level English language learners, with whom cultural identity is a central issue in the construction of the development of language course books.

According to Gan, Humphreys and Hamp-Lyons (2004), negative attitudes toward educators, peers, the learning environment, and the target language group, reduce motivation to integrate and negotiate identities, overruling self-confidence in ELL, discouraging the students, and limiting development in communicative competence in English. Macintyre (2007) states that "[a]fter almost 50 years of research, and over 75 studies published by Gardner and associates, it is clear that the intergroup features of language provide significant support for the motivation to learn … [where]

[t]he major motivation to learn another language is to develop a communicative relationship with people from another cultural group" (p. 566).

Currently, theorists such as Dörnyei (2001a; 2001b), as well as Ellis (2005), attest to motivation strongly influencing ELL and learner behaviour, which responds to why South Korean students lack willingness to participate in verbal interaction in formal ELL (Section 2.5). Dörnyei (2001a, p. 49) defines instrumental motivation as the "potential pragmatic gains of L2 [target language] proficiency, such as getting a job or a higher salary", which emanates from wanting to obtain social, academic, or economic rewards through target language achievement. Furthermore, Dörnyei notes that integrative motivation emanates from learners desiring to integrate into the target language group. Ryan and Deci (2000), define intrinsic motivation as

> the doing of an activity for its inherent satisfactions rather than for some separable consequence. When intrinsically motivated a person is moved to act for the fun or challenge entailed rather than because of external prods, pressures, or rewards. (p. 56)

In contrast, extrinsic motivation stems from outside sources compelling learners to engage in language practice, frequently with disinterest. According to Dörnyei (2001a), as intrinsic motivation increases, interaction and language-learning efficacy do also, while also prolonging persistence to improve overall learning performance and the emotional climate. Dörnyei argues for the greater importance of intrinsic over extrinsic motivation in developing communicative competence in ELL, adding the notion that intrinsically motivated learners often confidently interact, but that a combination of both leads to optimum ELL in South Korea. Intrinsic motivation strongly mediates the relationship between target language affinities and achievement, where instrumental motivation correlates with extrinsic regulation, and less with target language competence than integrative orientation. South Korean learners experience largely extrinsic motivation (Pae 2008).

De Guzman *et al.* (2006) urge us to consider that culturally specific factors increase our understanding of factors that provide motivation in ELL contexts. Three major studies of South Korean tertiary-level learners of English – Kim (2003), Murray (2005), and Park (2005) – concentrate on motivational factors. These studies argue that South Korean students lack in confidence and refrain from making effort to interact and speak during English instruction (see Sections 2.5 & 2.6.1), greatly

increasing the difficulties these students face in their efforts to develop competence in English. These studies also emphasise that South Korean enculturation plays a vital role in the difficulty South Korean learners experience in becoming critical, and interacting and negotiating orally. Murray, Kim, and Park all argue that South Korean learners of English experience mostly extrinsic and instrumental motivation, and generally have not learned to experience intrinsic motivation. They thus determine that South Korean pedagogies alone are not conducive to developing communicative competence in English, and encourage instrumental and extrinsic, not intrinsic or integrative, motivation. Kang (2000) studied 192 South Korean learners of English, concluding that instrumental motivation dominates over integrative motivation. In their studies of South Korean learners of English, de Guzman *et al*. (2006) conclude that South Koreans become instrumentally motivated by economic or social rewards attainable through learning the target language, and have little interest in integrating with the target language culture, compounded by a fear of loss of identity. They note that South Korean learners admit to this, influenced by a lack of positive role models, which implicates English teachers in South Korea.

The anxiety students experience during learning for which they are socioaffectively unprepared reduces communicative capacity (Clément, Baker & MacIntyre 2003), interferes with mental and cognitive processing (Ohata 2005), tilts learners towards passivity, withdrawal and activity avoidance (Liu & Jackson 2008), and demotivates learners (Dörnyei 2001a; Liu & Jackson 2008). Reduced anxiety through minimizing learner competitiveness, and hence increasing collaboration, facilitates learning another language (Diaz-Rico 2004). Concomitantly, gradually increasing and maximizing learner cooperation and motivation creates a low-filter environment which contributes to a willingness to communicate, and promotes effective learning (Dörnyei 2003b).

Through these strategies, we can interpret communication of novices in context without comparison to native speaking norms or target proficiency (Lantolf 2007), or in regards to an interlanguage. In the case of South Korean tertiary learners of English, this de-emphasises the importance of language and emphasises the importance of social content, opening up space for the introduction of learner sociocultural content, and hence for negotiation of learning material.

Subsequently, this provides language learners with the opportunity to concentrate on personal material, which further engages the language learners.

Sociaffective strategies become central to the construction of an effective conceptual framework, and hence to *Conversation* and *Speak4yourself,* in that they describe actions and intentions that facilitate or inhibit language learning to varying degrees, through social and affective directives.

3.3 Sociocultural theory during language learning

Sociocultural theory defends the use of socioaffective strategies, where language learners can benefit by bringing to interactions their own personal histories replete with values, assumptions, beliefs, rights, and obligations. Subsequently, students reinterpret and transform their learning and teaching activity to actively transform their world and not conform to it (Donato 2004). The main premise of a sociocultural theory during language learning becomes that cognitive functions translate into mental activities, mediated by activities external to students in which students participate, through co-operative collective behaviour. Semiotic tools such as language mediate this process (Swain 2004, p. 103).

Ohta (2004) argues for the importance of learner cultural relevance and learner engagement in tasks, and the contingency on the language learner to create task effectiveness. In situated processes of ELL, all students apply themselves in unique ways, irrespective of task design, as students "involved in the same *task* are necessarily involved in different *activity,* since they bring to the task their unique histories, goals, and capacities" (Roebuck 2004, p. 79). Consequently, task effects vary for each student, and are not generalizable. As students invest their own goals, actions, and cultural background, and beliefs, and hence their own agency, into tasks and, thus, transform the tasks, as the tasks cannot manipulate the students to act in certain ways. Subsequently, teachers should focus less on task outcomes and more on student orientations and goals during use of tasks. Thus language learning tasks and associated interactions emerge from participant backgrounds and goals, rather than on task objectives and procedures (Donato 2004, p. 44). From a sociocultural theory perspective, we

can therefore view language learning as a developmental process mediated by semiotic resources, such as the *Convernation* and *Speak4yourself* materials, and appropriated in the classroom by the unique histories of each student and teacher (Wertsch 1998).

In Section 6.3 I discuss the predominance of non-localised materials privileging western social environments, largely ignoring local, student relevant environments and learning styles. This is compounded by autonomous educational policymakers and materials developers creating an environment where pedagogy reflects intellectual fashions, rather than responding to learner needs. Subsequently, course and materials designers generalise pedagogies, ignoring and opposing diversity and local enculturations, pedagogical innovation, and rejecting the notion of universally appropriate ways of teaching and learning (Hinkel 1999). Canagarajah (2007) suggests that the frequent resistance by local groups around the world to pedagogies of non-local origin justifies language learners adopting an 'ideological' approach.

Firth and Wagner (1997; 1998) combined domains in language learning, as did Watson-Gegeo (2004), advocating a sociocognitive approach to ELL, acknowledging mind-body-world activity, as language learners interacting in the language draw on a range of sociocognitive affordances (Atkinson, Churchill, Nishino & Okada 2007). Language learning constitutes a semiotic process attributable to participation in socially-mediated activities, which themselves mediate cognitive processes and hence learning, and thus, the sociocognitive phenomenon occurs (Section 3.1; Donato 2004, p. 46). Subsequently, social processes allow the language to become a cognitive tool for the individual. These planes of functioning dynamically interrelate, linked by language which mediates social interaction on the interpersonal plane, and mediates thought on the intrapersonal plane (Ohta 2004, p. 54).

Thus learning and teaching emerges as a collaborative achievement not reduced to implicit or explicit instruction, programmed input to the learner, or the individual's unassisted and unmediated discoveries about language form and function, constituting a social constructivism (Vygotsky 1978; Reznitskaya, Anderson & Kuo 2007; Lantolf & Thorne 2009). In social constructivist thought,

individuals within groups collaborate to construct knowledge through shared learning and negotiated meaning. Furthermore, context and culture become central to developing shared meaning (Bruner 1961), and during which learning and realization are intersubjective amongst participants of the learning community. Lave and Wenger (1991) contend that a community's practical knowledge is situated in relations and practice among members. Social constructivist theory therefore grounds the discussions I present throughout this exegesis, such as those on shared learning, interaction, and socioaffective strategies (Section 3.2), the importance of sociocultural theory during ELL (this section), drawing from language learner relevant content (Section 3.4), interactive strategies (Section 3.5), and group dynamics (Section 3.8).

Social constructivism strongly pertains to ELL at the tertiary level in South Korea, as students must interact to negotiate personal and social dispositions. The students can benefit by collaborating to develop communities through which they collectively construct knowledge (Lantolf 2004, pp. 16–18), advise other members in relation to comprehensibility of language, motivate one another, thus learning to control anxiety as a socioaffective strategy, and hence language skill develops. This collaboration grounds classroom communities, reinforces group cohesion, and coincides with the aims of the prior strategies by providing a gradual movement toward fuller interaction. During social constructivism, students locate more individualised and malleable learning routes and content that facilitate the development and traversal of social pathways. Students also locate routes that agree with learning requirements of other students in the learning community, and learning routes through which the students make sense of their own and others' surroundings, thus contributing to a more participatory pedagogy.

Sociocultural theory emphasises modified interaction and the negotiation of meaning in classroom settings. As a result, individuals are not constrained by lack of comprehension, and teachers and students are afforded opportunities to mediate and assist language learning in zones of proximal development (Vygotsky 1978). Members of learning communities collaboratively produce utterances which they jointly own, realizing language learning through a collaborative process whereby they appropriate the language of the interaction as their own, and for their own purposes. Consequently,

they situate learning in local contexts, increasing the effectiveness of learning, and hence increasing student engagement in the learning community. During language development, speakers switch between being novices and collective experts, potential sources of new orientations for each other, and guides through complexities of linguistic problem solving, reinforcing the shared learning aspects of the learning community (Section 3.2). Furthermore, students build grammatical, expressive, and cultural competence through this process. Here, the language learning task becomes an entity which transforms through its instantiation into the activity of particular learners (Ohta 2004). Students shape, construct, and influence learning within interactional and instructional contexts, and the negotiation and creation of meaning intertwine in a collaborative act, bridging the gap between the interpersonal and intrapersonal processes. By shifting the focus to collaboration during instruction, we begin to understand the responsibility of interactions within a social instructional network for cognitive and linguistic development (Donato 2004, p. 46). This stems from that "social interaction actually produces new, elaborate, advanced psychological processes that are unavailable to the organism working in isolation" (Vygotsky 1989, p. 61).

3.4 Social theory as content during language learning

The above discusses that language learning contexts should pedagogically consider local diversity, and should not marginalise a region, which would otherwise render it a culturally deficient 'other'. However, this consideration should not focus only on pedagogical design, but also on learning content. ELL students in South Korea, at advanced levels, benefit from negotiating sociocultural content (Hall 2002), including critique of the social system, as well as, and negotiating, their own identities. I now argue for social theory within the pedagogies and content of ELL.

As notions of ownership of English, as well as the traditional teacher / student relationship change, the cultural component of English language teaching and learning should reference local as well as global cultures. Shifts of ownership and authority to local speakers and their varieties of English, combined with global cultural flows (Pennycook 2007), create the need for reconceptualizing English as a pluralised global language, informed by local norms, functions and practices. This

advocates an ecological approach to ELL that becomes a 'globalisation from below', where knowledge from suppressed traditions challenges, changes, and reconstructs dominant paradigms. This approach in ELL content can greatly assist language learners to reclaim and emphasise, during learning, their local identities, and realise the potential of globalisation to construct more democratic relationships (Rubdy 2009). Students become aware of the benefits of expressing voice in intra- and international relations, and also by defining themselves, rather than having a foreign other define them. In this way, English language learners change native speaker / non-native speaker models of English, which have become implicated in a cultural struggle in which 'centre' definitions of language deny the voice of the 'periphery'. Therefore ELL must allow 'periphery' teachers and students to claim English and English language education in their own terms, and to define the nature of their culture and language, by becoming critical of their own and others' social stances during classroom discourse. For this, according to Rubdy, students must acknowledge definitions of culture, identity, collectivism and individualism, and speakerhood and language standards, as ideological acts within an unequal world. Students should acknowledge attempts at placing nations in hierarchies, and that national boundaries increasingly blur and become negotiable, where peripheral nations can position themselves commensurately with the west.

Furthermore, teachers and students of English can greatly benefit by acknowledging the expertise of teachers of English whose primary discourse is another language, and who hence contain familiarity with the 'local' context. These teachers have the advantage of expertise in English as well as the culture of the language learner, and hence expertise in the specific issues the students encounter and should encounter when developing competence in English (Medgyes 1994). English language teachers in South Korea do not generally utilise this ideology and related concepts in their courses, but more frequently focus on language competence material connected to the west (Lee 2001b). With the advantage of having this expertise, local teachers can increase their immediacy with students, and can also increase student-to-student interaction, which becomes a teacher role (Section 5.5).

3.5 Interactive and communicative strategies

The significance of social theory with its focus on both pedagogical design and learning content, as I described above, calls forth the importance of interactive pedagogies. In appropriate contexts, interaction contributes to language learning by mediating its own construction, and the construction of knowledge. The appearance of process and knowledge in external speech facilitates their internalization (Swain 2004).

Interaction has many benefits. On a linguistic level, Watanabe and Swain (2007) argue that it induces cognitive development and comprehension of input, and confirms that peer-peer collaborative dialogue mediates learning another language. The relationship between learners' post-test scores and their patterns of interaction highlights how learning of another language "occurs in interaction, not as a result of interaction" (Swain & Lapkin 1998, p.321). Gass, Lee and Roots (2007) extrapolate by arguing that, to obtain meaning when learning another language, interaction becomes necessary as

> [m]eaning … is not an individual phenomenon consisting of private thoughts executed and then transferred from brain to brain, but a social and negotiable product of interaction, transcending individual intentions and behaviours. (p. 763)

Naughton (2006) argues that interaction maximises learning potential while language learners modify their speech. As Lafford (2007, p. 739) suggests, interaction promotes focus-on-form (Section 3.6), as it affords students opportunities to notice gaps between the inter- and target-language, mediating between the students and the linguistic material, while they test their target language hypotheses.

On a social level, Belchamber (2007) argues that interaction strengthens participant involvement, and elicits feedback, allowing analysis of group contributions as the participants design and choose their own curriculum. Gass, Lee and Roots (2007) note that "language—as a social and cultural phenomenon—is acquired and learned through social interaction" (p. 758). Here they refer to Long (1981; see below), noting that "participation in conversation, made possible through the modification of interaction, is the *necessary* and sufficient condition for S[econd] L[anguage] A[cquisition]" (p. 758). Interaction, according to Park (1999a), and Park (2000), becomes a critical factor with South Korean learners of English, complementing traditional learning methods.

Long, in his Interaction Hypothesis (Long 1996), states that

conversation is … the means by which learning takes place [during negotiation which] … triggers interactional adjustments by the Native Speaker or more competent interlocutor, [and] facilitates acquisition because it connects input, internal learner capacities, particularly selective attention, and output in productive ways. (pp. 451–452)

Through the Interaction Hypothesis, Long posits that when language learners negotiate the language, discrepancies become salient, and through observation of these discrepancies, language learners seek more negotiation to further locate and rectify language deficiencies.

In interaction, as language learners support one another and mutually construct assistance through negotiation of meaning, scaffolding occurs. Scaffolding is "a dialogically produced interpsychological process through which learners internalise knowledge they co-construct with more capable peers" (Lantolf & Thorne 2009, p. 282). Dialogic interaction has the potential to appropriate linguistic knowledge by individuals who collaboratively form a collective expert to accomplish tasks that they might not individually. "When learners work together ... strengths and weaknesses may be pooled, creating a greater expertise for the group than of any of the individuals involved" (p. 284).

As I describe below, and as Long (1981) proposed, input becomes comprehensible through 'interactional modification', and hence, through modifications to learners' input as a consequence of their having signalled a lack of comprehension. Swain (2004, p. 98) refers to this modification, that occurs when language learners anticipate, perceive, or experience difficulties in message comprehensibility, as negotiation. Through negotiation, speakers achieve comprehensibility as interlocutors repeat and rephrase for their conversational partners, and , "with its emphasis on achieving comprehensibility of message meaning ... has sparked and sustained considerably more interest in the field of SLA" than all other areas (Pica 1994, p. 495).

Anton (1999) contends that the "interactionist position in SLA research [has] maintained that negotiation of meaning when learners engage in communicative activities becomes crucial for [language] ... acquisition" (p. 306). Emphasis on communicative language teaching originated from the changes in the language learning requirements following the Chomskian era, predominantly in the 1970s (Brown 2001), and from the sociocognitive perspective of sociolinguistic theory. The teaching

practice emphasises meaning and communication, and in the process builds communicative

competence, where to communicate effectively, argued Hymes (1972), speakers must know how to

use language to develop pragmatic ability. Savignon (2002) notes that through communicative

language teaching, meaningful cues activate semantic networks and through an increasingly higher

level of task complexity, facilitate long-term retention and a deeper level of processing. According to

Anton (1999), the communicative method enhances fluency, raises consciousness of linguistic forms,

tests learner language hypotheses, and promotes reflection through other participant recasts. Richards

and Rodgers (2001) argue that in communicative use of language, contextual meaning becomes

paramount, as relevant context activates discourse. It follows that in communicative language

teaching, functional and social tasks, and hence content-based pedagogies (Section 3.7), engage

learners in meaning and authentic language, who draw from cultural knowledge alongside developing

linguistic awareness (Wesche & Skehan 2002). Central to communicative language teaching is that it

"pays systematic attention to functional as well as structural aspects of language" (Littlewood 1981, p.

1). Canagarajah (2007) emphasises that communicative language teaching well assists complex

language proficiency, leading to permanent language retention. Yoon (2004) explains that in language

learning in countries such as South Korea, and in Asia in general, goal-directed communicative tasks

can be strongly conducive to language permanency if applied in correct conditions.

Researchers such as Ellis, Basturkmen, and Loewen (2001), as well as Gass (2002), argue that

communicative language teaching encourages negotiation, and becomes conducive to long-term

language retention, defending the prominence of negotiation in ELL (Section 3.2), and hence in

materials such as *Conversation* and *Speak4yourself*. Supporting this, Breen and Candlin (2001) note

that "[c]ommunication is not only a matter of following conventions but also of negotiating through

and about the conventions themselves" (p. 10), supporting the importance of negotiating pedagogies

as well as content (Sections 3.2─3.4).

The benefits of communicative pedagogies well extend to the social aspects of the learning

environment, reinforcing arguments in Section 3.4. According to Richards and Rodgers (2001),

communicative language teaching changes student perceptions to no longer view teachers as the

authority and purveyors of absolute knowledge, but rather as participants in the learning community of practice who exchange participant roles with students to facilitate development of communicative competence in the language. Thus, in communicative language teaching, members must position themselves as negotiators, communicators, discoverers, as well as contributors. Teachers and students enact these roles as they become co-communicators, needs analysts, organisers, task facilitators and negotiators. This parallels the social constructivist intentions of the course material products of this project (Section 3.3). Hu (2002) contends that the collaborative learning properties of communicative language teaching appear consonant with the Confucian heritage cultural emphasis on collectivism, reinforcing Northeast Asian, and hence South Korean, socially appropriate behaviour. This may appear to contradict earlier suggestions that interaction in South Korean cultural and educative contexts is not welcome (Section 2.6.1), yet, I argue that if interaction does not challenge the social or cultural environment of Northeast Asian language students and teachers, and does not indicate that participants are refuting traditional identities, it does not devalue those groups.

As language learners thus collaborate to develop expertise in a language, they contribute to the learning content, and ultimately to the curriculum. To contribute to and to create the learning environment where students can build a base of knowledge, frameworks of understanding, shared meanings, and values and beliefs for purposes of mutual growth, Richard-Amato (2003) suggests that students can and should participate in the development of transitional and integrative educating processes. This becomes a gradual introduction of participatory pedagogies; an increasingly introduced learner-centered pedagogy influenced by the growing use of lifeworlds of the language learners as the primary basis for contributing to curriculum or instructional tasks, as well as conveying to the learning environment student own enculturations. Zuengler and Miller (2006) maintain that a participatory pedagogy emphasises the student's place in society, requiring the discussion of issues relevant to learners (Section 3.3; Section 3.4). Similarly, Firth and Wagner (2007) argue that a participatory pedagogy assists language students to build on their repertoire of skills, and hence own identities, to create motivating environments, to transform themselves in socially meaningful ways, and to build knowledge and skills for full participation in their larger social worlds. Furthermore, as

Richard-Amato (2003) argues, through a participatory pedagogy, students collaborate and negotiate identities, while balancing power, bringing to the community of practice their enculturations, which assists the language learners to reach ELL goals through relevant pedagogies. This style becomes apparent in the increasingly open-ended structure of the tasks throughout the *Conversation* and *Speak4yourself* materials (Section 4.2.2 Strategy C).

A participatory pedagogy effects increasingly greater change in students as they achieve greater agency and become more competent members of the discourse community, and hence scaffold learning to make language comprehensible, thus increasing participation. Firth and Wagner (2007) contend that a participatory pedagogy encourages students to build on their skills, and hence identities, to transform themselves in socially meaningful ways, and to build knowledge for full participation in their larger social worlds. This gradual increase in participation creates a safe environment for language students, such as those in South Korea, whose enculturation limits premature social exposure, and hence exposing their linguistic incompetence to peers, apprenticing themselves through gradually developing language expertise. A situated ELL curriculum thus emerges, organised around language learner experience, need and concern, which students identify as personally significant, and one which elevates language learner awareness, as the students shape themselves within their growing sociocultural concerns.

In language learning, knowledge becomes relational, located in the evolving relationships between people and the social settings in which they conduct their activities (Firth & Wagner 2007). These evolving relationships in growing communities encourage the use of verbal interaction, during which language learners 'give and take' in order to make linguistic and sociocultural semantic sense, as a central aspect of content-based language learning (Nakahama, Tyler & Van Lier 2001). This becomes a negotiation of not only language, but also pedagogy and identity, within language learner relevant context-based situations.

The increased exposure of language learners to any interactive environment increases their opportunities for oral negotiation, and thus, complements the reception, practice, and production

phases (Section 3.8), as well as repetition, and hence Korean traditional learning styles. Congruent with the Interaction Hypothesis, Naughton (2006) proposes that once language learners reach a certain competence sufficient to complete basic tasks, simply practising and producing loses effectiveness. At this stage the students greatly benefit from negotiation, thus greatly increasing learning, as "interaction without negotiation [has] … only limited effects on linguistic development" (p. 170).

Through the RPPN model (Section 4.3.2 Strategy B), I argue extensively for practice and production as important phases between reception and negotiation. These two phases provide a bridge to negotiation. Caroll (2000) suggests that negotiation of meaning leads to the provision of feedback, including correction, comprehension checks, clarification requests, topic shifts, repetitions, and recasts, drawing learner attention to mismatches between language reception and production. Brouwer and Wagner (2004) similarly note that negotiation becomes the development of interactional skills, and interactional resources" (p. 32), and more so, of an "increasing interactional complexity in language encounters" (p. 44). Negotiating meaning to ensure the success of delivery of a message grounds language learning (Nakahama, Tyler & Van Lier 2001), where even at novice levels, language learners can negotiate the language (Harris 2005).

On a linguistic level, Gass, Mackey, and Ross-Feldman (2005) argue that through negotiation, language learners check and clarify utterances and interactional modifications. According to Morris (2002), negotiation encourages language learners to emphasise linguistic forms. As Houston (2006) suggests, negotiation assists long-term retention which, according to Mori (2007), makes language less susceptible to attenuation. Leeman (2003) notes that negotiation constitutes one of many language retrieval strategies that is deeper and more complex than language learning processes that simply reactivate and strengthen encoding of linguistic elements. As negotiation involves taking slower and more complex routes to retention, it multiplies and elaborates cognitive schema (Lightbown & Spada 2006), and through which, language learners increase understanding of the language (Pica 1994). On a social level, Rydland and Aukrust (2005) argue that negotiation engenders a shared understanding through modification of speech and content. On an affective level, it motivates participants to acquire conceptual, cultural, linguistic, and interactional knowledge (Kasper & Rose

2002). Anton (1999) notes that "when learners are engaged in negotiation, language is used to serve the functions of scaffolding … and to provide effective assistance as learners progress in the zone of proximal development …" (p. 303).

The multifaceted significance of negotiation in ELL thus becomes evident, and clearly connects language learning practice to consolidation of language elements, where much work on negotiation evidences the existence of strong ties between linguistic and social areas, reinforcing the social constructivist intentions of the *Convernation* and *Speak4yourself* course books.

3.6 Cognitive strategies

Despite a strong sociocultural focus, the *Convernation* and *Speak4yourself* conceptual frameworks endorse cognitive aspects, highly pertinent to ELL (Firth & Wagner 1998). Bloom (1956), revised in Anderson and Krathwohl (2001), described the cognitive aspect of learning, articulating a six-level taxonomy. From lowest to highest, Anderson and Krathwohl contend the levels remembering, understanding, applying, analysing, evaluating, and creating, indicating a progression from lower- to higher-order thinking. Lower-order thinking occurs when students receive or repeat, in the case of ELL, language elements. Tasks associated with lower-order thinking can have a short or extended nature with an extensive number of steps. Progressing through the levels, students require increasingly higher-order thinking, which requires them to manipulate information and concepts more than at each previous level. Thus students combine language elements during speech production to synthesise, generalise, describe, hypothesise, conclude or interpret, while solving problems and extending knowledge of language. I discuss the relevance of work by Bloom as well as Anderson and Krathwohl to the conceptual frameworks of *Convernation* and *Speak4yourself* in Section 4.2.

The cognitive act of repeating language elements to aid learning substantially defines learning and teaching styles in South Korea. This practice, which constitutes repeatedly but meaningfully using a language element during learning (Ausubel 1963), in varying contexts, consolidates language element retention (Lightbown & Spada 2006). Barcroft (2007) argues that both output and input-oriented repetition become an effective stimulus, and imperative during ELL, where repetition for

learning in the target language "positively affects long-term … learning" (p. 38). Litz (2005) has argued for the importance of language accuracy in building fluency during early stages of ELL, where for effective ELL, reception and controlled repetitive practice, activities must precede free communication. This becomes relevant to South Korean learners of English, who as Lee (2001b) argues, refrain from verbal interaction in English without independently consolidating the use of the language element. Furthermore, repetition in South Korean ELL, as Lee (2001b) argues, has strong compatibility with traditional cultural and educational methods, thus highly significant as it provides students in South Korea with familiar pedagogies, hence contributing highly to the transition model (Section 4.2.2).

On a cognitive level, Macaro (2006) notes, repetition facilitates self-initiation, language retention, and use. Oxford (1990) notes that it enhances comprehension, where an action ultimately "becomes automatic in learning situation[s]" (p. 329). On a social level, repetition during learning initiates cooperation, and as Lutz, Briggs, and Cain (2003) contend, increases opportunity to scaffold during collaboration, contributing to negotiation (Section 3.2). On a linguistic level, repetition exposes the rich pragmatic potential of linguistic forms, enables students to produce language while formulating utterances, and connects earlier discourses. Furthermore, "the act of retrieving the item modifies the learner's existing memory representation system such that the encoding of the item is strengthened" (Barcroft 2007, p. 49), thus strengthening connections between formal and semantic representations. In general, combined with other methods, repetition facilitates short- and long-term retention of language (Wood 2006).

Trofimovich and Gatbonton (2006) argue extensively that repetition during language learning increases opportunities for students to perceive discrepancies between linguistic features in language reception and their own use of the language. Repetition extends language learner contact with the language, freeing processing resources and allowing the language learners to access form-related properties. During the use of the technique, there occurs

> improved intelligibility and comprehensibility and reduced accentedness in sentences spoken by learners after explicit [repeated] instruction … . This … translates into learners' closer approximations of native-like spontaneous L2 [target language] speech … (p. 521)

Furthermore,

> most adult learners often acquire their [second language] … without sufficient native-speaker input and by learning semantic and conceptual aspects of [second language] … words concurrent with, or prior to, learning their perceptual and articulatory correlates. Hence these adult learners require repetitive practice. (p. 527)

The practice of repetition during learning language elements has lost much credibility, influenced by beliefs such as that "repetition is often viewed as being incompatible with meaningful communication and is therefore seen to have little or no beneficial effects on [second language] development" (Trofimovich & Gatbonton 2006, p. 520). However, in my experience in South Korea, repetition proves effective for learning the Korean language, insofar as it allows for repeated impressions of language elements.

Repetition during language learning formally emerged during the era of grammar translation. In the first half of the 20th century, and hence in the pre 'communicative' days of language learning, students mainly repetitively learnt elements of vocabulary and grammar, as language learning and use largely required translations and drills, while students minimised efforts in language pronunciation and negotiation. The grammar translation method remains popular in Northeast Asian contexts, as it requires teachers to achieve only limited verbal communicative competence, and not to develop expertise in the target language, while facilitating language assessment.

Ellis, Basturkmen and Loewen (2001) argue that form-based tasks, and those involving techniques such as repetition and grammar translation, focus strongly on structure. Meaning-based tasks, argues Oxford (2006), de-emphasise grammar and structure and which, as theorists such as Ellis (2005) suggest, are alone inadequate for development of linguistic knowledge, and may implant wrong grammatical forms without the use of form-based tasks. I thus suggest combining linguistic structure, meaning, and context, during language learning, which is a feature of *Conversation* and *Speak4yourself*. The integrated multi-skills design of such a technique requires both form- and meaning-based tasks. This technique, as Richard-Amato (2003) notes, facilitates the ability to use the skills in language use, and strengthens ELL pedagogy, and as Swain (2004) notes, become useful for learning strategic processes as well as grammatical aspects of language.

Focus-on-form (Long 2000), combining form- and meaning-based tasks, engages learners in tasks as grammatical form and accuracy develop. During focus-on-form, discussion shifts back and forth from meaning to form, especially during communication breakdown, greatly benefiting ELL (Oxford 2006). The content-based pedagogies I discuss in Section 3.7, according to Daloglu and Marsh (2007), greatly facilitate focus-on-form. Language theorists such as Lantolf and Johnson (2007) advocate the importance of this technique, during which the concurrent learning of the English language and other disciplines occurs, increasing motivation and thus becoming highly conducive to language development. Bardovi-Harlig and Mahan-Taylor (2003) have argued that language learners must develop grammatical, strategic and pragmatic competence, as these environments often limit the exposure of students to authentic pragmatic use.

3.7 Task- and Content-based pedagogies

Task-based pedagogies become imperative to ELL, as they promote learner-centred environments, negotiation, and language learner interdependence, while also facilitating a growth in accountability of the individual language learner. According to Firth and Wagner (2007), task-based pedagogies engage students by incorporating linguistic methods and social tasks, during which, language learners test hypotheses and make generalizations about linguistic items, consolidating and extending learning, and receiving a curriculum and syllabus framework (Litz 2005). I argue that as task-based pedagogies encourage cooperative learning and necessitate interaction, they become consonant with Confucianist heritage culture cooperative learning styles.

The importance and effectiveness of tasks, however, emerges in their thematically sequential formations as chains. Diaz–Rico (2004) contends that tasks should link thematically in chains to language objectives through a content base, involving a variety of language modes, and much repetition. Oxford (2006) supports this, arguing that thematically linked tasks, while gradually increasing in linguistic complexity, create varying conditions and increase communicative competence, thus assisting recognition of linguistic and sociodiscursive cues.

Pragmatic task-based work calls for a significant level of content-base pedagogy, which Brinton, Snow and Wesche (1989, p. 2) define as "the integration of a particular content with second language aims …. [referring to] the concurrent teaching of academic subject matter and second language skills". During content-based work, students develop knowledge of subject areas, while developing language competence, as they focus on authentic and meaningful content. As language use cannot occur in a contextual void, language learners may acquire subject knowledge, achieve sociolinguistic competence, and develop literal, interpretive, and critical facility, fostering sophisticated pragmatic use of English (Daloglu & Marsh 2007). Content-based ELL design develops student ability to analyse, critique and identify ways to transform language, to broaden communicative experiences and worldviews, and to understand the roles of these pedagogies in constructing these worlds, encouraging relevance to the language learner. I maintain that, as I argued in Section 3.3, students must achieve their personal goals, and larger mutually-constructed social goals, with tasks including relevant content, encouraging the reception of knowledge and the use of contextually relevant, socially appropriate, achievable language. This becomes possible through a content-base pedagogy.

3.8 Task and group dynamics

In this section, I discuss that negotiation occurs in environments in which interpersonal interaction occurs. To increase interactive competence, language learners can vary group sizes, and greatly benefit by familiarizing themselves with social and educational facets, increasing the group size malleability. Effectively designed language pedagogies aid this, while improving communicative performance and reducing learning inhibition, ultimately increasing and fine-tuning learning (Dörnyei 2003b).

I draw from Rossiter (2005, p.56), proposing the hierarchy of tasks: repetition, memorization, formulaic expressions, verbal attention-getters, answering in unison, talking to self, elaboration, anticipatory answers, monitoring, appeals for assistance, requests for clarification, and situated and contextualised practice. This sequence parallels the reception, practice, production, negotiation

framework I propose in Section 4.2.2 Strategy B, and also builds on frameworks by Bloom, as well as Anderson and Krathwohl (Section 3.7). The taxonomy by Anderson and Krathwohl comprises remembering, understanding, applying, analysing, evaluating, and creating. Rossiter (2005) states

> the most frequently used strategies developed in the following hierarchical order: repetition, memorization, formulaic expressions, verbal attention-getters, answering in unison, talking to self, elaboration, anticipatory answers, monitoring, appeal for assistance, request for clarification, and role play. (p.56)

In Section 4.2.2 Strategies C and D I discuss the extent to which methods exemplified in *Convernation* and *Speak4yourself* employ the approach by Rossiter, and how they build on Bloom's classification (Bloom 1956; Anderson & Krathwohl 2001). Effectively used, this hierarchy integrates multiple skills, while combining methods to facilitate skills development without causing cognitive or affective overload. Furthermore, language competence also accelerates as skills become increasingly more demanding yet manageable through increasing competence (Richard-Amato 2003). This becomes central to the *Convernation* and *Speak4yourself* conceptual frameworks (Section 4.2), as the transition element of the framework builds on the concept of expansion. However, course materials, offering a constrained pedagogy and a limited range of content, cannot accommodate the needs of individual students, where course book task design "ultimately cannot determine the nature of activity engaged in by learners" (Lantolf & Thorne 2009, p. 284), and this devolves to the teacher.

In Section 4.2.2 Strategy C, I discuss task dynamics in the *Convernation* and *Speak4yourself* conceptual frameworks, and present the reception, practice, production, and negotiation approach. In this approach, at the outset of a sequence, students focus on language form through reception-based learning (Litz 2005), and hence transmission pedagogies. Tasks in which students practise the language then follow, constituting practice (Section 3.7). The subsequent production stage encourages students to consolidate language elements and extend their range of applicability (Norman 2006). Negotiation then follows (Section 3.2) as a final constituent of the four-phase model. Jung (2000) supports this sequence of learning in South Korean contexts, through his argument for the effectiveness of an integrated approach, where there occurs a gradual movement from receptive preparation to practice, to production, and finally to negotiation. This also bridges Korean traditional and western language learning methods through increasing group sizes. Jung notes that beginner-

competence South Korean learners of English resort to traditional learning methods to develop competence, such as individually repeating language elements. Alternatively, advanced competence learners should employ methods such as interaction and negotiation.

Brouwer and Wagner (2004) also argue for increasing group sizes during interactive ELL. This style becomes highly conducive to effective ELL in South Korea as, according to Lee (2001b), South Korean learners of English are generally not accustomed to interaction in learning, and need gradual skill development which facilitates and parallels the level of their participation in collaborative learning modes. This becomes necessary within the space of each learning session, and transforms to a transition pedagogy. Although Sullivan (2004) notes that group work conflicts with group harmony in Confucian environments, I suggest that non-competitive group formations create pathways to larger, whole class collaboration.

The introduction of large groups within which students become exposed to peers prior to adequate language preparation and competence, can injure language learner ego and image, also contributing to my argument that the formation of groups requires gradual expansion. To achieve this gradual expansion, I combine frameworks by Dörnyei (2003b) and Rossiter (2005) to build the following sequence of interaction permutations:

1. educator initiated tasks
2. work-alone tasks
3. pair work
4. group work
5. whole-class discussion

Dörnyei (2003b) contends that in these types of sequence combinations, language learners first individually consolidate knowledge, then work in controlled productive tasks such as semi-structured dialogues, followed by freer activities such as negotiation. The sequence designs begin with what Krashen (2007) labels as traditional, individual, teacher-centred, during which students receive and repeat language elements. This initial, educator initiated work stage engages and motivates the students, guiding them to understand the foundations of language. The following individual work stage, as Richards and Lockhardt (1999) note, affords students the opportunity to progress at their own rate, to practise skills with reduced anxiety, during which teachers tailor tasks for students, and

assess individual learner progress. Diaz-Rico (2004) argues that pair work bridges individual and group work, without which students become deprived of opportunities to draw on linguistic resources in non-threatening environments, and during which students complete tasks with greater facility than in larger groups. Pair work lowers anxiety adequately for students to build competence for upcoming group work (Dörnyei 2003b), and during which, a zone of proximal development results in both students performing at higher competence (Ohta 2004), reinforcing the importance of the pair-work dimensions of the *Conversation* and *Speak4yourself* course materials.

Following pair work, the sequences progress to group work, gradually and increasingly assigning interactive, communicative, and negotiative agency to students (Dörnyei 2003b). In these sequences, as groups grow, interactional space increases for language learners, who according to Dörnyei, learn to freely cooperate in groups, and increasingly engage in interpersonal negotiation. This graduation encourages participants to extend, refine, and increasingly personalise material, while considering other participants. According to Houston (2006), group work maximises the efficiency of negotiation of meaning, as students optimise language learning through extended interaction, and hence larger communities of practice. Nunan (1999) argues that group work is essential to any classroom, where based on principles of experiential learning, learners develop their ability to communicate in the world. Crucial for strengthening target language behaviour, group work affords participants opportunities to create their own activities in micro-interaction and, "when left to their own devices, students prefer to interact in a collaborative format" (Lantolf & Thorne 2009, p. 287). In line with Korean theorists Jeon and Hahn (2006), in South Korean contexts, group work motivates those learners who have had adequate preparation during smaller group, and even personal, work, stabilizing the affective elements of learning, while simultaneously assisting the consolidation of knowledge.

3.9 Summary

Throughout the chapter, I outlined, presented and developed approaches which, I argued, used in specific combinations and in ordered sequences, can assist to overcome ELL impediments in South Korean tertiary environments to promote effective learning.

The first set of these approaches constitutes socioaffective practices. I argued that addressing issues such as negotiating social identity to reduce feelings of perceived inferiority, localizing and negotiating learning, culture-language mediation, integrative motivation, socioaffective proximity to the target language group, and appropriating learner agency, can all contribute to a reconceptualised approach in tertiary ELL contexts in South Korea.

The second set of these approaches constitutes sociocultural theory, defending the use of socioaffective strategies, and during which language learners can benefit by bringing to interactions their own personal values and beliefs. In this way, ELL becomes uniquely situated in language student contexts, while also recognizing the specialty competence of local teachers. Furthermore, the application of social theory within the pedagogies and content of ELL assists language learners to conceptualise their learning environments, and hence to increase their learning.

The third set of these approaches recognises the importance of interactive and communicative strategies, and hence combining pedagogies, thus including negotiation, participatory pedagogies, increasing learner-centred pedagogies, and situated learning.

The fourth set of these approaches is the cognitive approach. Here I discuss Bloom's six-level taxonomy and progression from lower- to higher-order thinking.

Finally, and to support the above approaches, I discuss focus-on-form, task-based pedagogies, task and group dynamics, and thematically sequential task chains, and ways in which they all interlink. These task chains emerge as a sequence supporting the transition model (Section 4.2.2).

This language research informs the design of an alternative approach to English language learning in South Korean tertiary contexts, as exemplified in the *Conversation* and *Speak4yourself* materials, described in the follow chapters.

Chapter 4

Methodology for reconceptualizing English language learning materials

4.1 Introduction

Thus far, I have discussed some of the social and cultural influences on modern South Korea, and have drawn from sociocultural, affective, linguistic, as well as educative domains to argue for influences on both traditional and emerging South Korean ELL. Within this context, I have foregrounded salient curriculum and pedagogical approaches in South Korean as well as global ELL to contribute to a discussion of models from which I aim to build a transition approach to ELL in South Korea. Through this, I have attempted to provide a response to the main research question, "How might a reconceptualised approach to English language education be designed to motivate learning in South Korean tertiary contexts?"

This is not a conventional methodology chapter, but rather one where I describe the conceptual framework for the materials developed as the focus of this doctoral study, as the methodology for the materials, and the materials themselves. For this, the theoretical literature review in Chapters 2 and 3 informs the development of the conceptual model and product for the materials, in the form of an alternative approach to ELL in South Korean tertiary education, which includes the transition model I develop in Section 4.2.2. This chapter forms the methodology with which I address my main research question regarding how reconceptualised combinations of learning styles and methods can invoke an effective approach to ELL in tertiary contexts in South Korea. I develop this discussion through a social constructivist approach to English language learning, which becomes a chief feature in the approach I adopt in the *Convernation* and *Speak4yourself* learning materials.

4.2 Developing a conceptual framework for English language learning materials

4.2.1 Beginnings of the conceptual framework

Emerging from the models and theories I discussed in Chapters 2 and 3, the following conceptual framework underpins the *Convernation* and *Speak4yourself* designs (Sections 5.2–5.3).

Through *Convernation* and *Speak4yourself*, I have aimed to address a number of the factors identified as affecting formal South Korean ELL, and to improve those learning environments. The main research question asks how a reconceptualised approach to English language education might be designed to motivate learning in South Korean tertiary contexts. *Convernation* and *Speak4yourself* aim to present a reconceptualised approach by adopting specific curriculum, pedagogical, and language learning designs I have discussed (Chapters 2 & 3), while also considering and appropriating sociocultural factors, to encourage South Korean tertiary learners of English to expand their communicative competence in global Englishes (Crystal 2007; Section 3.3).

The *Convernation* and *Speak4yourself* conceptual frameworks aim to cater to upper intermediate to advanced competence speakers of English, and build on the predecessors, *VerbOmatik* (Hadzantonis & Kim 2007a) and *IdiOmatik* (Hadzantonis & Kim 2007b). The conceptual framework emphasises transition between South Korean traditional pedagogies (Section 2.6.1) and those newly introduced to South Korea and predominant in the west (Chapter 3). The framework also highlights a back and forth transition between local context and contexts of other localities, regions, and enculturations, encouraging students to recognise and incorporate wider cultural perspectives (Section 3.3).

4.2.2 The transition model

The conceptual framework of the products for this PhD by Project builds on transition, which predominantly describes the need for a gradual shift between South Korean traditional learning styles and those introduced by foreign teachers. This gradual shift, or transition, between pedagogies, aims to promote the acceptance by South Korean English language learners of English speaking cultures

(Section 3.3). Throughout the literature review, I discussed elements which contribute to the development of this model, which I argue can open up effective learning pathways for South Korean learners of English at the tertiary level.

In the following, I argue for transition between east and west, and also the integration of eastern and western methods. Effecting this integration provides an opportunity to merge and stage pedagogies, which has several benefits described throughout this thesis, and which form the basis for the conceptual framework of not only *Conversation* and *Speak4yourself*, but also their predecessors, *VerbOmatik*, and *IdiOmatik*. *Conversation* and *Speak4yourself* cater to language learners at upper mid to advanced language competence levels (and the upper levels of the transition model), and hence draw from later stages of the Strategies A, B, C and D, which I present below. I now discuss and integrate these elements into a pragmatic framework.

Strategy A. Negotiation of identity

I argue in Section 3.5 that increasing interaction facilitates the negotiation of language and various aspects of identity. Subsequently, through interaction, students in South Korea can learn to enact new 'transitional' sociocultural or transcultural and classroom identities (Sections 3.2–3.3), and can hence increase their English learning effectiveness by overcoming cultural inhibitions around interaction. As part of this learning, students can also greatly benefit by observing their social environment (Section 3.4) and subsequently performing a comparative study of concepts from their own social environment with other social environments as they develop competence in speaking English. Students then learn to negotiate identity, through questioning traditionally and locally enacted identities, through observing identities of people in other regions and of different enculturations, and through observing South Koreans who have relocated from South Korea and have developed expertise in the English language. Students can thus apprehend the benefits of learning to switch between identities, and more easily integrate into a variety of groups.

A multiplicity of textual modes, such as print, visual, and verbal interaction with peers and teachers, can mediate this learning and hence the negotiation of identity. Students can greatly benefit

through support to act reflexively during this learning, considering the contingent nature of cultural understanding. Students also benefit by observing that they need not ignore traditional enculturations, and that they subsequently may enrich their sociocultural repertoires by developing an expanded range of personal and sociocultural identities (Lantolf & Thorne 2009).

Strategy B. Reception, Practice, Production, Negotiation

The conceptual frameworks guiding the materials *Convernation* (Hadzantonis 2007) and *Speak4yourself* (Hadzantonis 2011), as well as *VerbOmatik* (Hadzantonis & Kim 2007a) and *IdiOmatik* (Hadzantonis & Kim 2007b), employ the sequence of reception, practice, production, and negotiation (Section 3.5; Section 3.8), which I label RPPN. *VerbOmatik* and *IdiOmatik* emphasise reception and practice, where as the *Convernation* and *Speak4yourself* framework seeks to advocate a greater use of the production and negotiation strategies, as they cater to language learners at higher language competence levels. Language learners at the appropriate language competence stage for using *Convernation* and *Speak4yourself* have surpassed the need to prioritise extensive repetition of language elements, and to perform extensive grammar translation, as by this stage they would have achieved mastery of basic syntactic structure. Using *Convernation* and *Speak4yourself*, students can hence develop their language skills through interpersonal negotiation (Section 3.2), during which they must negotiate the meaning of concepts both linguistically and socioculturally. Following adequate individual reception and repetition as practice (Section 3.6), speakers produce language through increasing levels of interaction (Section 3.5). Students must ultimately negotiate (Section 3.2), to position the concepts well within their discourses, where conceptualizing and reconceptualizing occurs, as students extend the range of applicability of the concepts and language elements to suit their particular environments (Section 3.3; Norman 2006).

The RPPN model builds from Bloom's taxonomy of cognitive activity (Bloom 1956) revised in Anderson and Krathwohl (2001). This revised classification comprises remembering, understanding, applying, analysing, evaluating, and creating. I relate the lowest two levels of the work by Anderson and Krathwohl, remembering and understanding, to reception, during which the learner

develops knowledge. I relate the third level, applying, to practice, as students gradually and increasingly contextualise their interactive speech. The sixth level, creating, I apply to production. Finally, I relate the fourth and fifth levels, analysing and evaluating, to processes that occur during negotiation.

Strategy C. Task hierarchies

In Section 3.8 I discussed Rossiter's (2005, p. 56) task hierarchy, which describes a task sequence that gradually progresses from independent and personal work to interdependent and interpersonal work, and which parallels the reception, practice, production, negotiation strategy I propose above (Strategy B). While adhering to Strategy B, language learners at the *Conversation* and *Speak4yourself* levels focus on the later stages of the task hierarchy, where language learners at the *VerbOmatik* and *IdiOmatik* stages focus on the lower and mid stages respectively. *Conversation* and *Speak4yourself* task sequences thus focus on the interactive production and negotiation phases, which constitute the later stages of the Rossiter sequence, more so than the earlier stages. Tasks at these stages, though to a lesser extent than in *VerbOmatik* and *IdiOmatik*, also draw from Korean traditional learning styles, such as grammar exercises and repetition, so as to prepare the students for interactive exposure, and hence limit student discomfort during interaction, but also to encourage students to interact throughout the task sequences.

Strategy D. Group hierarchies

Traversing task sequences in *Conversation* and *Speak4yourself* encourages and requires expanding groups. *VerbOmatik* and *IdiOmatik* course book conceptual frameworks require that students begin with a substantial amount of personal and independent work. Students using *Conversation* and *Speak4yourself,* however, already at a communicative mastery of English, begin task sequences, and hence expanding group formations, with independent work at a lesser intensity than *VerbOmatik* and *IdiOmatik,* and more quickly move to pair and group work. Thus the initial but short independent or teacher-initiated work engages and motivates the language learners to understand the foundations of language elements. Subsequently, as students gain confidence, as groups form and

66

expand, and hence as students engage in discussion in increasingly larger groups, they become more adept at managing anxiety during interaction (Dörnyei 2002; Dörnyei 2005).

Furthermore, while the *VerbOmatik* and *IdiOmatik* conceptual frameworks emphasise small group interaction, students at the *Convernation* and *Speak4yourself* level should progress to whole class discussion and interaction, and interact with people outside of the classroom, venturing into other communities. Here the combined Dörnyei (2003b) and Rossiter (2005) framework I outlined in Section 3.8 is particularly relevant, to build an appropriate sequence of interaction permutations: educator initiation, work-alone tasks, pair-work, group-work, and subsequently whole-class discussion. *Convernation* and *Speak4yourself* emphasise these later stages of the sequence, while also encouraging the earlier stages. Furthermore, the sequence gradually and increasingly assigns interactive, communicative, and negotiative agency to language learners at this level, as they expand their linguistic capacities (Dörnyei 2003b), but at higher rates than for those language learners at lower competences. This affords the students opportunities to increasingly extend, refine, and personalise material, while considering other participants, as they increasingly interact.

4.2.3 Scaffolding

As group sizes increase, students learn to build on the competences of each other through peer scaffolding (Vygotsky 1978, p. 86). During this peer scaffolding, language learners can greatly increase their learning by collaborating to construct knowledge and concepts. In this way, they engage in a social constructivist approach through which they assist other members of the classroom community to develop English language expertise, and hence develop their own. Similarly, students build on the existing aptitudes and resources of other students, where each student enters the class with his or her own set of enculturations, knowledge, influences, as well as learning needs. Following the above discussion of task designs (Strategy C), a course book alone does not fully build on student input, and as such does not scaffold student competences and enculturations: a book can only partially realise the shared learning goals. Print materials provide a range of possible resources and strategies to inspire students, and to activate input, providing cues for the students to recall pertinent information,

67

where they work with other students, teachers, and information in such a way that they scaffold each other during learning. This scaffolding also occurs through the availability of increasingly open-ended tasks in the course book. To facilitate interaction, course materials must thus explore ideas around relevant cultural concepts and must include individual and collaborative tasks. The materials must assume prior knowledge of cultural concepts by students, as well as requiring students to bring their ideas and enculturations to the formal learning environment. This also becomes one of the roles of teachers, increasing the importance for the teacher to develop knowledge of students. However, this becomes only a part of social constructivism, and more specifically, shared learning, the theory of which should guide conceptions of learning during the use of any materials.

4.2.4 Localised pedagogies

South Korean tertiary students can greatly benefit by participating in a learning environment in which they reduce power distance between themselves and teachers. In the process, these students can negotiate facets of ELL, including personalised pedagogies, personal and relevant learning content, membership in relevant learning communities, as well as their relationships with their teachers. Macdonough and Shaw (2003) consider that a methodology only becomes effective when students and teachers trust it and accept it as authentic and effective for their environment.

To construct knowledge collectively, and to effectively negotiate their social position, English language learners in South Korean tertiary contexts can benefit through utilizing and bridging a range of ELL pedagogies and content, both foreign and localised, reinforcing the intentions of the transition model. The provision of a relevant pedagogy and content, which does not generally exist in currently available materials, requires a language course relevant to the current sociocultural disposition of these language learners. To increase learning effectiveness, South Korean English language students at the tertiary level must situate their pedagogies, during which they collaborate in the construction and development of the learning content.

The materials and pedagogies that English language teachers employ for South Korean tertiary students must enable gradual integration of traditional independent with participatory learning,

68

and hence gradual shift from eastern to western ELL styles. This contributes to harnessing the affective elements of learning, while simultaneously consolidating the development of student knowledge of the English language. This also affords students the opportunity to draw on South Korean traditional learning styles while increasingly incorporating western ones, a process which constitutes transition, and to develop a range of identities, which students reappropriate according to their prior knowledge. In this way, they integrate traditional South Korean language learner identities with new English identities.

Furthermore, ELL in South Korea should integrate a learner-centred focus with a knowledge-centred focus (National Research Council 1999), and should integrate learner personal development and hence communicative competence with authentic and meaningful communicative practice. Richards and Rodgers (2001) maintain that these factors should be goals of the communicative classroom, and should integrate language form with meaning. The *Conversation* and *Speak4yourself* learning materials thus intend to integrate South Korean institutional aims with reference to relevant learner lifeworlds and classroom contexts.

4.2.5 Using social concepts as content base

Localised pedagogies engage students while they learn to draw from and incorporate relevant and personal social concepts. When doing so in another language, the students also begin to draw comparisons between their own and foreign social environments, reinforcing the intentions of the transition model. Students of ELL in South Korea at the tertiary level can greatly benefit by drawing from social concepts as a content base in this way.

Simplified social concepts, such as those included in *Conversation* and *Speak4yourself*, assist English language teachers, unqualified or without adequate knowledge of social concepts, to incorporate the material into their English language courses. The benefits of incorporating these concepts include: encouraging students to build strategies in social analysis, cross cultural and social comparison, while observing and describing cultural bias, prejudice, stereotyping, and the study of social and cultural identity; encouraging students to study social theory, and hence all of the subfields

above, to overcome learnt tendencies which inhibit ELL; allowing for a transition that requires the language students to gradually build from local traditional pedagogies and reduce anxiety while integrating new learning styles.

In *Convernation*, and more so in *Speak4yourself,* students learn to identify, question, and contest cultural assumptions which frame South Korean identities, particularly in relation to ELL, and the ways that ELL is embedded in traditional power relationships in South Korea during verbal interaction. The prevalence of social themes, as well as questions connected to these social themes, should ground extensive discussion of sociocultural identities. In moving through task and group formations, and hence from Korean traditional to newer pedagogies, students not only learn to attempt new educational and social identities, but also learn to build increasing confidence with English during social interaction.

4.3 Summary

In this chapter, I outlined methodological concepts for the English language learning material products of the doctoral project. The framework builds predominantly from the transition model. In the next chapter, I proceed to describe the materials, and how they build on the conceptual framework I developed in this chapter, as well as discussions in Chapters 2 and 3.

Chapter 5

Description of the course material products

5.1 Introduction

In the first four chapters I introduced and discussed literature pertaining to South Korean English language education, and sociocultural English language learning theory, while also drawing on that literature to develop a conceptual framework for the course material products. In this chapter I describe the two course material products, *Convernation* and *Speak4yourself*, including their structure, intentions, and subsequently their tasks. Following this I discuss the *Teacher's manual* for the materials, including the roles of teachers while using the materials.

Through effective pedagogies, language courses can achieve the aims in Chapter 4. However, course books can attempt to approximate learning needs, but cannot accommodate the uniqueness of each individual student in learning communities, offering a limited range of content, and constrained pedagogical methods, as they act as expository sources of information. Despite this, teachers and students can use course book content, in conjunction with prior knowledge and more effective wider pedagogical frameworks, to appropriate learning relevant to purpose and audience. Course books and related teachers' manuals can provide advice and guidance, but teachers and students ultimately select, appropriate course book content which they reshape to suit their learning needs, learning environments, and enculturations. Furthermore, language course books should not require students to adhere to all tasks and predetermined sequences. Tasks should stand alone for students and teachers to select appropriate pathways, thus addressing point-of-need and just-in-time learning.

5.2 *Convernation*

5.2.1 Beginnings and predecessor models

Working for a year at SMOE (Seoul Metropolitan Office of Education) in 2001, I educated South Korean high-school English teachers, and developed course materials for other teacher

educators, contributing to the curriculum and syllabus. In my teaching, I frequently incorporated interactive tasks, during which the students would perform the tasks and solve problems while interacting verbally. During these courses, and more specifically, within the class sessions, the importance of emphasizing grammar, transition, interpersonal negotiation, and a socially relevant content base, became salient. The participants welcomed this method as crucial to their attempts at developing communicative competence.

My conviction then was, and still remains, that available materials do not effectively address the pedagogical needs of South Koreans. This encouraged me to collate themes, around which I began to create a contextualised sequence of individual and interactive tasks, and hence to build a predecessor for what would later become *Convernation*. However, the course book concept alone was not strong enough to support a conceptual framework effective for South Korean ELL, and I opted for doctoral study to develop the concept.

The products *Convernation* and *Speak4yourself* have grown out of the research undertaken in this doctoral study. The initial design comprised the course books *VerbOmatik* (Hadzantonis & Kim 2007a) and *IdiOmatik* (Hadzantonis & Kim 2007b) for lower lever competence language learners, and *Convernation* (Hadzantonis 2007), for upper-mid to advanced language competence levels, which aim at South Korean tertiary-level English language learners. The first two course books emphasise South Korean traditional pedagogies, whereas *Convernation* focuses on increasing levels of interactionist pedagogies. *Convernation*, however, emerged from many years of developing ideas of themes relevant to South Korean English language learners, an extensive literature review, and an investigation of other language learning materials. *Speak4yourself* (Hadzantonis 2011) evolves from the evaluation of *Convernation* in Chapter 6.

I redesigned the initial concept of *Convernation* to include a broader sociolinguistic framework, based on an investigation into the development of communicative competence in English for South Korean learners, developing my theoretical stance and research methodology. The development of appropriate theoretical perspectives occurred alongside the ideas for the course books.

I collected themes most popular for discussion amongst advanced level competence adult learners of English, around which I built sequenced learning materials, by approaching social concepts from various angles and through textual modes such as film. These themes and their associated tasks aimed to effectively engage learners of English, to facilitate language retention, to assist learners to overcome sociocultural and communicative barriers, and to negotiate sociocultural content during learning. I have organised *Convernation* into an increasingly logical sequence through research in sociology and related fields, by including film materials that appeal to these students and that balance engagement and language learning requirements.

The course of the doctoral study has included publishing *Convernation* with a small independent publisher, *Lingui Stick*. *Convernation*, an amalgamation of the words 'conversation' and 'nation', focuses on social concepts as its content base. The course book caters to language learners of upper-intermediate to advanced English communicative competence. In *Convernation*, each of the seven modules varies in format, length and task type. Furthermore, rather than only sequencing tasks within each chapter, the modules also cohere, building on the conceptual framework in Chapter 4.

5.2.2 Structure of *Convernation*

Oxford (1990) argues that, by employing socioaffective, cognitive and linguistic strategies, students such as those in South Korean tertiary contexts can improve meaningful discourse and verbal communicative competence in the English language. Thus, to assist students to develop this competence, *Convernation* aims to employ specifically designed combinations of reconceptualised pedagogies, while structuring itself within the conceptual framework I proposed in Chapter 4. Furthermore, *Convernation* aims to present students with the opportunity to critically discuss their learning strategies, an opportunity they would not generally receive in other courses in South Korean tertiary contexts. This opportunity provides a useful, cultural debate, and a two-way flow of information, allowing students to draw a sociocultural map, so to negotiate cultural identities.

The *Convernation* task and chapter sequences encourage students to develop their comprehension of basic social concepts and implications, which they should linguistically and

contextually integrate into their discourses. The concepts include collectivism, individualism, prejudice, stereotypes, in-group and out-group theory, and identity negotiation. Students convey their sociocultural knowledge to the learning environment (Section 3.3) to contextualise these concepts, while comparing South Korean and western sociocultural environments, through various tasks, constituting a cross-cultural study of sociocultural environments. Consequently, the students construct sociocultural east-west maps to locate themselves as traditional Koreans negotiating identities and membership in international communities, and position themselves in relation to the target language and its related set of cultures. Students thus gradually identify to what extent they can and do progress in negotiating identities.

By using course materials such as *Conversation*, students can develop an understanding of cultural diversity, sociocultural awareness, sociolinguistic competence, as well as related language forms, and conceptualise and negotiate cross-cultural identities through interaction with increasing facility (Gee 2001b; Sections 3.2–3.4). The basis of this pedagogy thus becomes a back-and-forth language and identity dialogue, and hence a collaborative transition between Korean traditional and English language identities, reinforcing the intentions of the transition model (Section 4.2.2). This amounts to using curriculum as a pedagogy, and content as a tool to expand sociocultural identity, as well as adopting new identities that increase integrative motivation, fostering development of communicative competence in English (Section 3.3; Dörnyei 2003a). This type of pedagogy may appear ambitious for these learners, but I argue that this is within the range for an upper intermediate to high competence level in English. As Spielmann and Radnofsky (2001, p. 273) note, language learners become

> motivated and stimulated not simply by the level of difficulty, tension, and expectation of the course, but also by the quality of tasks [and materials] that truly challenge their cognitive abilities and contribute to the satisfactory development of their … [second language] personalities.

I selected themes that bridge ideas from east to west, to encourage students to locate themselves socioculturally, as they question their identities as learners of English, and as negotiators within local, global, social, professional and academic communities. The task sequences in *Conversation* define and trace these fundamental concepts at a level appropriate for students not familiar with social

concepts, but who are competent in spoken English. The student-relevant themes provide a content base that has academic, sociocultural and lifeworld connections for the students. The tasks solicit description, interpretation and contextualization of the concepts and media through collaborative verbal negotiation, and through expanding classroom communities (Section 3.8). The *Conversation* course book focuses less on the linguistic structure, and hence on the form, of English than its predecessors *VerbOmatik* and *IdiOmatik*, and more on the exploration, application, contextualization, and recontextualization of concepts, and hence on meaning. In this way the course book ultimately aims to achieve a balance between language form, meaning and context (Section 3.6) in academic, social, personal, and professional learner-relevant discourses.

5.2.3 *Conversation* module intentions

The *Conversation* course book aims to inspire analysis of and reflection on personal and foreign sociocultural environments, and ultimately asks students to compare societies. It encourages students to identify and contest traditional assumptions framing South Korean identities, and the ways in which ELL is embedded in traditional South Korean discursive power relationships. Students thus attempt to increase their language competence through sociocultural aspects, as *Conversation* attempts to inspire the students to observe themselves as members of socially shifting groups at a time of extensive cultural integration, as South Korea is at present. To aid this, *Conversation* encourages students to investigate, negotiate and contextualise concepts through different forms of media, including video and print textual modes.

Users of *Conversation* perform several roles. They develop English literacy skills through the course book reading and writing tasks. They develop their oracy skills through verbal interaction with others with whom they collaborate in increasingly expanding groups (Section 3.8) to negotiate their understandings and consolidate their knowledge of the social concepts (Section 3.4). They develop their academic skills, as the course book prompts them to focus on social concepts (Section 3.4). They learn to incorporate academic areas into their ELL, contributing to the *Conversation* intention of integrating an academic content base to produce an integrative pedagogy (Section 3.8), facilitating

transition between academia and English language development. The students negotiate their

identities as English language learners, and challenge their anti-foreign conceptions, hence

reconsidering cultural assumptions, stereotypes, and prejudices (Section 3.4), which assists the

students to move more freely between ingroups, and hence increasing language learning effectiveness

(Section 3.2).

The course book begins with *Somalogy*, an amalgamation of the words *Soma* for body, and

logy for rhetoric. The module investigates functions of the human body, which students can later use

to analyse social phenomena. It intends to assist students to identify emotion, habit, thinking, instinct,

understanding, and intuition, as at many times, the idiomatic use of terms in the English language,

such as "I think I am tired", "I feel as though it's too big for the room", is confusing. Students hence

better discuss the functions of the body through this module. The discussion of the functions of the

body such as emotion, the intellect, and habit, relative to interpersonal communication (Triandis 1977;

1995), provides students with a basis for control of ELL strategies (Oxford 1990), and grounds

concepts in succeeding chapters. Subsequently, these learners realise that they can control the

functions of the body which play a part in language learning and use. Through this realization, the

students learn to control their learning to appropriate speech acts.

I have built the module from work in social anthropology, using Triandis (1977; 1995) who

argues extensively for the use of emotion and the personality in interpersonal and intercultural

interaction, and as a basis for social thought. I also draw from Bloom (1956; 1965), Anderson and

Krathwohl (2001), as well as Kandel, Schwartz and Jessell (2000), to describe the functions in

interpersonal behaviour. The course book then encourages students to explore and relate the

phenomena introduced in Module 1 to social concepts in subsequent chapters.

Module 2, ...*ISM*, denotes the suffix from the two ideologies individualism and collectivism.

The module introduces the concepts of individualism and collectivism, assisting South Koreans to

compare themselves to those in other geographical and sociocultural regions, facilitating cross-

cultural integration and into a global culture (Sections 3.3 and 3.4). Subsequently, students better

appreciate and question their enculturated habits and emotions, and observe the extent to which they can appropriate and negotiate their sociocultural identities to achieve learning and sociocultural development goals (Sections 3.2–3.3). Students revise definitions related to collectivism and individualism, and question the legitimacy of labelling people as belonging to either one of these groups, thus problematizing these binaries. Students observe that communication between differing societies, constituting intercultural communication, requires specific sociocultural practice.

Module 3, *ID*, an abbreviation for identity, affords the students opportunities to consider their individual, learning and social identities, and to conceptualise boundaries around themselves and their larger groups, as well as the permeability of these boundaries (Section 3.3). Students learn to permeate group boundaries, to perform tasks such as to reduce prejudice and the alienation of others, and hence to integrate social groups. This assists students to learn to negotiate identity, thus assisting language development (Section 3.2). Module 3 builds on Module 2, as it addresses classroom, social, individual, and collective identities, together with their interconnectivities. Students use the individualist and collectivist descriptions in Module 2 to describe identities of others, with whom they must learn to communicate, thus reducing prejudice (Section 3.4). They also expose inconsistent arguments in individualism and collectivism, as the students perceive that the concepts symbolise different identities. For example, South Korean students enact certain identities by considering themselves 'naturally' collectivist, wherein they have *Chung*, a 'natural' tendency to consider, connect with, and feel for every other Korean person. However, after the course book encourages students to consider that in many aspects they may not exhibit *Chung*, they can realise that they may not always act collectively, which challenges the simplistic binary. Students also consider that countries they consider individualist, can act collectively.

Module 4, *East and West*, investigates differences between eastern and western societies, reinforcing the social intentions of *Convernation* (Section 4.2.6). This module encourages students to rethink their positions as easterners, and to expose differences between east and west, and within the east and the west, thus students reposition themselves as global residents. This also assists students to permeate sociocultural boundaries (Section 3.2), effecting a negotiation of identities, increasing social

integration (Sections 3.2–3.4), and thus increasing ELL. Module 4 builds on previous modules by further observing individualist and collectivist stereotypes of social and cultural regions, and encouraging students to question these assumptions, as well essentialist notions of geographically localised identities. The module asks students to observe how different groups moderate the emotional investments involved in ELL (Section 3.3), and to observe practices that may assist learning, such as collaboration and risk taking (Section 3.2). As I describe in Section 3.4, models such as those in this module provide students with broader perspectives of sociocultural difference.

Modules 5 to 7 contextualise concepts from the first four modules. Through Module 5, *Family Structures*, students compare their family environments, to those in other societies, and to formal learning environments in their societies. Furthermore, Module 5 focuses on manifestations of social theory (Sections 3.3–3.4) in the family, and how student belief systems connect to students' surroundings.

Module 6, *Working*, encourages students to compare professional environments from different societies. The *Working* module encourages students to observe how concepts in previous modules affect professional practices, how their language learning pedagogies have evolved to suit a local professional culture, and that they as South Koreans have learnt to comply with that culture.

In Module 7, *Music Sociology*, students amalgamate previous concepts to discuss music in different eras, societies, and genres. Subsequently, students can better appreciate unique musical tastes of respective societies, contributing to the uniqueness of a society. The module investigates how concepts of identity in earlier modules connect to music styles, such as pop and underground. Music is proximal to everyone in its many forms, and hence the module aims to engage students with content familiar and relevant to the students.

5.2.4 Description of tasks in *Convernation*

Performing the tasks throughout each module, students developmentally draw from their social repertoires, negotiating traditional identities and rehearsing new target language identities.

Students thus interact, and build linguistic, sociocultural and communicative competence, through increasing verbal negotiation (Section 3.2). This increasing engagement parallels the transition from a predominant use of Korean traditional to western learning styles (Section 3.8), aims to gradually expand student social and linguistic repertoires, and aims to strengthen learner autonomy where students can increasingly adopt appropriate identities and language learning methods (Sections 3.2–3.3). Paralleling the developing confidence of the students as they expand their communicative expertise, the task sequences increase in open-endedness (Section 3.8), increasingly encouraging students to negotiate through interaction (Section 3.5). Students also question and build on the curriculum through tasks that encourage them to relate the concepts and content to their lifeworlds. Examples are Tasks 3.3a, 3.3b, and 3.3c (p. 66), through which students observe how they generalise phenomena around them, as well as how they generalise about people.

Paralleling this increasing open-endedness, throughout the sequences, groups gradually expand (Section 3.8), increasingly inviting students to a participatory pedagogy (Section 3.5), while increasingly building student to student interactional space (Section 3.5), where interactional organization becomes less constrained. Similarly, students and teachers increasingly interact at a more commensurate level, strengthening student-teacher immediacy and communication. Examples of this include Tasks 1.16 (pp. 25–26), 2.9c (p. 58), 3.23 (p. 91), 4.23 (p. 121) and 5.6 (pp. 141–142). Tasks throughout *Conversation* assist students to interact in new and larger communities (Section 3.2), and hence to simultaneously manage language and social engagement. Students thus scaffold each other to develop communicative competence in English (Section 3.2). Examples include the film discussions in each module.

As sequences progress, and paralleling increasing task open-endedness, the tasks require the use of an increasingly simultaneous use of language dimensions and strategies. These dimensions and strategies include access of emotion (Section 3.2), need for linguistic and social negotiation (Section 3.2), personal style determination (Section 3.3), increasing difficulty level of tasks and skills (Section 3.8), increasingly communicative content (Section 3.5), and problem-solving content (Anderson & Krathwohl 2001). This builds the engagement of the students in higher-order cognitive functions and

79

social scaffolding (Section 3.6). Examples of this include Tasks 3.19–3.26 (pp. 86–94), during which, students must increasingly exchange information to reach learning goals, and must increasingly negotiate linguistic and sociocultural responses to tasks. Tasks are short to minimise anxiety and intellectual load, and to maintain motivation (Section 3.2), but nevertheless sequentially connect.

Task types in *Conversation* also include vocabulary skill-building techniques, which comprise mnemonic techniques, semantic and situational relationships, translation of context, arrangements of grammatical form, and collocation tasks. Most individual, pair-, or group-work tasks contain social constructivist elements (Section 3.3), as students interact to exchange information, and to negotiate language learning pathways (Section 3.2; Ellis 2003). These include film discussions, but represent only a small section of a larger range of language learning intentions. The repetitive contextualizing of language elements and concepts in various ways within each module complements the *Conversation* conceptual framework to encourage repetition (Section 3.7).

As the terms individualism and collectivism can take the form of reductive socio-political constructions, the *...ISM*, *ID*, and *East and West* modules encourage students to examine and problematise these concepts, and not to reinforce their universality, acknowledging their presence as ideologies. These modules encourage the students to not adhere to conventional perspectives of the east as collectivist and the west as individualist, apparent in Figure 2.1 (p. 30), which questions the relevance of collectivism and individualism to any particular society. Task 2.2f (pp. 33–34) asks students to determine to what extent they believe they enact individualist behaviour, and Task 2.3f (pp. 37–38) asks the students to determine to what extent they believe they enact collectivist behaviour. Task 3.2 (p. 88) asks, "Is the East Individualist and the West Collectivist?", attempting to elicit the opinions of students following evidence they uncover throughout the module, and to determine whether the students have better understood the terms and their applicability. This challenges their initial conceptions of typifying themselves as individualist or collectivist, and affords students an opportunity to further contextualise the concepts stereotype, prejudice, and generalization.

Conversation presents phenomena in professional environments which influence student immediate and distant social and cultural practices, such as long and short power distance (p. 160),

which may affect learning (Section 3.4). These descriptions (Task 6.4a, p. 160; Task 6.6, p. 161) aim to alert students to different practices of working and learning.

Finally, the term *Dine*, in many tasks, suggests a composite of discussion and negotiation, which serves to inspire students to discuss and negotiate responses.

5.3 *Speak4yourself*

5.3.1 Transition from *Convernation*

The website *www.akatheme.com* houses the *Speak4yourself* learning materials, as well as a forum for students using the learning materials. *Speak4yourself* emerges as the by-product of *Convernation* for the PhD by Project, and addresses weaknesses in the *Convernation* course book, which the evaluation in Chapter 6 pinpoints. *Speak4yourself*, however, retains some of the *Convernation* material and many of its themes, but reshapes this material in response to the evaluation, and to produce more effective materials for students learning English for verbal communicative purposes in South Korea.

5.3.2 General structure of *Speak4yourself*

www.akatheme.com aims to provide students with a range of resources which increase the effectiveness of learning, and which become highly relevant to South Korean tertiary-level learners of English. The name is a composite of the suggestion that the material appropriates learning for *academic* contexts, and that the learning is *theme* based.

> To enter the site and to view contents
> 1. Access the URL http://www.akatheme.com
> 2. Click on the *Speak4yourself* link
> 3. Enter the user name – 'user001' (with a lower case u)
> 4. Enter the password – 'User001!' (including the upper case U and exclamation mark)

The site presents a learning platform on the main page, and a link to materials, the central of which is *Speak4yourself*. The site also contains forum space to contact, collaborate, and interact with other students, to view and comment on the work of other students, and to post work. *Speak4yourself* provides students with online ELL content, including themes, concepts, readings, and tasks, both

individual and interactive, constituting a course specifically catering for tertiary-level English language learners in South Korea.

I alone developed the *akatheme* website and *Speak4yourself*, including layout design, web design, flash language programming, and content writing. Despite my limited skills as a programmer, *akatheme* and *Speak4yourself* run smoothly. However, the *Speak4yourself* ebook requires much time to download, and should be rectified in future revisions with the assistance of a professional programmer, and hence in a more modern web format and computer language.

The predominance of electronic technology and online interactive spaces give *Speak4yourself* the ability to integrate well with currently popular modes, thus facilitating interpersonal interaction. A majority of students in South Korea now have *iPhones*, other smart phones, electronic tablets such as *Apple iPad* and *Motorola Xoom*, as well as notebooks, and Internet access in South Korea is free for everyone in selected areas. Despite that interaction largely occurs through the medium of the Internet, which reduces face-to-face interaction, *Speak4yourself* encourages students to also interact face-to-face. Subsequently, the students should post their accomplishments on the *akatheme* website forum, hence facilitating online interaction with other students, to complement face-to-face interaction.

5.3.3 *Speak4yourself* module intentions

Speak4yourself comprises four modules, *Families*, *Music*, *Work*, and *Social Identities*, through which students can connect their own lifeworlds to those of people in other social and geographical regions, encouraging students to think comparatively and critically (Anderson & Krathwohl 2001). The four *Speak4yourself* modules explore social contexts relevant to South Korean students, providing concepts and vocabulary which students contextualise through accompanying tasks, and in ways relevant to themselves and their lifeworlds.

Various factors have motivated my choice of these themes. The themes all encourage the students to conduct comparative studies of themselves with those in other regions. The themes all link to the lifeworlds of the students and hence the students can easily contextualise the concepts (Sections

3.2–3.4). Basic language forms for these themes are present in the course materials available in South Korea, though at basic language levels, and hence the students will have had an introduction to basic concepts within these themes, though these have been presented in other materials in such a way as to have insignificant relevance to South Korean students (Section 6.3). These themes all encompass issues related to identity, and more so, contain a range of dimensions related to identity, which relate to South Korean tertiary-level students studying English, a central tenet of the *Speak4yourself* learning materials.

The *Speak4yourself* modules thus aim to present the students with concepts and narratives socially significant to both the students and to other contexts. The modules also aim to provide students with media and accompanying tasks to contextualise and consolidate their knowledge of these concepts and themes, and with an opportunity to integrate their own personal and social environments with those of others (Section 3.3). Consequently, students develop their English language competence by focusing on the social aspect of communication, consistent with the transition model (Section 4.2.2), during learning.

I have arranged and programmed content into the website for only the first of the four modules, *Families*, but outline the other three modules below, the central 'identity' theme of which frames all themes.

The modules rely heavily on the film textual mode, which provides students with a range of benefits. Students observe and become familiar with situations and interactions of people to which they would otherwise not have access in their immediate environments, and situations and environments from various social arenas. Students exercise their ability to take a critical stance, as they learn to foresee, agree or disagree with, plot outcomes, and hence strengthen problem solving skills. Films engage the students in many ways that print text does not, while enabling students to imagine new social environments. Through film, students are simultaneously immersed in image, video and audio multimedia, hence strengthening impressions of the module themes. Finally, the film

medium has a rich variety of visual and auditory content, and therefore appeals to diverse student learning requirements.

Through Module 1, *Families*, students observe their own and other families in their immediate environments, as well as families in other social and geographical regions. The module encourages students to search for patterns, similarities and differences, which they subsequently attempt to describe, and to compare these three groups, constituting transition. The module uses the four films, *Family guy – To live and die in Dixie* (2001), *My so called life - Father figures* (1994), *From Korea with love* (2002), although my own translation of the title from its Korean title indicates the title is *From amorous Korea*, and *Bloody footy* (2006). These films aim to engage students and to contextualise the concepts and terms. The module provides students with opportunities to observe themselves in their family environments, and to observe how these environments and enculturations facilitate or restrict their interactions while developing competence in English, consistent with the transition model.

Module 2, *Music*, uses the four films, *High fidelity* (2000), *Disco – Spinning the story* (2005), *Paris is burning* (1990), and *Radio star* (2006). As with Module 1, this module introduces each film with tasks and opportunities for the students to contextualise concepts and terms, and before moving on to each next film. The module investigates identity through music genres, and encourages students to observe how respective groups of people claim identity through musical styles, and how musical styles influence the formation of individual and group identities. Furthermore, the module discusses how various groups appropriate and reappropriate music to their own cultural identities, hence inspiring the development of new styles and trends.

Module 3, *Work*, explores professional environments in different societies. The module uses the films, *In good company* (2004), *Working girls* (2010), *Gung ho* (1986), and *Office space* (1999), to investigate how enculturation affects progress in professional realms, and how identity affects work during cross-cultural interaction. Students observe how people in different work environments enact identities that reflect their enculturations. Students also study harmony and disharmony in the

workplace, where failure to negotiate identities in cross-cultural contexts can result from factors such as inability to understand intercultural communication (Section 3.2).

Module 4, *Social Identities*, is the longest module of the four, as it includes a wide range of themes across a broad spectrum of areas related to social identity (Section 3.4). The module introduces the films, *Do the right thing* (1989), *The Warriors* (1979), *The Twilight Zone-The monsters are due on Maple Street* (1959), *Crash* (2004), *Bendit like Beckham* (2002), and *My big fat Greek wedding* (2002). Students observe an extensive range of themes such as prejudice, stereotypes, eastern and western identities, racial and national identity, ethnicity and culture, and ingroup and outgroup theory. Students working through this module observe how various groups of people claim identity through social enculturation, while learning to recognise their own social identities. Students thus develop an understanding of the importance of negotiating identity while shifting among, and interacting with people from, other regions and communities, which becomes highly pertinent to developing competence in another language (Section 3.2). Finally, the module attempts to expose the diversity within social and cultural regions, through which students better realise the danger of generalizing about groups of people.

5.3.4 Description of tasks in *Speak4yourself*

The *Speak4yourself* modules build on the transition model (Section 4.2.2) to organise task sequences, and hence sequentially organise learning for students in several ways. Through the tasks, students interact in increasingly expanding groups, to gradually move from Korean traditional learning methods to interactive methods, and to connect content to student lifeworlds. Students subsequently learn to negotiate social identities and learning styles.

The *Families* module comprises eight sections, as do subsequent modules; *Module aims*, *Introducing concepts and terms*, *Connecting families and cultures*, *Building on concepts*, *Back to basics*, *Extended project*, *Self test*, and *Documentary project*.

The *Module aims and hints* section announces the aims of the module, providing students and teachers with a preview of the module intended framework, also complementing the *Teacher's manual*. It strengthens curriculum intentions of the course materials by providing framing questions around families, around which students build knowledge. It also provides students with advice indicating how to best use the module to optimise learning.

The *Introducing concepts and terms* section has several functions. It provides brief theory and discussion of the *Families* theme. It then introduces the concepts that students will use, contextualise and discuss throughout the module, acting as a word list. It provides alternative forms of the introduced terms and concepts, and examples of sentences integrating the vocabulary, and hence adhering to the reception and practice intentions of the transition model (Section 3.6; Section 4.2.2), and therefore the *Speak4yourself* conceptual framework.

The *Connecting families and culture* section introduces the four films, *Family guy – To live and die in Dixie*, *My so called life - Father figures*, *From Korea with love*, and *Bloody footy*. These films house the module terms and concepts, and hence expose the language learners to the new vocabulary. The films contribute to the reception and practice aspects of the conceptual framework, exposing students to vocabulary and additional language. After viewing each film, students respond to associated tasks, individually, through pair work and then in larger groups, contextualizing these concepts in ways increasingly relevant to themselves (Sections 3.3–3.4), and hence complying with the transition model. The module provides a hyperlink to each of these films, where students click once, and the film downloads or appears through their media player.

Following the first film, *Family guy – To live and die in Dixie*, which presents an animated and comical interpretation of a dysfunctional American family, students individually respond to questions which check their familiarity with the film plot. The questions firstly relate directly to the film, and then relate to the students, constituting transition (Sections 3.5 & 3.8). Following this, the online pair-work questions, separating Student A and Student B to limit viewing the partner's

questions, require the students to question each other in reference firstly to the film, and then in relation to personal environments, again personally contextualizing the film.

The second film, *My so called life - Father figures*, presents a drama which focuses on an American family, in which children contend with their deference toward their parents, and struggle to balance their parents' call for respect with their own desire for self-expression. Following the film, students individually respond to questions, which first directly relate to the film plot, and then connect the plot to aspects socially relevant to the students, constituting transition. The pair work questions, separating Students A and B, require the students to make text-to-self connections while surveying their partners, and hence to collaboratively negotiate the responses. In the *Extended discussion through family identities and belonging*, students interview their parents and compare their parents' families with their own, investigating generational changes in family culture in South Korea, while comparing their families with those of others through forums on the *akatheme* website. At this stage, students should begin to see the benefits of social comparisons. Following this, students connect developments in their family environments to Korean political changes, reinforcing their conceptions of aspects of social change. Finally, students in large groups develop a sibling disagreement scenario, and together discuss possible ways to negotiate family tensions.

The third film, *From Korea with love*, documents the adoption of a Korean baby boy by Australian parents. The film investigates issues such as identity loss, as the baby shifts to a new familial and cultural environment, and the legitimacy of moving children between cultures. The film becomes very relevant to the South Korean context, and has attributes that strongly engage students. Unlike the previous two films, where the individual student questions aim to first relate to the film and then contextualise the film plot to the lifeworlds of the students, the relevance of *From Korea with love* to South Korean student worlds integrates these two intentions. The individual student questions thus pinpoint issues relevant to Shin Jeong Soo, the main character of the film, and in doing so also address issues relevant to the Korean language learners studying the course. Following this, students individually describe themselves in a letter to their 'unknown child', as does Justine in the film to her future unknown child. The students post this to the forum, anticipating responses by other

students, while also responding to postings of other students, and develop their familiarity with the new letter-writing genre. In the subsequent pair work task (Section 3.8), students question each other with regards to the appropriateness of the events in the film, and how they as South Koreans ethically judge these actions. Through collaborating with other students in pairs, and later in larger groups, students scaffold each other and thus receive various perspectives by other students, encouraging negotiation. Each student can suggest a perspective on a film to motivate discussion by interacting in pairs or groups (Section 3.5). Following this, students interview each other to determine the competence of their partner as an adopting parent, as does the social worker Penny Haskins in the film. In the group work section, students form groups of three or four people, either online or in class, to first discuss the significance and legitimacy of adoption of South Korean children by western couples. Subsequently, they visit any one of the many orphanages in Seoul to interview a representative, eliciting feelings and perceptions of people involved in the process of adoption, and finally present their findings to the class.

The final of the four films, *Bloody footy*, is a short comedy film about Italian migrants to Australia and their Australian born children, living in Brisbane in the early 1970s. The father Victor urges the son Mario to play soccer, whereas the son desires to play Australian rules football, hence intercultural and generation tensions emerge within the family. The family members all ultimately compromise their identities to maintain familial cohesion. The individual student questions in Section A all firstly relate to the film, whereas in Section B, students connect Australian terms they hear in the film to those they would use in South Korea. Complying with the transition model framework (Section 4.2.2), the next section moves directly to group work (Section 3.8), omitting pair work, as the students should be prepared to more quickly interact in large groups than in previous sections. In this task, students collaborate to reappropriate names of Korean foods to local Australian contexts, as they use ingredients local to Australia, and hence negotiate the food names. Students also decide and describe why Koreans living in Australia should or should not celebrate traditional Korean holidays. Following this, in groups, the students compare their parents' generation to theirs, and to Victor's attitude to Australian football.

Up to this point, tasks involve lower-order thinking (Section 3.6), as they tend to be closed ended. From this point forward, however, the tasks require increasingly higher-order thinking.

The subsequent *Building on concepts* section affords students many opportunities to use the concepts through contexts relevant to themselves, and hence to discuss the constituents of various identities of families in different global regions, thus drawing comparisons. Through this task, students develop an awareness of differences in enculturation, and how these encompass various family identities, which students decide upon through negotiation (Section 3.2). Performing this task, and the previous 'connecting' tasks, students link the new concepts to environments with which they are already aware, forming relationships with and challenging previously held conceptions. The students thus tie the concepts to already existing notions of their environments (Section 3.3), again constituting transition.

The *Back to basics* section includes a simple individual student task during which students practise the module concepts and terms, by matching synonyms. This reversion to Korean traditional learning becomes effective in that it encourages the students to better see the benefit of maintaining their enculturated learning styles, while providing new perspectives of the concepts and terms, adding to the repetitive learning intentions of the transition model, and cyclic pedagogies.

The next section, *Extended project*, presents three tasks in which students work in groups to extend their familiarity with the concepts through practical application, and through extensive use of the four phases, reception, practice, production and negotiation (Section 4.2.2 Strategy B). The three tasks require the students to write a script for a TV series, to design a questionnaire to survey people in a public place, and to set up a radio station with music and discussion on families. The students will use this radio station in subsequent modules. Throughout these tasks, students use the designated concepts pragmatically.

The *Self test* section presents a task through which students interactively test themselves, as they exercise all the four phases, reception, practice, production, and negotiation, to perform the multiple choice word selection. The design separates the two student question sets, to limit viewing

the partner's section, and to maximise verbal interaction and hence the four above phases, through verbally exchanging information.

In the final stage, the *Documentary project*, students collaborate in large groups to produce a video documentary of approximately seven to ten minutes, which they then present to the whole class for discussion. The documentary making mobilises most if not all the elements arising in earlier sections, synthesising learning, and provides the opportunity to create a new text about family identities. Through this documentary, students should contextualise the concepts in pragmatic and creative ways. The making of a short film stimulates enthusiasm and creative impulses beyond the capacities of traditional learning. This final stage becomes one where students exercise a very high-order thinking, and hence conjoining various skills, concepts and content.

Building on Bloom's work (Bloom 1956; Anderson & Krathwohl 2001), these later tasks require more intellectual processing than the earlier more closed ended ones. They require analysis, such as in Section 3.1.4 (p. 78) – "How do parents contribute to strengthening their children's identities?", evaluation, such as in Section 3.4.4 Section D – "Find motives for Victor stating that "From this I wash my hands"", and synthesis, such as in Extended project 1 – "Write a script for a short TV series on a Korean family". In these tasks, learning involves judgmental skills more complex than the earlier tasks emphasizing reception and practice. Furthermore, these tasks inspire metacognition of language learning as they encourage consideration and redesigning of social contexts.

5.4 The *Teacher's manual*

Richard-Amato (2003) argues that a clearly written and pedagogically useful teacher resource should accompany course books. The *Teacher's manual* describes the course book methodology, addresses the module intentions, provides a resource and guide for teachers, and indicates to teachers how to effectively construct learning sessions to maximise learning. It assists teachers to develop facility with task and group hierarchies during formal ELL, and indicates to teachers how to interact with students to draw out their responses. The manual assists teachers to inspire students to

acknowledge their own localised areas of learning, and more so in ELL, thus empowering the students. The manual also indicates to teachers that *Speak4yourself* alone does not provide scaffolding, but rather, only when the students and the teachers interact does this shared learning occur.

The *Teacher's manual* assists teachers in the effective use of *Speak4yourself*, the structure of which calls for an increasingly intricate understanding of English language learning curriculum, and more so than other currently available materials. This understanding includes the use of social theory and culture, English language learning, as well as group dynamics, and an ability to motivate students through appropriately assigning them agency as participants of formal learning communities. I have not made these factors highly explicit in the task descriptions, and the effective use of these factors depends on the environments of the students, as well as the effectiveness of the teachers. A teacher's manual must articulate issues such as these, which should include teaching suggestions and options, and as Richard-Amato (2003) maintains, pedagogies should coherently tie these issues to language learner materials through teacher resources.

5.4.1 Teacher roles

Teachers using *Speak4yourself* have various roles within the context of the conceptual framework developed in this study. As with *Conversation*, teachers convene the course material aims, and supplement linguistic and contextual intentions by contributing curriculum and pedagogical knowledge, as well as sociocultural and linguistic perspectives, to the learning environment. Teachers participate in the learning environment, negotiating identities, that is, from their knowledge of their students, work to understand the perspective of students through familiarisation with student histories, as well as their sociocultural practices. Teachers organise learning using group dynamics (Section 3.8), motivation and learning methodologies, while manipulating the pedagogies to suit student competence and enculturation (Sections 3.3–3.4). Teachers contribute to the enjoyment of the learning environment, to further engage the students. Teachers also work to dynamically assess student progress (Section 2.6.5), to determine the extent to which students require additional supplementary materials, and hence whether the students should progress to higher levels or return to lower levels. Teachers encourage students to construct sociocultural maps, assisting the students to position

themselves within the language learning context relative to their language learning origins and their aims as students, as well as their relation to the target language culture. This added perspective enables the students to exert a more independent role in their own learning. Teachers encourage students to convey to the learning environment their own enculturations and relevant knowledge on which to build, thus contributing to a participatory pedagogy (Section 3.5).

As *Speak4yourself* is not a paper print text, but an electronic resource, teachers must administer and maintain the learning platform, so to ensure correct use by students. Teachers must ensure that the students have familiarity with the learning tool, to maximise its effectiveness in their learning. Teachers must assist student scaffolding, while both students and teachers interact in posting and replying to posts on the forums. This online interaction becomes significant as it satisfies the social constructivist intentions of the learning materials, as participants exchange feedback and hence build on the work of others in the learning community. This scaffolding inspires students as they interact with the teacher on a more commensurate level, and as they hence build confidence.

Teacher roles also include the teachers' own learning, as teachers should persistently learn about the students, their interests, motivations, and learning styles. Consequently, teachers should develop awareness of students' requirements, such as the feedback that students need, including clarification, verification or support, and whether the students have much contact with those from regions and cultures other than their own. *Speak4yourself* provides tasks in which the teacher must collaborate with the students, such as Tasks 3.3.5 Section A, and Part 6. Teachers therefore must be aware of student environments so as to more effectively assist and interact with the students. Teachers develop expertise with enculturations and language learning strategies the students are currently familiar with, as well as new modes and trends, through constant observation and interaction with the students (Lessard-Clouston 1997). Teachers should, therefore, provide a wide range of learning strategies in order to meet the needs and expectations of their diverse students (Hall 2002). Subsequently, teacher roles include the needs of each student, to learn about student personalities, to become familiar with motivators that increase the learning of each student, to develop a knowledge of student intelligences, and hence to learn how to extend the strengths of the students. Sociocultural theory posits that teachers mediate learning, and hence the discourse with the teacher becomes a

semiotic resource, and the role of instruction becomes central to second language development in the classroom (Donato 2004, p. 45).

Convernation assumes that all teachers want to interact comfortably with their students, that they want to interact with students as equal members of the classroom community, and that all students also want this, which reflects a western trait in education and society. Many tertiary students in South Korea however feel uncomfortable doing this with teachers, as do many teachers, both western and South Korean. The *Convernation* course book and *Teacher's manual* may well benefit by acknowledging this. *Convernation* provides opportunities for teachers to work in complementary but learner-centred ways, which boosts student learning by providing teachers with more opportunities to scaffold, offering their own knowledge and expertise in the English language. Students draw from teacher knowledge, and teachers also attempt to elicit student knowledge. However, the *Convernation* materials do not suggest that teachers enact these roles, which is made explicit in the *Teacher's manual*. Finally, teachers offer their knowledge of the films, as they contextualise the concepts, and as students compare their knowledge with that of teachers.

5.6 Summary

In this chapter I have applied the literature I outlined in the literature reviews in Chapters 2 and 3, and the conceptual framework I developed in Chapter 4, to the *Convernation* course book, and thus its by-product, *Speak4yourself*. I also discussed the roles of teachers while using the course materials. In the following chapter I discuss and evaluate how far *Convernation* and *Speak4yourself* managed to realise my research aims.

Chapter 6

Analysis of *Convernation*, *Speak4yourself*, and other available learning materials

6.1 Introduction

The literature reviewed earlier in this exegesis indicates that by rethinking learning content and methods, South Korean tertiary students can reduce social, affective, cognitive and linguistic barriers to improve English language learning. Such alternative pedagogies can assist adult learners to explore learning pathways to develop their communicative competence in English.

In this chapter, I firstly discuss evaluation criteria for English language learning materials, and evaluate English language learning materials available in South Korea. I then discuss ways in which these available course books inform the design of an effective English language course book, and hence how they contribute to the *Convernation* conceptual framework. Next, I evaluate the extent to which *Convernation* adheres to the conceptual framework I constructed in Section 4.2, and hence describe the extent to which I believe *Convernation* has achieved, or not achieved, the aims for the book. These aims include learner transition between Korean traditional and more interactive pedagogies, and transition between and merging of cultural identities, including those of English speaking countries. These aims also include motivating classroom identity negotiation, shared learning amongst members of the classroom including teachers, formation and expansion of learning communities to increase interactive competence between speakers, sequencing of tasks to adhere to the transition model, and an emphasis on social constructivism during ELL. Finally, I evaluate how *Convernation* can increase its effectiveness as learning material for tertiary level learners of English in South Korea, and consider changes which manifest themselves in the revised digital product, *Speak4yourself*.

Convernation and *Speak4yourself* pedagogies are not new, but reorganise both Korean traditional and western pedagogies in specifically designed and new ways for South Korean students at upper intermediate to advanced competence levels. The success of these pedagogies depends on their capacity to comply with curriculum that build student communicative competence. The materials

attempt to encourage the students to contribute to content, thus employing curriculum as pedagogy in the conceptual framework. Furthermore, the *Convernation* pedagogy is not always clear, despite extensive analysis and planning. The course book remains an experiment in progress, its next iteration emerging as *Speak4yourself*.

6.2 Developing a framework for evaluating English language learning materials

The evaluation criteria I employ stem from three sources. The first source of evaluation criteria stems from models by Bloom (1956; 1965) revised by Anderson and Krathwohl (2001), Richard-Amato (2003, pp. 338–340), Macdonough and Shaw (2003, pp. 62–71), and Lantolf (2004; 2007). These models advocate criteria with which to determine the quality of ELL materials, including: the extent to which materials organise language skills, knowledge and understanding into teachable units; proportion and integration of language skills; authenticity; generalizability and adaptability of tasks and pedagogies to a range of students and contexts; visual effectiveness; cultural bias or specificity; engagement of and sociocultural relevance to students. Importantly, I draw on a social constructivist tradition (Vygotsky 1978; Lantolf & Thorne 2009) to inform the evaluation of the course material conceptual framework. The second source of criteria to evaluate *Convernation* and *Speak4yourself* stems from my own critical perspective, as I attempt to take the perspective of Korean students and teachers. For this I employ seven main categories: objectives of the products, mode, layout, use of language skills, scope and sequence, pedagogical strategies, and curriculum as pedagogy. To frame these dimensions, I draw from the literature review to develop an expanded third set of evaluation criteria. These include: the level and quality of interaction by students using *Convernation* (Section 3.5), the extent to which socioaffective strategies become central to learning (Section 3.2), and the extent to which meaning and identity are negotiated when using *Convernation*.

6.3 Review of currently available English language learning materials

Teachers in South Korean tertiary level ELL contexts have several motives for using the materials they do. Students expect materials through which they can measure academic progress. Course books symbolise status for students, teachers and institutions in South Korean learning culture,

and more so books produced in western English speaking countries (Kim 2002; Yamanaka 2006). If teachers were to use only handouts, their evaluations would plummet, resulting in a penalty, stemming from perceived lack of course preparation, as institutions regard compiled and published materials as inclusive of set courses, particularly when the course books state this. A book compiles tasks, and as teachers lack time and resources, books offer prepared sequenced tasks, and act as walk-in-and-teach materials. A lack of teaching competence and professionalism in teachers necessitates useful course book materials, where teachers without the skills to develop effective teaching resources require materials that provide assistance. Universities in South Korea aim to regulate their courses (Lantolf 2007), whereby all teachers within a certain course are required to teach their students the same syllabus. However, I argue that through materials such as *Converpation* and *Speak4yourself*, teachers can regulate and design prescriptivist courses, as they are required to do so by the universities, while also concurrently expanding the syllabus during the course, and hence building on the syllabus within the span of the semester, and in collaboration with the students, constituting a participatory pedagogy.

I now identify and analyse the theoretical standpoints of other available course books used in language schools for South Korean tertiary language learners, to contribute to the effectiveness of the conceptual framework of *Conversation* and *Speak4yourself*.

Language textbooks, like all texts, have political or cultural bias, carrying views and values that emphasise certain aspects and omit others (Luke, Freebody & Land 2000). Litz (2005) suggests that, through this bias, ELL materials may limit learning and alienate certain groups, stereotyping and encouraging students to form prejudices toward foreigners, and develop resistance to learning. In South Korea, ELL materials rarely, if ever, focus on South Korean cultural content and pedagogical style, and focus almost wholly on western contexts and pedagogies. This focus on one western 'centre' financially suits publishers, creating materials that suit culturally heterogeneous groups in the west, not homogenous groups in the east (Dash 2003), hence reducing the need to contextually tailor materials to specific South Korean language learner enculturations. However, "ESL/EFL classes are found in such a wide variety of educational establishments that textbook publishers have a hard time tailoring material for the many contexts" (Brown 2001, p. 120). To compound this ignoring of local

contexts, western educators use books generically without familiarizing themselves with learner cultures and specific learning styles (Swan & Smith 2008). Kim (2002) found that of 62 course books used in South Korean tertiary ELL contexts, only four remotely related ELL to South Korea. Pak (1999) similarly found that popular tertiary level course books in South Korea contain material and pedagogy pertaining wholly to western culture. Teachers participating in Pak's study all agreed that cultural topics which motivate student performance should compare South Korean culture to those of English speaking societies, encouraging students to articulate the significance of South Korean culture to their learning, as well as context specific and situated pedagogies, in tertiary level ELL.

Yamanaka (2006), finding that available materials are biased toward western English speaking cultures, calls for development of interculturally appropriate materials. Similarly, Cornwell, Simon-Maeda and Churchill (2007) suggest supporting a multiplicity of global and local languages, cultural interconnectedness and roles of English in a global community, promoting learner cultural relevance, and not prioritizing western contexts (see Section 3.3). Litz (2005) calls for language learners to critically discuss these western ambassadorial cultural products, as a useful, cultural debate, allowing students to position themselves socioculturally, necessary for negotiating cultural identities (see Section 3.2). Therefore, issues such as learner autonomy become pertinent. Learner autonomy contributes to the ethnocentric appeal of course books, as the concept of learner autonomy is a culturally embedded western construct (Schmenk 2005; Section 3.2), but which many available ELL materials advocate (see below).

To compound the above, according to Litz (2005), currently available course books do not enhance cultural learning. These course books tend to idealise and oversimplify life in the west, misleading students' expectations when interacting with English speakers from western countries. Publishers also market the course books with artificial claims, such as that the course books alone fully develop communicative competence, and offer complete learning of the language. Yet, I argue that these course books contain theoretical problems, design flaws, and practical shortcomings, presenting disjointed material either too limited or generalised in a superficial and flashy manner. Litz (2005) maintains that most, now defunct, materials produced in the past ten years testify to this.

97

Similarly, Brown (2001) and Yoon (2004) note that poorly-designed English language texts fail to guide communicative ELL in South Korea, as part of a larger group of ineffective ELL teaching pedagogies and materials worldwide (Dash 2003). Consequently, most current course books do not provide appropriate tasks, and most materials that support 'communicative language learning' simply extend grammar translation (Wesche & Skehan 2002). Yu (1999) notes that this happens specifically in South Korea, indicating that the 7th Korean National Curriculum, though claiming to emphasise communicative competence, does not realise its intentions through these standard course books. However, foreign course books significantly differ from South Korean-produced dialogue course books, creating a huge gap for language learners who cannot deal with the leap from Korean traditional methods (Section 2.6.1) to non-traditional methods (Sections 2.6.3–2.6.6) without a bridging pedagogy.

I therefore question the effectiveness of materials available in South Korea, particularly the extent to which they promote effective ELL in tertiary learning contexts in South Korea, and then ask which materials and pedagogies could increase the quality of ELL.

Below I provide an overview of seven course book series, indicative of a larger range of approximately 50 texts popular in South Korean universities and English language institutes. Almost all of these available course books, aimed at interaction, have native English speaking authors, and very few of these course books are authored in collaboration with South Korean authors.

The *Side by side* course book series (Molinsky & Bliss 2000) caters to beginner to intermediate competence levels. It focuses on language form and encourages form-based, to a much greater extent than meaning-based, learning. The course books emphasise language drilling, where students repeat language phrases through various tasks, which becomes effective for language retention at lower competence levels (Section 3.6). The series advocates reception and practice (Section 3.6) more than production or negotiation (Section 3.2). The course books do not significantly draw from sociocultural theory (Section 3.4) except that they encourage participants to interact through drills, and do not include cultural concepts as content. Furthermore, the course books appear

to emphasise individual work at the expense of pair or larger group work. Repetition hence becomes a major aspect of the course book format, emphasizing lower-order thinking (Bloom 1956; Section 3.6).

The *New interchange* course books and accompanying work books (Richards 2003) cater to students from beginner to high-intermediate language competence levels, and emphasise form-focused learning. The methodologies employ reception, practice, and production, but in short bursts, and with short task sequences. The tasks hence do not appear to provide language learners with adequate practice to facilitate long-term retention. The content quickly diverts from its main themes, limiting reiteration, focusing solely on lower order thinking. The course books may instigate discussion, however, by providing various themes, and by offering subconstituents for each main chapter theme, including fragments of social comparison. The authors do not appear to call upon a range of different group dynamics, but rather randomise alternation between individual and pair work.

The four-level *Headway* series (Soars & Soars 2001) caters to beginner to high-intermediate competence students, and includes work books and audio CDs, which increase its usefulness. The format emphasises reception and practice phases, but not production and negotiation, and focuses on language form, but largely ignores non-western cultural contexts. The structure repeats with each chapter, and does not greatly vary content, skill work, or task type, while focusing on lower-order thinking. The series does not prioritise group or task dynamics, and at times introduces social aspects, but in western settings. Interactivity stops at simple closed-ended question and response.

The *Touchstone* series (McCarthy, McCarten & Sandiford 2006) comprises four levels, from basic to high-intermediate, including student books, audio, and video, which expose students to a variety of textual modes, while offering opportunity for extensive reception and repetition. The end section of each of the course books contains discussion tasks, emphasizing 'free talking', yet the design segregates these from main tasks, impressing upon students that they are an ideas index. The course books claim to employ integrated skills, but do not significantly encourage productive skills. They omit Northeast Asian contexts, and also omit social content and comparison. Learner interaction

would strengthen if students also had exposure to multimedia to negotiate solutions to problems. However, the course books substantially attempt to integrate the various areas of content.

The *Northstar* (various authors and published dates) content is substantially Anglo/US centric, but the course books infrequently reference Asia, and hence encourage a comparison of societies. By repeating language elements through various tasks throughout each chapter, the books consider Northeast Asian traditional learning methodologies (Section 2.6.1). The course books though do not consider modern topics of interest to a Northeast Asian tertiary student, such as travel, social and cultural comparisons, and personal freedom. *Northstar* though appears well constructed and contains themes such as 'psychological states' and 'pop art'. The course books attempt to integrate reception, practice, production, and negotiation, while also connecting the various skills. Furthermore, the course books adhere to lower-order thinking, without encouraging much higher-order thinking, thus limiting negotiation of language and content base, though competent teachers could inspire the use of multiple skills and critical thinking. Task and group dynamics (Section 3.8) seem organised, and the course books at times reflect aspects of social theory (Section 3.3). Finally, the course books include DVD and audio, though downloading is problematic.

Other course books, including *Icon (*Freeman, Graves & Lee 2005) and *Smart choice* (Wilson 2007) appear to offer elements deemed necessary in the literature to effectively develop competence in South Korean tertiary-level English students. However, these materials largely ignore South Korean enculturations, and include selected versions of western culture such as university life in the west, western food, western media, western music, and western fashion. They do not integrate Korean traditional and western pedagogies, nor do they integrate skills effectively. They generally consider lower competence speakers of English through 'survival' language skills, and with closed-ended questions such as "How do I get to the bank?", and "Where is the toilet?", which do not encourage students to negotiate. Though beginner competence requires closed-ended questions, tasks in these materials utilise basic instruction questions appearing repeatedly in middle and high-school materials, and which students should be working beyond at the tertiary stage. Furthermore, these tasks do not encourage a participatory pedagogy, or any shared learning, as well as local social and cultural

content. Yet universities and language institutes for adult students at beginner to advanced language competence levels continue to use these materials.

In South Korea, teachers of English aim to limit the complexity of ELL classes, so to score highly on their evaluations by students. Teachers reinforce formulaic pedagogies, where students score well in exams, which are easily gradable through multiple choice, and for which students learn by repeating syntactic structures. The lack of relevant local content in ELL also becomes obvious, limiting students' interactions with engaging or relevant content, which may otherwise encourage identity negotiation and promote social integration, and which may also otherwise assist students to greatly develop communicative competence (Lantolf & Thorne 2009).

6.4 Review of *Convernation* and *Speak4yourself*

6.4.1 Objectives of products

In *Convernation*, students negotiate and critically discuss a primary set of social concepts, gradually incorporating pertinent concepts and language in relation to their personal environments (Section 3.3). Social themes such as individualism and collectivism, prejudice and stereotyping, hierarchy, families, work, and music, all ground the *Convernation* modules and tasks, requiring collaborative discussion. Through travel, advertising, and interaction with other global regions, South Korean students experience these themes. Learning materials must thus incorporate global issues, where students renegotiate social and educational identities for global integration. South Koreans tend to resist this negotiation for the sake of maintaining national identity, but ironically desire to negotiate new social identities to integrate into global society (Section 2.2), where new pedagogies push and pull the students. Therefore, to assist this negotiation, *Convernation* and *Speak4yourself* attempt to balance traditional Korean, western, and global cultural aspects to engage students (Section 3.4). Subsequently, *Convernation* and more so *Speak4yourself* emphasise cross-cultural and comparative study of various contexts, cultures, and societies, such as Korean, American, Australian, Korean-Australian, and European-American. However, *Speak4yourself* provides a more integrated approach to assist students to investigate and compare societies, cultures and subcultures through multimedia

(Section 3.3), as students negotiate social identities, into which they integrate their socioculturally developing communicative competence in the English language. Subsequently, students experience various modes and genres of the English language, broadening language focus, emphasizing cultural diversity. *Speak4yourself* reinforces the importance of student local contexts and local pedagogies to learning (Section 4.2.5).

However, *Conversation* assumes that the themes it presents interest all language students, which may not be the case. I have based the themes on my twelve year experience in South Korea, and extensive travels elsewhere. The tasks resonate with the experiences of these students, such as the emotions and prejudices they experience, and the popular culture through which they shape their cultural identities. *Speak4yourself* provides a greater range of tasks than *Conversation* through which to investigate these themes, and from a greater range of perspectives, providing students a greater selection.

Conversation and more so *Speak4yourself* represent groups positively, encouraging students to critically explore prejudice, and to balance social views (Macdonough & Shaw 2003). Richard-Amato (2003) argues that materials must present all groups positively and realistically, with their values respected, enhancing self-concepts and boosting confidence. Furthermore, materials should position all groups as agents of social change, and as equally capable of negotiating identities in a global environment and community. Both *Conversation* and *Speak4yourself* aim not to essentialise any content. Where *Conversation* discusses conventional views of people, such as societal type, it provides the students with questions to interrogate these essentialist views. For example, Task 2.1 (p. 30) suggests that people in the west and east tend to have distinct enculturations, but subsequent tasks encourage students to contest whether the terms 'collectivism' and 'individualism' pertain specifically to either of these groups, questioning this traditional stereotype.

The concepts in *Conversation* may appear arcane and complex for non English-speaking students and these have been simplified in *Speak4yourself*. *Speak4yourself* encourages students to be more active and to negotiate basic perspectives in relation to concepts, themes, and their connections to students, while extending vocabulary in relation to the central ideas. To introduce concepts and

themes, *Conversation* requires the inclusion of some reading at the start of each module, which *Speak4yourself* addresses through the aural description at the start of the Families module. Similarly, *Conversation* contains theory which could be better integrated into tasks to further engage learners, and to illustrate the use of concepts. *Speak4yourself* addresses this revision, such as in Task 3.3.5 Section C, by integrating theory with the tasks. In Chapter 3 of this exegesis, I noted that the concepts in *Conversation* Module 1 build on work by Triandis (1977; 1995), Kandel, Schwartz and Jessell (2000), Bloom (1965, pp .7–8), and Anderson and Krathwohl (2001), but I do not reference these researchers in this module, thus reducing the integrity of the module and course book, and students may perceive the work as ungrounded. To reduce confusion, *Speak4yourself* omits the *Somalogy* module and retains material that adheres to the central theme of the learning materials, 'identity'.

Conversation would benefit from engaging student curiosity more compellingly at the outset of task sequences, linked to language form or sociocultural aspects of learners. Richard-Amato (2003) suggests that using engagers at the outset of sequences has long-term motivating effects, calling on learner prior knowledge. *Speak4yourself* presents vocabulary, alternative forms of words, and example sentences describing concepts and terms, at the start of the chapters, as well as mobilizing aspects of learner lifeworlds.

Evident in *Conversation* and *Speak4yourself* is a "voice that runs through the book" (Richard-Amato 2003, p. 340). I have sequenced the modules with common elements, such as comparison of societies, and a central identity theme, thus revisiting concepts within and across chapters. Various tasks in *Conversation* have similar constructions, such as the Likert scale surveys and film questions. However, tasks vary within each chapter, as well as across chapters. Richard-Amato (2003) warns against excessive repetition of tasks, but advocates sufficient variety, balancing predictability and change. Although ELL materials must repeat concepts and strategies, across task sequences and modules for effective internalization, more planning would ensure that *Conversation* sustains interest. *Speak4yourself* reduces task repetitiveness, containing shorter but more innovative pragmatic task sequences with greater variety, and relevant to South Korean students, apparent in Module 1. All *Conversation* modules have multiple links to each other, reiterating concepts to develop learner familiarity, facility, knowledge, and competence in the designated topics and concepts, practical for

verbal communication with people from other sociocultural communities. Subsequently, students repeatedly practise the concepts within and across modules, as the concepts have multiple applications in various social domains discussed throughout the course book. *Convernation* Module 1, however, does not discuss identity, which limits the course book intentions to build its pedagogy on sequencing the modules, unlike Modules 2–7, which focus on identity, stereotypes, generalizations and prejudice, affording students opportunities to effectively build on their own knowledge, and therefore, curriculum also becomes pedagogy. Introducing identity in Module 1 would better sequence the modules and reinforce the *Convernation* pedagogical intentions, and may benefit students identifying with issues and themes emotionally or intellectually. Also, the lack of reference to Module 1 concepts in subsequent modules weakens the module-sequence intentions of *Convernation. Speak4yourself* omits this module to focus on identity.

Task sequences in *Convernation* would benefit by more frequent reversion to explicit grammar instruction, which would encourage students to refocus on language form (Section 3.6), better understanding language elements they contextualise, and promoting language retention (Section 3.6). Similarly, more frequent reversion to traditional Korean learning styles would emphasise communicative competence, as students would complete non-communicative tasks and would, in retrospect, realise their benefits for or limits to increasing language competence. Furthermore, reversion to earlier task concepts, or inclusion of structural elements from previous tasks, should increase comfort and consolidation, balancing predictability and surprise. *Speak4yourself* offers this reversion in Part 5, *Back to basics*, and Part 7, *Pair work test*, and Section C of Task 3.3.3 offers a spot grammar exercise.

Developing tasks with more interactive problem solving to increase language negotiation can strengthen all phases of reception, practice, production and negotiation. *Speak4yourself* improves on this in the *Families* module, with numerous open-ended, interactive, and problem solving extended project tasks where students must collaborate to complete tasks, such as the radio station, and film plot. However, increasingly integrating reading, listening, writing and speaking language strands should extend the practice phases of the tasks, where students focus on use, and repetitively absorb the concepts before the production and negotiation phases, in which they further consolidate language.

To encourage responses and literal comprehension, *Convernation* contains multiple closed-ended tasks, such as Tasks 1.2–1.11 (pp. 13–16), although students are not required to respond to all prompts. Similarly, to expose students to new genres, and to assist comprehension of new material, *Convernation* asks students to consider multiple examples, while connecting the concepts to their personal experiences. Consequently, some of the tasks and dimensions may provide limited ways of thinking, and may appear tedious, and superfluous, but I have designed them as such to suit a range of learners. These 'superfluous' tasks present a way of inculcating or contextualizing language elements, depending on the needs of each student, and to which each student can revert to strengthen language elements and concepts, while promoting negotiation. Subsequently *Convernation* addresses point-of-need learning. However, to reduce the perception of repetitive and superfluous work, I have reduced the task-type repetition in *Speak4yourself*, where a greater variety of task types and projects offers more opportunities to consolidate the concepts and themes.

Throughout *Convernation*, clearer and better organised module descriptors would augment learning, and would provide students with stronger direction. *Speak4yourself* provides clearer module descriptors by articulating the aims at the outset of each module, as well as throughout the modules. Similarly, *Convernation* would benefit by including audio examples and instruction to better engage learners, and to orient readers to the textual features, content and use of the text. Richard-Amato (2003) argues for the prime importance of audio and clear instruction that students can comprehend, which *Speak4yourself* addresses.

Macdonough and Shaw (2003) argue that, as an indication of effective pedagogy, we ask questions such as how course books organise the language into teachable units/lessons. I designed *Convernation* for use over a 15–week university semester with two hours of instruction per week. However, *Convernation* content may be difficult to cover in the classroom without private study. Course effectiveness increases through individual study to more easily cover the *Convernation* work load, and teaching the course over two semesters would also alleviate the extensive workload. *Speak4yourself*, however, while containing fewer modules but a similar number of tasks per module, offers tasks that require more work than in *Convernation*. *Speak4yourself* also adopts more of an individual, informal nature to tasks, which students can individually and collaboratively accomplish

outside of the classroom. Consequently, *Speak4yourself* better paces learning than *Convernation*, as it affords students greater opportunity to learn both independently before the interpersonal negotiation phase, such as in Parts 3.1–3.4, and in collaboration. Each module in *Conversation* introduces and gradually contextualises concepts through tasks related to the students' lifeworlds, and then to media and comparative cultural studies. *Convernation* and more so *Speak4yourself* provide questions and examples after concept introductions, which should pace student learning, as they provide students with the opportunity to initially engage in the reception phase of the transition model, prior to practice, production, and negotiation. Subsequently, students gradually and repeatedly internalise and develop competence in the concepts and language elements, then moving to production and negotiation, satisfying the RPPN strategy of the transition model.

In *Speak4yourself*, students have greater agency to select or omit methods and tasks to complete at any relevant time, and to interact with other students when prepared, as they fine tune methods to access personal learning pathways, and better contribute to developing an ELL curriculum. To facilitate this, teachers become organisers, guides, and interpellators of learning methods, in addition to explicating linguistic and sociocultural concepts (Section 4.2.6). *Speak4yourself* hence becomes powerful in that, as an online interactive space, it effectively deals with just-in-time learning, offering renewed and renewable information and potential for discussion with students in other regions, unlike the static print *Conversation*, which as a limited resource, limits learning.

Strategies in *Conversation* do not consistently cater to individual students, but frequently take a one-size-fits-all stance. *Speak4yourself* provides students with opportunities to personalise learning through a constructivist approach, and as students conduct projects investigating their lifeworlds and comparing them to those of others, they increasingly negotiate contributing greater amounts of personal content.

In *Conversation*, a final project and accompanying reflection would invite collaboration and problem solving, where students apply concepts, and which may increase course book effectiveness. Students could collaborate to produce a video project, a power point, or a multimedia presentation,

which would involve multiliteracies, strengthening reception, practice, production, and negotiation. *Speak4yourself* hence has a video documentary and presentation project at the end of the produced module, for which students in groups investigate a theme of their own choice related to the module.

Speak4Yourself still contains substantial amounts of written text, and may at times appear overwhelming for students, although the materials move from print text to more multimodal text, such as film. However, I argue that South Korean students have developed familiarity with extended amounts of text and need to begin from more comfortable learning positions.

6.4.2 Mode

Many ELL publications have accompanying audio, video, and online activities and forums, as does *Icon* (Freeman, Graves & Lee 2005; Section 6.3). This media should increase the effectiveness and impact of learning materials. *Convernation* exists as hard copy with related films suggested as associated tasks. Students either view the whole film before attempting the tasks, or review the tasks prior to viewing the films, and can hence be aware of the responses they need to search for whilst viewing the film. With the availability of these films on free and legal access websites by the respective media companies, viewing of these films becomes possible for everyone, accessing which becomes essential to successfully using the course book, as it bases many tasks around the films. *Speak4yourself* provides hyperlinks to the films; another benefit of online learning materials and pedagogies. *Speak4yourself* also includes video interviews of 'Larry' and 'Gary', American expats who have lived in Seoul for 30 years.

The interactive internet-based element of *Speak4yourself* enhances learning and learner agency, increasing enjoyability and student agency by providing opportunities for students to select tasks, and to use engaging technologies. Students develop opportunities to produce knowledge in conjunction with *Speak4yourself*, which becomes 'malleable' to students' needs. Incorporating modes discussed above supplements learning and increases learner motivation by engaging students, as they have strong familiarity with these new modes through socialization. South Korea has become a digital country, where computer applications conform to the needs of individuals. The use of the print mode

in individual work can thus impede reception, practice, production, and negotiation, but in conjunction with collaborative work, print materials can increase the use of these phases. However, despite gradually losing popularity, and becoming obsolete and superannuated by multimedia, the affordability of the print mode in the English language classroom, and lack of ICT skill by teachers, has maintained the prevalence of the print mode in South Korean tertiary ELL. Very recently, however, students have largely begun to acquire smart phones and tablets, which allow for continuous online interaction. A mixture of modes, and in line with transition pedagogies that this exegesis advocates, thus presents students with motivating and familiar pathways, and augments the four phases. Other options for learning modes include newspapers, current affairs programs, blogs, and websites, which *Speak4yourself* links to. By including tasks which encourage access to other media, *Speak4yourself supports* current learning approaches in South Korea, and incorporates interactive, multimodal material, which extends to a range of contexts and learning needs. This contributes to point-of-need learning, as the sole use of print mode constrains the needs and interests of all students.

The print medium may constrain learning in that it offers students fewer learning pathways than electronic interactive materials, and restricts negotiation of material and content, though negotiation may become more possible during face-to-face interaction. Print materials do not have the capacity to continuously inform students of current events, whereas online interactive spaces such as the popular *Facebook*, *Twitter* and *Cyworld*, perpetually refresh information and discussion with students in other regions. Furthermore, students cannot reappropriate print material tasks to make them more relevant to their own disposition. Students and educational institutions still prefer the affordable print text mode to digital technology for education, advantaging course books. However, as from 2010, change has come rapidly, with the diminishing cost of smart phones and electronic tablets, as well as a recent *iPad* replica in India for $40 USD. Possibly by 2012, all tertiary-level students will have exchanged their 'antiquated' mobile devices for smart phones, due largely to increasing affordability.

Students experience constant language and sociocultural transition (Section 3.4), and require materials that cater to new needs, rather than static outdated pedagogies and materials. The

Convernation design prepares students to adapt to 'new' learning environments. Subsequently, tasks encourage students to access and use information concerning mainstream issues, and people, increasing learning engagement, such as questions which encourage film analysis, but which in *Speak4yourself* occurs earlier in the sequence to better engage students. Through engaging questions that encourage students to investigate social concepts, *Convernation* focuses on contexts relevant to students continuously exposed to learning, commercial entertainment, and mainstream issues, and experiencing rapid social and technological change. To assist this, *Convernation* could reference the popular South Korean blog system, *Cyworld*, or internationally popular *YouTube*, *Twitter*, and *Facebook*, which *Speak4yourself* does.

Congruent with this is the discussion of Web 2.0 technologies. With the predominance of digital communication in South Korea, Web 2.0 technologies have become a necessary mode for increasing learner autonomy. Through this interactive environment, students have a greater agency and one more commensurate to that of teachers and learning materials, through a convergence of technology toward student centred learning. The Web 2.0 properties of *Speak4yourself* facilitate an integration of technology and curriculum as pedagogy, allowing for a more learner-centred environment, and subsequently, interaction among members of the learning community increases greatly. Whereas *Convernation* presents a source of information and simple closed-ended tasks, *Speak4yoruself* encourages students as an interconnected community to collaboratively, and through shared learning, contribute to the content as curriculum. Web 2.0 offers a learner-centered design where the teacher's role changes from teacher centred to a more commensurate role with the students, as students contribute to their own learning, and hence assert more control. Students now do not create for one or two audiences, as they did with *Convernation*, but for an increasing number of audiences. *Speak4yourself* allows for improved communication through posting additional necessary tasks and course information online, and where absent students can still receive information and interact efficiently with others in the learning community. The Web 2.0 format that *Speak4yourself* presents can create new learning opportunities for students, where the content is characterised by open communication, decentralised authority, and interactivity.

The potential for expansion of *Speak4yourself* becomes easily visible when considering pathways such as blogging, podcasts, wikis, and tagging, as well as social bookmarking and links to social sites. Finally, *Speak4yourself* can be used on a variety of interfaces, such as computers, smartphones and tablets, electronic readers, televisions with online access, as well as gaming devices that access the Internet, and thus allows for transformed pedagogies through information and communication technology.

6.4.3 Layout

I alone designed the *Conversation* layout and prepared *Conversation* for printing. The spatial design appears clear, facilitating the understanding of task procedures, as well as the course book language intentions. I have designed *Conversation* so that the visuals aid learning, and are not simply cosmetic (Macdonough & Shaw 2003). In *Speak4yourself*, however, the electronic online format provides another dimension, as students have access to infinite internet content, and infinite layout types, and hence, the concept of layout takes a different direction. This assumes though that students have competence in using online systems, and computer technology. Koreans have been well socialised in using ICT, which has become a central part of life in many countries.

The tasks in *Conversation* and *Speak4yourself* encourage students to engage in dialogue, requiring them to avoid viewing their partner's information. However, accessibility of the partner's corresponding page information in *Conversation* may tempt students to 'cheat', hence weakening verbal negotiation central to ELL (Section 2.3.4). More effective designs to discourage 'cheating' include placing Student B tasks at the back of the course book, thus encouraging verbal negotiation, or otherwise separating *Conversation* into two: Student A and Student B, but sold together as a package. *Speak4yourself* separates the questions for each student in the pair-work tasks.

Conversation has several typographical errors and inaccuracies in spelling and syntax, which may deter and confuse students, and is a flaw in *Conversation*, as accuracy is central to developing competence in language learners. Though I believe *Speak4yourself* has no errors, error correction, improvements and upgrades become easily rectifiable online.

6.4.4 Use of language skills

According to Dörnyei (2003a), and Macdonough and Shaw (2003), well-balanced language courses provide roughly equal opportunities for meaning focused listening, reading, speaking and writing; language focused learning through attention to linguistic features; and fluency development through employing the four skills at a higher than usual level of performance and interactive engagement. Although *Conversation* encourages this proportionate use, *Speak4yourself* aims to better balance learning opportunities through the above aims, and increases opportunities for reading and film viewing. Furthermore, as Macdonough and Shaw maintain, certain strategies should engage the skills discretely whereas others should integrate the skills. Congruently, *Conversation* and more so *Speak4yourself*, increasingly incorporate spoken interactive tasks to develop student oral competence, while encouraging students to search for literal and implied meaning.

Convernation provides substantial practice with a small range of genres which are predominant in South Korean ELL. These include: data collection, as in Task 1.14 (p. 20); note taking, as in Task 2.4 (p. 39); descriptive writing, as in Task 2.7d (p. 51); and academic discourse, apparent in Task 3.6a (p. 68). *Conversation* offers opportunities for practice and production of this literacy range while exposing students to sociocultural concepts, thus minimizing anxiety as students practise a few genres while developing oral competence in the concepts and linguistic elements. Furthermore, a growing familiarity with the genres in *Conversation* and *Speak4yourself* assists students to collaborate more comfortably. *Conversation* and *Speak4yourself* ask students to use genres with which they are already comfortable to develop knowledge of and fluency in new concepts, before applying these concepts through new genres, and while scaffolding with other students and teachers. *Speak4yourself* gradually increases the number of genres in *Conversation*, to include online chat, formal letter writing, academic literacies, email, film narration, critique of media, and data collection and representation. *Speak4yourself* exposes students to a larger range of dialects, sub cultures and audiences toward whom to orient writing and discussion, through classroom and online interaction, than does *Convernation*.

I now examine *Convervation* task effectiveness to assist students to understand themes. Following the definition of identity in Task 3.9a and examples in Task 3.9b (p. 72), students can contextualise the concepts within their own environments. Task 3.9c (p. 72), "With another person, negotiate examples of identity", requires groups to develop different examples of identities, although the term 'negotiate' may require elaboration, and hence students may require assistance to 'negotiate' identity. *Speak4yourself* addresses this by modelling for students examples of identities familiar to Korean students in Module 1, *Families*.

In *Convervation*, questions that promote discussion, such as Task 3.19 (p. 86), "Collaborate with 2 people and respond to the following in Forum 7:1. Is our behavior natural or learned? How is this culturally related?", are designed to elicit various perspectives. Task 3.19.4 (p. 86), "Consider a character from media, real or fictitious. Is this character based on a stereotype, or not? Why do you think so?" attempts to motivate students to contextualise stereotyping. Task 3.20 (p. 88), "With 3 other people, consider the following. A. What makes Korean people angry?" is open-ended. Responding to this, students bring to the learning environment their experiences and scaffold to build knowledge language and course related concepts (Section 4.2.3). This question though is somewhat reductionist, and hence *Speak4yourself* avoids these reductionist efforts. *Speak4yourself* better focuses on assisting students to describe their experiences and relate them to tasks and concepts in the learning materials.

Macdonough and Shaw (2003) argue for a glossary as necessary to language course books, as it offers a reference and additional exposure to language elements, and hence adhering to the repetitive learning and consolidation intentions of the *Convervation* and *Speak4yourself* conceptual framework. *Convervation* apportions the vocabulary and definitions throughout the modules. *Speak4yourself*, however, includes a vocabulary list in the early stages of modules, providing morphology, and sentences contextualizing the vocabulary. Audio supports these examples, but given more time, I would provide audio of multiple pronunciations such as Indian and South African, in order to expand the ability of students to recognise variations in English, and to better understand the delocalisation of standard forms of English.

6.4.5 Scope and sequence

This section builds on Section 5.2 to suggest revised alternatives for the modules, and how *Speak4yourself* responds to the analysis.

As previously discussed, 'Somalogy', does not have an identity theme as do the other modules, and the concepts in the module may require understandings from different fields, such as psychology. *Speak4yourself* thus omits this module so to provide a more concise and relevant set or materials, allowing for a common voice throughout the materials (Richard-Amato 2003).

Module 2, *...Ism*, encourages South Korean students to contest and problematise the concepts of individualism and collectivism (Section 5.2). However, the module must provide students with a range of possible outcomes of social action, which leads the students to employ higher-order thinking, so that students more clearly envisage or conceptualise the consequences of individualism and collectivism. Through increasing awareness of social mores, students can understand how their responses are patterned, and develop alternative responses, preparing students to accept different pedagogical approaches, constituting increasingly higher-order thinking, where a bridging of learning pedagogies can occur. The relevant *Speak4yourself* module will encourage students to understand some of the theoretical underpinnings of individualism and collectivism, and to contest reductionist perspectives, which will require collaborative negotiation, and hence more than lower order thinking.

Module 3, *ID*, an acronym for identity, encourages students to compare their immediate enculturations with those of other regions. *Speak4yourself* however should provide students with the opportunity to consider reimagined Korean identities, and to rethink their ongoing social positioning, and more so in relation to changing global environments. This repositioning should require the students to negotiate their sociocultural dispositions in multiple and complex ways, drawing from various areas such as history, intercultural communication, and multiple textual modes, which students combine to demonstrate their knowledge of the multiplicity of their identities.

Module 4, *East and West*, could more effectively deal with demographic shifts, which have largely influenced transnationalism. These shifts increasingly blur the boundaries between the east

and west, as well as producing hybrids of the two. Similar to Module 3, this module should also require the students to rethink their ongoing global social positioning, as they continuously enact new identities to adapt to social and cultural requirements. However, the module risks reducing east and west ideology to a binary, and, in response, *Speak4yourself* aims to address diversity within regions.

Through Module 5, *Family structures*, students better understand that they convey familial practices to formal ELL, encouraging the students to select learning practices alternative to those they have been enculturated into. Similarly, the module encourages students to provide more content related to their own enculturations, rather than those of other regions, but while comparing their own enculturations to those of others in other regions. The exposure to these open-ended tasks, which constitute higher-order thinking, should promote a cumulative understanding of concepts more so than the previous four modules, as students now use the concepts in areas highly pragmatic to their societies, and thus attempt to negotiate with other members of their learning community to understand how to negotiate their identities. *Speak4yourself* expands on all of these aspects by providing many open-ended tasks during which students compare their immediate South Korean social and familial environments to those of other regions.

In *Convernation* Module 6, students can observe that professional environments connect their immediate and distant sociocultural practices, alerting the students to different styles of working and learning. Following this observation, students can reconfigure learning from narrower views and hence lower-order thinking, realizing that effective language learning pedagogies and working practice should incorporate a range of methods, from different cultural standpoints (Sullivan 2004). Although the module has not been produced as yet, *Speak4yourself* will further this by providing diverse examples of Korean working environments and comparing them to those in other regions.

In the final module, *Music sociology*, students link previous concepts to their own lifeworlds through music of different eras, societies, and genres, where students learn to appreciate different ways of adopting and producing unique and various musical forms. Although the module has not been produced as yet, *Speak4yourself* will further this by considering examples connected to South Korea, and will ask students to observe how Korean music has challenged its traditional roots to adapt to global influences and marketability. In this way, students will need to interpret Korean music and its

effects by and on society, including its relationship with language socialisation. Furthermore, *Speak4yourself* will ask students to observe how Korean music influences other regions, and how it adapts to global requirements of South Korea, and to promote the 'Korean wave', a term used by Koreans and now other countries to denote the current media efforts globally to promote South Korea, such as music and film. This will require students to draw multiple simultaneous parallels between music, many areas related to student lives, and concepts presented earlier in the course. This drawing of parallels suggests the need for collaborative scaffolding by members of the immediate classroom community, and through interaction with people and sources from outside of the classroom community, increasing the need for higher-order thinking.

To increase pedagogical quality, *Conversation* could encourage students to find multiple ties between their current and growing interests, and hence social environments familiar and relevant to their own lives, and the course concepts, facilitating student learning. In response, *Speak4yourself* increases the amount of investigative work students must conduct to connect their immediate social environment with those of others.

While through the final three modules, *Families*, *Working*, and *Music sociology*, students contextualise the concepts from the first four modules, students would better understand the intentions of *Conversation* if they more frequently linked text to self. Examples of this may include, "How does the film represent your beliefs in society?", "Do you know anyone who resembles this character?", and "Would your family act in similar ways if you migrated to a Western region?". Furthermore, these questions should interconnect to facilitate integration of concepts. With more of these task types, *Conversation* would link more powerfully to students' worlds than it does at present. *Speak4yourself* therefore includes questions that promote text-to-self, text-to-text and text-to-world links.

6.4.6 Pedagogical strategies

Adhering to the transition model (Section 4.2.2), *Conversation* encourages gradual group expansion throughout task sequences, from independent, to small, to large group work, as it generally moves students from South Korean traditional to interactive pedagogies. Subsequently, it increasingly

aims to encourage collaboration and peer scaffolding (Section 3.5). The Module 4 task sequence exemplifies this (pp. 98–133). Through this scaffolding, students access and build on cognitive zones of proximal development, collaborating to consolidate retention of language elements, and to negotiate discursive pathways (Section 3.5). This adds another dimension to the accessibility of *Conversation*, reducing task repetitiveness, as students internalise and use language elements in ways increasingly relevant to their lives. However, *Conversation* does this inconsistently, reducing student agency. Encouraging students to work more with their own cultural and social resources would allow the students to determine the rate and size of their expanding groups, which is difficult through course books, as they have no personal relationship with students. This expansion should become a negotiation between teachers and students, and hence becomes a part of the teacher's role. In *Speak4yourself, task* sequences begin with independent work, move to pair work, and then group work, constituting an expanding group design, and adhering closely to the transition model.

Similarly, *Conversation* task sequences gradually decrease in rigidity, increasing open-endedness, to encourage greater linguistic freedom and sociocultural negotiation. Tasks should increasingly elicit more personalised and negotiated responses from students throughout the sequences, rather than focusing on closed-ended tasks with correct or incorrect answers. This movement provides students with growing agency and autonomy, contributing to the negotiative element of the course book. This supports the transition model intentions, and *Conversation*'s aim to not lock student*s* into prescribed learning pathways. *Speak4yourself* does this to a greater level, and focuses on more open endedness toward the end of the task sequences than does *Conversation*. The projects at the end of the sequences evidence this.

Tasks in *Conversation* indicate that the course book successfully employs the phases reception, practice, production, and negotiation (Section 4.2.2 Strategy B). The reception stage becomes evident in Task 2.2e (p. 32), in which students receive information. The practice stage appears in tasks such as 4.14 (pp. 110–111), where students alter word forms. Production and negotiation phases occur in tasks such as 3.2d (p. 64), where students collaboratively contextualise concepts. *Conversation* facilitates a gradual shift from language form to meaning, which the conceptual framework advocates (Section 4.2.2 Strategy C), as students connect learning concepts and

methods, within and across tasks and task sequences. This strengthens practice, production and negotiation, evident as students internalise vocabulary through repetition, and then apply the vocabulary in varying contexts. The task sequence throughout Module 3 exemplifies transition and expansion. However, not all task sequences throughout the course book adhere closely to this model. Consequently, *Convernation* could provide students with more independent work at early stages of the sequences while groups grow throughout the task sequences. *Speak4yourself* gives students greater reception through film hyperlinks and animated text. Practice and production become more pronounced through online and offline tasks, and negotiation increases with more open-ended tasks and projects, which students must negotiate to complete. *Convernation* requires from students approximately 40% pair work, 10% individual work, and 50% group work. *Speak4yourself* provides students with approximately 25% individual work, 20% pair work, 25% small group work, and 30% larger group work, allowing for a more proportionate set of group dynamics.

Social, and cultural transition largely ground *Convernation* pedagogies, through which students transit between Korean traditional and progressive pedagogies, and shift from independent to collaborative learning styles as they merge and stage pedagogies (see below). However, as I argued in Section 2.6.1, South Korean students would rather minimise personal risk than collaborate when risking compromising their enculturated styles. In ELL, and hence in *Convernation*, unlike collaborative work in other areas which comply with Korean tradition, students must take risks and expose themselves and their language weaknesses (Section 3.2). Students must hence integrate new identities by altering cultural, gender, and hierarchical roles (Chapter 2), receiving feedback from other students, which, collaboration in traditional Korean learning does not. This challenge to traditional roles may also summon self defence mechanisms (Section 3.2). The transition model attempts to resolve this through deliberate and gradual shifts, where students gradually realise the benefits of transition through staged pedagogies, while increasing language competence. The basis of this pedagogy thus becomes a back-and-forth language and identity dialogue. *Speak4yourself* aims to improve the social, cultural, and pedagogical transition intentions, by increasing socially-related content, better balancing and integrating Korean and non-Korean environments. Discussions throughout *Convernation*, such as in the …*ISM*, *ID*, and *Family structures* modules, encourage

students to explicitly challenge traditional hierarchical roles during interaction (Section 3.2). Hierarchical power structures are interrogated during transition from Korean traditional to western pedagogies, where language mediates the relational position of speakers in social spaces.

6.4.7 Curriculum as pedagogy in *Conversation* and *Speak4yourself*

Conversation offers students clear opportunities to learn by receiving, practising, producing and negotiating new knowledge, as it provides students with opportunities to view and discuss films of various cultures, and as the students draw parallels between the films and society, hence recontextualising their knowledge. To frame concepts, *Conversation* offers students simple definitions of concepts such as 3.9a – Identity (p. 72), and 3.13a – Ethnicity (p. 76), which students are encouraged to contextualise and critique. As an example, in Task 2.8b (p. 54), "2.8b – Dine – After watching The Warriors, mark the following as Ind[ividualism] or Col[lectivism]", students apply the module concepts to the films. The 'Dine' tasks, as I describe in Section 5.2.4, suggest discussion through negotiation, and through which, the course book attempts to elicit personal opinion about student enculturation, such as in Task 4.11 (p. 105). However, the term 'Dine' is not been described or clarified to any extent in *Conversation*, and may cause confusion, and thus *Speak4yourself* omits the use of the term. *Conversation* also includes inappropriate task wording, such as in the above Task 3.13a, in which it reduces the concepts to binaries in that it suggests "mark the following as Ind or Col", rather than acknowledging their complex interrelationships. Furthermore, *Speak4yourself* omits terms such as 'racism', as extensive complex discussion is required to resolve or refute outdated conceptions of terms such as this.

Conversation prompts students to contest their culturally-constructed identities, and to grapple with higher-order thinking through questioning and negotiation social structures. In a strongly nationalist environment such as South Korea (Shin 2006; Eckert 2000), students using higher-order thinking and interrogation can benefit by questioning or supporting group and national identity, defending their choices during interaction in the classroom. *Speak4yourself* improves on this, providing opportunities for greater discussion of traditional assumptions through more open-ended and investigative tasks that encourage students to draw from their immediate social and cultural

resources. Furthermore, through the online forum, students can question and interact with wider communities.

In Chapter 3 I argued that appropriately designed pedagogies should reduce anti-western attitudes in South Korean tertiary-level ELL. In *Conversation*, and more so in *Speak4yourself,* I attempt to use curriculum materials as a reflective tool to address this process. The materials encourage South Korean learners of English to interrogate their attitudes toward foreigners, as well as hierarchical structures in learning and social communities, and attitudes which might limit their attitudes to ELL (Sections 3.3–3.4). Addressing prejudices increases intercultural integration and students' willingness and ability to negotiate traditional identities, thus strengthening the development of verbal communicative competence in English. Offering new sociocultural identities necessary for ELL assists students to confront prejudice, as advocated in Sections 3.3–3.4. Furthermore, the concepts in *Conversation* and *Speak4yourself* inspire cultural integration and its applicability to the sociocultural inhibitions students may experience as they journey through ELL. Throughout these materials, the sequenced tasks invite critical thinking, as they increasingly encourage students to search for factual information in order to substantiate, contest, or refute their beliefs and views of society and culture, therefore assisting students to reassess their social and cultural positions. Students hence learn to critically analyse and negotiate sociocultural concepts, aiding development of communicative competence in English. Tasks that assist students to tackle social and cultural concepts include those accompanying the film *Crash* in *Conversation* (Module 3) in *Conversation*. These tasks encourage students to relate prejudice to their own experiences and to draw parallels between those experiences and those of the characters in the film. Through the tasks, students consider how the characters in the film change consequent to their actions toward ingroups and outgroups, and decide whether the characters in the film should act on emotions such as remorse. Students then produce a mini film script, drawing from their views on society. *Conversation* also assists students to question their conceptions of foreign groups, to reduce their prejudice, thus facilitating cultural and pedagogical transition. However, *Conversation* does not explicitly suggest that students declare their prejudices, where doing so would enlighten conceptions of segregation. Prejudice will become a central theme in the *Social Identities* module in *Speak4yourself* when written.

6.4.8 Course book response to South Korean language assessment requirements

The course materials seek to assist South Korean tertiary level students to develop their performance in standardised tests, which have become central to academic and professional domains in South Korea (Sections 2.6.5). Students must score highly on these tests through internalizing extensive vocabulary and grammar, language elements necessary for performance in standardised tests such as the TOEIC and TOEFL, which *Conversation* and *Speak4yourself* reinforce through repetition, contextualization, negotiation, perspective taking, collaboration, and transition between/among pedagogical styles. The *Conversation* and *Speak4yourself* course materials assist assessment of learning progress, whereby recontextualising concepts and language elements in various new ways and in subsequent tasks, students can verify whether they can negotiate appropriate use of concepts and the extent to which they have developed expertise in these objects. Students can do this by verifying that their discourses are comprehensible to other students, both in form and meaning. However, *Conversation* could benefit from self testing tasks, which *Speak4yourself* includes, and which most learning materials presented in Section 6.3 do not include.

6.5 Summary

This chapter has sought to present an analysis of the *Conversation* course materials, and to detail how *Speak4yourself* has addressed a revision of *Conversation*, while also presenting the extent to which *Speak4yourself* succeeds in representing the conceptual framework in Chapter 4. The revision of the course materials is based on criteria from the models, concepts and theories discussed and developed throughout the exegesis, work by Macdonough and Shaw (2003), Richard-Amato (2003), and the review of learning materials in South Korea. The analysis chapter thus attempts to identify ineffective pedagogies in South Korea, and to devise a reconceptualised set of pedagogies and materials that may provide alternative learning pathways for tertiary level students of English in South Korea.

Chapter 7

Reflection and Conclusion

7.1 Revisiting the study

The exegesis has aimed to address the following research question: How might a reconceptualised approach to English language education be designed to motivate learning in South Korean tertiary contexts?

This research question becomes vital to English language learning as it seeks to address one of the most salient economic issues in modern South Korea: that English language learning in South Korea, on a national scale, is less efficient than in any other country, and involves enormous national expenditure. Addressing this question has social, political and economic ramifications in that, despite injecting significant resources into English language learning, South Korean learners appear to lack language learning competence in comparison to learners from other related countries. These countries spend less, yet achieve greater success in language learning, as measured by tests of English communicative competence (IELTS 2008).

Throughout the exegesis, I aimed to negotiate and develop pedagogies that increase the quality of English language learning in South Korea. Subsequently, I aimed to produce course materials that facilitate the learning of English for communicative purposes in a Northeast Asian context. This project has thus produced a conceptual framework which aims to guide South Korean learners of English, realised as the *Conversation* course book, and then revised as the *Speak4yourself* online resource.

In this study, I reviewed relevant literature to explore existing knowledge around the research question. This analysis informed the building of the *Conversation* course book conceptual framework, and the evaluation of the course book according to its pedagogical intentions, informing the design of the online learning resource, *Speak4yourself*.

I have positioned the design of the course book and online resource to sit within a Northeast Asian language learning context, employing South Korean traditional learning methods, and increasingly expanding learner agency. The findings of my evaluation indicated that the *Conversation* course book framework lacks in certain areas in terms of its pedagogical and sociocultural intentions, and indicated areas where productive research can inform an improved design, emerging as the online *Speak4yourself*.

Lim and Griffith (2003) suggest that in South Korea, teachers should combine authority with roles that guide learners to more learner-centered modes, thus more effectively shaping student learning trajectories. Pennycook and Coutand-Marin (2004) claim that issues of agency are embedded in ELL, where educators must minimise psychosocial barriers, empower learners by actualizing cultural interchange and, as Nation (2003) maintains, emphasise the native culture, hence supporting participatory pedagogy. I advocate the reduction of hierarchies within the professional learning environment to facilitate negotiation, and to increase the learning performance of students with other students, as well as with Korean and foreign teachers in those language learning environments. Furthermore, I believe my role includes increasing perceptions of learner-centredness within these environments, empowering students by actualizing cultural interchange, and hence shaping their learning trajectories.

Over the course of my doctoral study, I attended conferences on sociology, linguistics, and cultural studies, during which I contextualised discourses in academic areas such as identity, education, sociology, anthropology, and language learning theory, to strengthen my interpretation of concepts of language development. I thus subjected my prevailing ideas to scrutiny, locating gaps and inconsistencies in my thesis through negotiation with others, drawing from studies by other researchers, clarifying and extending my role as a researcher. Consequently, I have located areas which I would like to further explore, including bilingualism and code switching, issues of critical collectivism and individualism, cultural diversity, sociology and social anthropology, and neurolinguistics, to extend ELL thinking I have developed in this exegesis.

Personally, I have been encouraged to consider language learners in greater depth, hence becoming less teacher-centred in practice, and have learnt to continually place myself in a position of learning facilitator rather than leader. I have learnt to continually question my beliefs, and to realise that my understanding is constantly in transition. I have realised the benefits of learning design in preparing effective content for learners and in establishing an understanding in more relevant and effective ways. Finally, I have learnt to more effectively question and reduce my prejudices.

7.2 Implications of the study

7.2.1 Themes emerging from the study

A proliferation of language learning models has saturated the field of language development over the past century. From the time of significant work of Firth and Wagner (1998), language learning has aimed to bridge the cognitive and the sociocultural. This study has aimed to cover new ground in that it has attempted to combine existing areas of ELL, sociology, and identity work, to promote change in English language learning for a specific geographic and sociocultural domain.

The project has aimed to draw parallels between domains in order to link existing models and make transitions. It has attempted to bridge two separate cultural methods to transit between distinct English language learning styles. Subsequently, and congruent with my sociocultural framework, I argue that to build on current theory, language learning must gradually assign greater agency to learners of English as a secondary discourse, as emerging bilinguals who can negotiate multiple discourses and identities.

Throughout the exegesis, I argue that the field of English as a secondary discourse should move toward employing a 'transition theory', which argues that specifically designed transitions between socioculturally different theories, models or contexts, become conducive to the development of communicative competence in another language. What persisted throughout the study is that transition can facilitate pathways to English language learning in Northeast Asian contexts such as South Korea.

7.2.2 Limitations of the study

This study did not seek to collect empirical evidence but rather relied on literature and evaluation of existing curriculum materials and a preliminary course book product, *Convernation*, in substantiating the language learning product, *Speak4yourself*.

A different study could have surveyed South Korean students and teachers to obtain a more detailed picture of the South Korean ELL environment. I could have also included interviews with English language learners from Japan and China currently in South Korea, as well as English language teachers, as comparative data for course materials. As this PhD is project-based with the product included, I chose to limit empirical data collection in favour of the literature.

7.2.3 Considerations for further research

Consonant with the intentions of the conceptual framework, this exegesis advocates that revised course materials will encourage greater language learner participation in (de)construction of power relations during formal ELL, whereby the learners build resources and strategies they have developed to actively participate in learning communities (Morita 2004). The success of learning becomes contingent on learner stances towards the world and, in particular, a sense of self and a desire to learn (Benson & Voller 1997).

The study located a range of teaching approaches which I have suggested will increase language learner performance in South Korea, and which I argue current materials do not significantly consider. These approaches include course book task restructuring and revision, reconceptualizing and refining pedagogies, and encouraging students and teachers alike to develop their competence in intercultural communication. These factors promote reflective thinking and can facilitate the realization that in learning another language, student and teacher styles differ both culturally and individually, requiring negotiation on both sides to ensure transition between traditional and other styles. This process becomes the central theme of the thesis, as well as of the conceptual framework of the learning materials.

Future editions of the learning materials should include fully evolved chapters, with material that allows for more critical reflection on the course themes. This may take the form of tasks where the learners reflect on the course, both at module and whole course levels. The course materials should increasingly attempt to strengthen communicative competence through curriculum, as well as pedagogical choices. The materials can benefit by better addressing nationalist sentiment within South Korea, and concomitant anti-foreign attitudes, as well as those attitudes by English-speaking foreigners toward Koreans, which impact on effective English language learning. Here educators would make more space for, and better address, learner resistance stemming from these attitudes. Hall (2002) maintains that language learners must identify these learning obstacles, thus increasing collaborative reflection and dialogue. Learner resistances motivate a development of curriculum, as the language learners increasingly negotiate their needs, learning strategies and relevant social and pedagogical issues, and as they develop expertise in the English language. Furthermore, effective pedagogies in English language learning can interrogate existing power structures, weaken resistance to negotiating identities and social integration, and fire debate or dialogue, conducive to the facilitation of communicative competence in English.

A series of *Speak4yourself* resources would strengthen learning intentions. The current *Speak4yourself* addresses tertiary-level intermediate to upper-level language learners. Therefore, materials for beginners and lower intermediate language learners with a larger focus on South Korean traditional learning styles would definitely reinforce the transition model intentions of the conceptual framework, as the upper-level materials focus more on interactive learning.

Further exploitation of digital technologies would ensure alignment of course materials to the worlds of current language learners. More multimedia, the programming of which is a limitation of mine as a web designer, and more interactive content within the web design, would also assist engagement and motivation with dynamic text. Web 2.0 becomes a significant paradigm shift in terms of conferring agency on the learner and moving away from teacher-controlled print-based learning.

More sample stories and instances from Korean and foreign nationals, and hence describing their environments, such as the videos of Larry and Gary, should enrich and engage student learning. In this way, students could compare videos of interviewed people, and respond to tasks connected to these people. Adding to this, students in the courses could produce the videos themselves and post them, positioning learners as writers, as well as readers, of texts.

Macdonough and Shaw (2003) infer that the success or failure of learning materials becomes evident after their deployment in the formal learning environment, with real language learners. Similarly, Ellis (1997) argues for a retrospective evaluation, rather than a predictive one. In light of these arguments, a retrospective evaluation would allow for a more effective method of evaluation of the *Speak4yourself* materials, and which Macdonough and Shaw (2003) contend, links closely with an action research approach that has become pervasive over the past two decades.

Observing the effects of these materials on other Northeast Asian learners, such as the Japanese and Chinese, would provide grounds for an interesting comparison, and would highlight learning perspectives of different cultural contexts. This would ensure that the observation remains within Northeast Asian contexts, allowing for a comparison of the applicability of the materials to even more finely-nuanced variations of traditional pedagogical learning styles.

Relevant future studies could take many directions, including the investigation of learning pathways that course books enable or disable, and the extent to which sociocultural influences shape individual and group learning, emphasizing group dynamics, with an online interactive element, which current CALL (Computer Aided Language Learning) seeks to do.

Empirical data to substantiate my conceptions of language learning pedagogies would add further strength to my current knowledge, and hence build the conceptual framework of the course materials I have produced. In time, I could also extend the collection of empirical data to not only South Korean students, but also to a larger group of students, which would increase its reliability, and make the findings more applicable to a larger Northeast Asian context. This follows from what this

investigation has become effectively, a case study in change, where I have gained a deeper understanding of the network of relationships, and am better able to see the ways they articulate to a rapidly changing world.

I also plan to maintain the website www.akatheme.com for a number of years, after fully developing the resource, and hence, revising and enhancing the resource. I plan to develop the site and learning materials through student feedback to aid in my revisions.

My linguistic and cultural immersion experiences during my twelve years in South Korea have provided me with mediating tools to develop my conceptions of language development. These experiences have assisted me to develop familiarity with South Korea, and I consequently aim to maintain my affiliation with the Northeast region. I believe that through my enculturation as a western researcher with a range of sociocultural influences, and having lived in South Korea for an extended period, I can position myself well to contribute to efforts to bridge sociocultural and sociolinguistic understandings of and by those in Northeast Asia. This positioning better assists me to facilitate an integrated learning. My future research then involves cross-regional research and education.

7.3 Conclusion

This study has attempted to locate salient factors and pathways to improve the quality of English language learning in South Korea, while weaving together traditional and modern pedagogies and sociocultural factors. The study begins to construct a model of English language learning in South Korea, from my perspective as a researcher and westerner with twelve years' experience in the east and with a strong interest in sociolinguistics. I argue that the model I have developed can effect as sociocultural, educational, and specifically language learning transition. At present, gaps exist in language learning, reflecting the ineffectiveness of ELL in South Korea. I would hope that these findings contribute to improved pedagogies and courses for educators, providing a sociocultural basis for describing aspects of inefficient ELL in South Korea, and also Northeast Asia. I would hope that findings from the study shed light on limitations of current learning materials, and the limitations of

their focus on learning styles. It is my hope then that this language learning model contributes to strengthening language learning, both in a Northeast Asian context and elsewhere. I believe that the conceptual model has global implications for English language learning, as through this model, educators may better specify methodologies for language learners with particular ways of thinking.

I have argued throughout the investigation that sociocultural aspects of both the language learners and the target language are central to language learning effectiveness. I have argued that the teacher should emphasise these during language teaching, reinforcing the importance of learner attitudes, thus creating more effective language learning. Language learning factors I have discussed throughout the exegesis frequently compete and I have attempted to organise them in sequenced curriculum design, while aiming to create complementary learning methods that neither negate each other nor impede language learning, but deliberately drive pedagogical progress.

References

Adamson, J. (2005). Teacher development in EFL: What is to be learned beyond methodology in Asian contexts? *The Asian EFL Journal*, May 2005 Conference proceedings, 6. Retrieved on June 1, 2007, from the *Asian EFL website*: http://www.asian-efl-journal.com/May_2005_Conference_Adamson.php.

Ahn, S. H. (2003). A case study of a Korean learner. *The Asian EFL Journal*, 5, 4, December. Retrieved on July 10, 2007, from the *Asian EFL journal website*: http://www.asian-efl-journal.com/dec_03_sub.K1.php.

Anderson, L. W. & Krathwohl, D. R. (Eds.) (2001). *A taxonomy for learning, teaching, and assessing: A revision of Bloom's taxonomy of educational objectives*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon (Pearson Education Group).

Anton, M. (1999). The discourse of a learner-centered classroom: Sociocultural perspectives on teacher-learner interaction in the second language classroom. *The Modern Language Journal*, 83, 303–318.

Atkinson, D., Churchill, E., Nishino T. & Okada, H. (2007). Alignment and interaction in a sociocognitive approach to second language acquisition. *The Modern Language Journal*, 91, 2, 169–188.

Ausubel, D. (1963). *The psychology of meaningful verbal learning*. New York: Grune & Stratton.

Ausubel, D. (1978). In defense of advance organizers: A reply to the critics. *Review of Educational Research*, 48, 251–257.

Bang, Y. M. (1999). EFL learners' risk-taking behavior. *English Teaching*, 54, 4, 49–70.

Banks, J. A., Cookson, P., Gay, G., Hawley, W. D., Irvine, J. J. & Nieto, S. (2001). Diversity within unity: Essential principles for teaching and learning in a multicultural society. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 83, 3, 196–202.

Barcroft, J. (2007). Effects of opportunities for word retrieval during second language vocabulary learning. *Language Learning,* 57, 1, 35–56.

Bardovi-Harlig, K. & Mahan-Taylor, R. (2003). *Teaching pragmatics.* Washington, DC: United States Department of State.

Barron, A. (2003). (Ed.) *Acquisition in interlanguage pragmatics*. Philadelphia. John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Barron, P. & Arcodia, C. (2002). Linking learning style preferences and ethnicity: International students studying hospitality and tourism management in Australia. *Journal of Hospitality, Leisure, Sport and Tourism Education*, October, 1, 2.

Bax, S. (2003). The end of CLT: A context approach to language teaching. *English Language Teaching Journal*, 57, 3, 278–287.

Belchamber, R. (2007). The advantages of communicative language teaching. Retrieved on August 2, 2007 from the *Internet TESL Journal* website: http://iteslj.org/Articles/Belchamber-CLT.html.

Benson, P. & Voller, P. (1997). *Autonomy and independence in language learning*. London: Longman.

Bevan, T. & Simmons, R (Producers), Frears, S. (Director). (2000). *High fidelity* [Romance comedy]. United States: Touchstone Pictures.

Bhatt, R. M. (2005). Expert discourses, local practices, and hybridity: The case of Indian Englishes. In S. A. Canagarajah (Ed.), *Reclaiming the local in language policy and practice* (pp. 25–54). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Bialystok, E. (1978). A theoretical model of second language learning. *Language Learning*, 28, 1, 69–83.

Block, D. (2007). The rise of identity in SLA research. *Modern Language Journal*, 91, 5, 863–876.

Bloom, B. S. (1956). T*axonomy of educational objectives: The classification of educational goals.* Handbook 1: The cognitive domain*.* New York: David McKay Company, Inc.

Bloom, B. S. (1965).T*axonomy of educational objectives: The classification of educational goals.* Handbook 2: The affective domain*.* London: Longman.

Blum, D. (Producer), Howard, R. (Director). (1986). *Gung ho* [Comedy drama]. The United States of America: Paramount Pictures.

Bohn, T. (2004). Japanese classroom behavior: A micro-analysis of self-reports versus classroom observations - with implications for language teachers. *Applied Language Learning*, 14, 1, 1–35.

Bond, M. H. & Hwang. K. K. (1986). The social psychology of the Chinese people. In M. H. Bond (Ed.): *The psychology of the Chinese people* (pp.213–266)*.* Hong Kong: Oxford University Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1984). *Distinction: a social critique of the judgment of taste.* Trans, Richard Nice. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1991). *Language and symbolic power,* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bouzereau, L. Davies, F. A., Gordon, L., Hill, W. (producers), Hill, W. (Director). (1979). *The Warriors* [drama]. The United States of America: Paramount Pictures.

Bowker, J. (Ed). (2000). *The concise Oxford dictionary of world religions*. Retrieved on October 11, 2007, from the *Oxford reference online* website: http://www.oxfordreference.com.

Breen, M. P. & Candlin, C. N. (2001). *The essentials of a communicative curriculum in language teaching*. In D. R. Hall & A. Hewings (Eds.) (2001). *Innovation in English language teaching: A reader* (pp. 9–26). London & New York: Routledge.

Brinton, D., Snow, M. & Wesche, M. (1989). *Content-based second language instruction*. New York. Newbury House.

Brouwer, C. E. & Wagner, J. (2004). Developmental issues in second language conversation. *Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *1*, 29–47.

Brown, D. H. (2001). *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy* (2nd Ed.). White Plains, NY: Addison Wesley Longman.

Brown, D. H. (2007). *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy* (3rd Ed.). White Plains, NY: Pearson Education.

Bruner, J. S. (1961). The act of discovery. *Harvard Educational Review,* 31, 1, 21–32.

Bruner, J. S. (1996). *The culture of education*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bucholtz, M. & Hall, K. (2005). Identity and interaction: A sociocultural linguistic approach. *Discourse Studies*, 7, 4–5, 584–614.

Butler, Y. G. (2004). What level of English proficiency do elementary school teachers need to attain to teach EFL? Case studies from Korea, Taiwan, and Japan. *TESOL Quarterly*, 38, 2, 245–278.

Canagarajah, S. A. (1993). Up the garden path: Second language writing approaches, local knowledge, and pluralism. *TESOL Quarterly*, 27, 2, 301–306.

Canagarajah, S. A. (2005). *Reclaiming the local in language policy and practice*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Canagarajah, S. A. (2007). Lingua franca English, multilingual communities, and language acquisition. *The Modern Language Journal*, 91, 1, 923–939.

Canale, M. (1983). *From communicative competence to communicative language pedagogy*. In J. C. Richard, & R. W. Schmidt (Eds.) *Language and communication* (pp. 2–27). London: Longman.

Canale, M. & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied linguistics*, 1, 1–47.

Carroll, D. (2000). Precision timing in novice-to-novice L2 conversations. *Issues in Applied Linguistics*, 11, 1, 67–110.

Chadha, G., Nayar, D. (Producers), Chadha, G. (Director). (2002). *Bendit Like Beckham* [Comedy Drama Romance]. The United Kingdom. Twentieth Century Fox.

Chang, S. J. (2008). A cultural and philosophical perspective on Korea's education reform: A critical way to maintain Korea's economic momentum, *Korea Economic Institute*, 3, 2, 1–11.

Cheadle, D., Haggis, P., Harris, M. R., Moresco, R., Schulman, C., Yari, B. (producers), Haggis, P. (Director). (2004). *Crash* [Drama]. The United States of America. Lions gate Films.

Goetzman, G., Hanks, T., Wilson, R. (producers), Zwick, J. (Director). (2002). *My big fat Greek wedding* [Drama]. The United States of America. IFC Films.

Chen, J. F., Warden, C. A. & Chang, H. T. (2005). Motivators that do not motivate: The case of Chinese EFL learners and the influence of culture on motivation. *TESOL Quarterly*, 39, 4, 609–633.

Cheng, Cr. Y. (1987). Chinese philosophy and contemporary human communication theory. In D. L. Kincaid (Ed.): *Communication theory: Eastern and western perspectives.* San Diego, CA: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Cheung, M. (2000). Reading, writing, and rote learning … drive students to western schools. Retrieved on August 14, 2008, from the Business week website: http://www.Businessweek.com/2000/00–33/c3694189.htm.

Cho, J. H. (2007). The economics of English. Retrieved on August 5, 2008, from the *Seriworld* website: http://www.seriworld.org/03/wldKetV.html?mn=E&mncd=0302&key=db20061120001&sectno=3.

Choi, I. C. (2008). The impact of EFL testing on EFL education in Korea. *Language Testing*, 25, 1, 39–62.

Chomsky, N. (1957). *Syntactic structures*. The Hague, Netherlands: Mouton.

Chomsky, N. (1965). *Aspects of the theory of syntax*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Chou, Y. L. (2004). Promoting learners' speaking ability by socioaffective strategies, *Internet TESL journal*. Retrieved on June 1, 2007, from the *Internet TESL journal website:* http://iteslj.org/Articles/Chou-Socioaffective.html.

Chung, S. H. (2006). Improving Korea's English language instruction. Retrieved on September 13, 2008, from the *SERI website*: http://www.seriworld.org/05/wldColumnV.html?mn=F&mncd=0103&key=200609120001&sectno=2.

Clément, R., Baker, S. C. & MacIntyre, P. D. (2003). Willingness to communicate in a second language: The Effects of context, norms, and vitality. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology,* 22, 2, 190–209.

Cornwell, S., Simon-Maeda, A. & Churchill, E. (2007). Selected research on second-language teaching and acquisition published in Japan in the years 2000–2006. *Language Teaching*, 40, 2, 119–134.

Covington, M. V. (1992). *Making the grade: A self-worth perspective on motivation and school reform.* New York. Cambridge University Press.

Crozier, J. (2002). *A unique experiment*. Retrieved on May 20, 2008, from the website: http://www.sacu.org/cifc 12.html.

Crystal, D. (2007). *English as a global language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Daloglu, A. & Marsh, F. (2007). Teacher-student partnership in evaluating and revising a multidisciplinary sustained-content English language course. *Applied Language Learning*, 17, 1 & 2, 15–31.

Dash, P. S. (2003). Culture rejected as an individual difference in the SLA process: Not significant, separate and appropriate, overall-nor for Northeast Asia. *The Asian EFL Journal*, June, 5, 2, 4. Retrieved on June 21, 2007, from the *The Asian EFL Journal* website: http://www.asian-efl-journal.com/june2003subpd.php

de Guzman, A. B., Albela, E. J. A., Nieto, D. R. D., Ferrer, J. B. F. & Santos, R. N. (2006). English language learning difficulty of Korean students in a Philippine multidisciplinary university. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, 7, 2, 152–161.

del Rosario, V., del Rosario-Corpus, M. & Abacan, J. M. (producers), Reyes, J. J. (Director). (2010). *Working girls* [Comedy drama]. The Philippines: Unitel Pictures.

Diaz-Rico, L., T. (2004). *Teaching English learners: Strategies and methods*. Boston: Pearson Education.

Donato, R. (2004). Sociocultural contributions to understanding the foreign and second language classroom. In Lantolf, J., P. (Ed.), *Sociocultural theory and second language learning* (pp. 27–50). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Dörnyei, Z. (1998). Motivation in second and foreign language. *Language Teaching*, 31, 117–135.

Dörnyei, Z. (2000). Motivation in action: Toward a process-oriented conceptualization of student motivation. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 70, 519–538.

Dörnyei, Z. (2001a). *Teaching and researching motivation.* New York. Longman.

Dörnyei, Z. (2001b). *Motivational strategies in the language classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dörnyei, Z. (2002). *The motivational basis of language learning tasks*. In Z. Dörnyei & P. Skehan (Eds.). *Individual differences in second language acquisition* (pp. 137–158). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Dörnyei, Z. (2003a). *Attitudes, orientations, and motivations in language learning: Advances in theory, research, and applications*. Massachusetts. Blackwell Synergy.

Dörnyei, Z. (2003b). *Group dynamics in the language classroom*. Cambridge. Cambridge University Press.

Dörnyei, Z. (2005). *The psychology of the language learner: Individual differences in second language acquisition*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Dörnyei, Z & Csizér, K (2005). The effects of intercultural contact and tourism on language attitudes and language learning motivation. *Journal of Language and social Psychology*, 24, 4, 327–357.

Dörnyei, Z. & Murphy, T. (Eds) (2003). *Group dynamics in the language classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Douglas-Henry, J. & Thornburn, C. (producers), Cummins, J. (Director). (2002). *From Korea with love* [Documentary]. Australia: Iris pictures and Heiress films.

Eckert, C. J. (2000). *Epilogue: Exorcising Hegel's ghosts: toward a postnational historiography of Korea*. In G. W. Shin & M. Robinson (Eds.). *Colonial Modernity in Korea* (pp. 363–380). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Ellis, R. (1997). *Second language acquisition*. Oxford. Oxford University Press.

Ellis, R. (2003). *Task-based language learning and teaching*. Oxford. Oxford University Press.

Ellis, R. (2005). Principles of instructed language learning. *The Asian EFL Journal*, September, 7, 3, 1. Retrieved on April 7, 2007, from the website: http://www.asian-efl-journal.com/May_2005_Conference_Ellis.php.

Ellis, R., Basturkmen, H. & Loewen, S. (2001). Learner uptake in communicative ESL lessons. *Language Learning*, 51, 2, 281–318.

Em, H. H. (2000). *Minjok as a modern and democratic construct: Sin Ch'aeho's historiography*. In G. W. Shin & M. Robinson (Eds.). *Colonial Modernity in Korea* (pp. 336–362). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Firth, A. and Wagner, J. (1997). On discourse, communication, and (some) fundamental concepts in SLA research. *The Modern Language Journal,* 81, 3, 285-300.

Firth, A. & Wagner, J. (1998). SLA property: No Trespassing! *Modern Language Journal*, 82, 1, 91–94.

Firth, A. & Wagner, J. (2007). Second/foreign language learning as a social accomplishment: Elaborations on a reconceptualized SLA. *Modern Language Journal*, 91, 798–817.

Freeman, D., Graves, K. & Lee, L. (2005). *Icon*. New York: McGraw Hill.

Gan, Z. D., Humphreys, G. & Hamp-Lyons, L. (2004). Understanding successful and unsuccessful EFL students in Chinese universities. *The Modern Language Journal*, 88, 2, 229–245.

Gardner, R. C., Masgoret, A. M., Tennant, J. & Mihic, L. (2004). Integrative motivation: Changes during a year-long intermediate-level language course. *Language Learning*, 54, 1, 1–34.

Gass, M. A. (2002). Kurt Hahn Address. 30th Annual Association for Experiential Education International Conference. St. Paul, MN, November 7–10.

Gass, S., Lee, J. & Roots, R. (2007). Firth and Wagner: New ideas or a new articulation? *Modern Language Journal*, 91, 786–797.

Gass, S., Mackey, A. & Ross-Feldman, L. (2005). Task-based interactions in classroom and laboratory settings. *Language Learning*, 55, 4, December, 575–611.

Gatbonton, E., Trofimovich, P. & Magid, M. (2005). Learners' ethnic group loyalty and L2 pronunciation accuracy: A sociolinguistic investigation. *TESOL Quarterly*, 39, 489–511.

Gee, J. P. (2001a). *Learning in semiotic domains: A social and situated account*. Madison, WI. Unpublished manuscript.

Gee, J. P. (2001b). New people in new worlds: Networks, the new capitalism, and schools. In B. Cope & M. Kalantzis (Eds). *Multiliteracies: Literacy learning and the design of social futures* (pp 43–69). South Yarra, Victoria: Macmillan.

Gee, J. P. (2005). *An introduction to discourse analysis: Theory and method* (2nd Ed.). London: Routledge.

Gu, Q. & Schweisfurth, M. (2006). Who adapts? Beyond cultural models of the Chinese learner. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 19, 1, 74–89.

Hadzantonis, D. M. (2007). *Convernation*. Seoul, South Korea: Lingui Stick.

Hadzantonis, D. M. (2011). *Speak4yourself*. Retrieved on March 10, 2011, from the website: http://www.akatheme.com.

Hadzantonis, D. M. & Kim, E. (2007a). *VerbOmatik*. Seoul, South Korea. Lingui Stick.

Hadzantonis, D. M. & Kim, E. (2007b). *IdiOmatik*. Seoul, South Korea. Lingui Stick.

Hall, J. K. (2002). *Teaching and researching language and culture*. Essex: Pearson Education.

Han, S. A. (2002). Do South Korean adult learners like native English speaking teachers more than Korean teachers of English? Retrieved on June 5, 2008, from the *Australian association for research in education* website: http://www.aare.edu.au/03pap/han03087.pdf.

Hankook ilbo Newspaper. (2005): Retrieved on December 10, 2007, from the website: http://weekly.hankooki.com/lpage/nation/200505/wk2005052615132237070.html.

Harlow, L. L. (1990). Do they mean what they say? Sociopragmatic competence and second language learners. *The Modern Language Journal*, 74, 328–351.

Harris, K. A. (2005). *Same activity, different learning. Focus on basics: Connecting research and practice*. Boston, MA: NCSALL. Retrieved on December 2005, from the website: http://www.ncsall.net.

Hellsten, M. & Prescott, A. (2004). Learning at university: the international students experience. *International Education Journal*, 5, 3, 344–351.

Hinkel, E. (Ed.) (1999). *Culture in second language and teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hong, S. (2003). Early English fervor: when should we start studying? *Donga Ilbo*. Retrieved on December 17, 2005, from http://www.donga.com/fbin/output?sfrm=2&n=200309030241.

Houghton, B. (producer), Winston, R. (Director). (1959). *The Twilight Zone – The Monsters are due on Maple Street* [Mystery Drama]. Cayuga productions, Inc.

Houston, T. (2006). Communication strategies in the foreign language classroom. *Applied Language Learning*, 16, 1, 65–82.

Hsiao, T. Y. & Oxford, R. L. (2002). Comparing theories of language learning strategies: A confirmatory factor analysis. *The Modern Language Journal*, 86, 3, 368–383.

Hu, G. H. (2002). Potential cultural resistance to pedagogical imports: The case of communicative language teaching in China. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 15, 2, 93–105.

Hudson, J. M. & Bruckman, A. (2002). IRC Francais: The creation of an Internet-based SLA community. *Computer Assisted Language Learning (CALL)*, 15, 2, 109–134.

Hymes, D. (1971). *Competence and performance in linguistic theory*. In R. Huxley & E. Ingram (Eds.) *Language acquisition: Models and methods.* (pp.2–28). New York: Academic Press.

Hymes, D. (1972). *Models of the interaction of language and social life*. In J. Gumperz & D. Hymes (Eds.) .*Directions in sociolinguistics.* (pp. 35–71). New York: Holt.

IELTS. (2008). Retrieved on October 13, 2007, from the *IELTS website*: http://www.ielts.org/teachers_and_researchers/analysis_of_test_data/test-taker_performance_2006.aspx.

Isai, D. (producer), Chircop, D. (Director). (2006). *Bloody footy* [Short film]. Australia: Entropy.

Jeon, H. C. (2006). The economics of English. The dominant Language, SERI, 445, November l. Retrieved on April 10, 2008, from the *Samsung Economic Research Institute website*: http://www.seriworld.org/03/wldKetV.html?mn=E&mncd=0302&key=db20061120001&sectno=3.

Jeon, I. J. & Hahn, J. W. (2006). Exploring EFL teachers' perceptions of task-based language teaching: A case study of Korean secondary school classroom practice. *Asian EFL Journal*, 8, 1, 5. Retrieved on March 24, 2007, from the website: http://www.asian-efl-journal.com/March_06_ijj.php.

Jerch, K. (2004). Retrieved on December 11, 2008, from the *JungAng Daily website*: http://service.joins.com/asp/print_article_english.asp?aid=2446555&esectcode=e_life&title=Teachers+give+bad+grades+to+state-run+ESL+program.

Jung, W. H. (2000). Communication strategies: Their use and instruction. *English Teaching*, 55, 2, 59–80.

Jungang Daily**.** (2005). Retrieved on September 18, 2008, from the *JungangDaily website*: http://joongangdaily.joins.com/200512/04/200512042255394979900090409041.html.

Kandel, E. R., Schwartz, J. & Jessell, T. (2000). *Principles of neural science.* 4th Ed. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Kang, D. H. (2000). Motivation is such a complex process. *English Teaching*, 55, 3, 3–39.

Kasper, G. & Rose, K. R. (2002). *Pragmatic development in a second language (Language learning monograph series).* Oxford: Blackwell.

KEDI. (2003). *Korean educational development institute audit*. Seoul, South Korea: Seoul Government Publication.

KEDI. (2007). *Understanding Korean education*, Volume 1. Seoul. KEDI Publishing.

Kennedy, B. (producer), & Rosner, M. (Director). (1994). *My so-called life: Father figures* [TV Drama]. The United States of America: a. k. a. Productions, Inc.

Kennedy, P. (2002). Learning cultures and learning styles: myth-understandings about adult (Hong Kong) Chinese learners. *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, 21, 5, 430–445.

Kim, D. D. & Margolis, D. (2000). Korean student exposure to English listening and speaking: Instruction, multimedia, travel experience and motivation. *The Korean TESOL Journal, 3,* 29–54.

Kim, D. H. (2004). *Seo-ulsi yeong-eogonghwagug mandeuna?* Making Seoul 'a republic of English? Retrieved on April 9, 2006, from the website: http://www.hani.co.kr/section-005000000/2004/04/005000000200404252101345.html.

Kim, E. J. & Choi, Y. H. (1999). An analysis of English textbooks and English teaching methods in South and North Korea. *English Teaching*, 54, 4, 177–198.

Kim, K. J. (2003). Examining the affective domain in college students' learning English as a foreign language in Korea: relationships among academic motivation, intercultural sensitivity, and English achievement. PhD dissertation at the A & M University, Texas.

Kim, P. (2002). Korea. A cross-cultural communication analyzed. Retrieved on February 13, 2003, from the *Asian EFL Journal online website*: http://www.asian-efl-journal.com/june2002art3.htm.

Kim, S. Y. (2000a). Contextual factors associated with anxiety and motivation. *English Teaching*, 55, 3, 91–110.

Kim, S. Y. (2000b). A study on language learning anxiety and goal orientation: Their relationship across different classroom contexts. *English Teaching*, 55, 1, 23–46.

Kim, T. W. (producer), Lee, J. I. (Director). (2006). *Radio Star* [Documentary]. South Korea: Achim Pictures.

Kim, Y. (2006). English fever in Korea: Impacts on the teaching of English and social issues that arise. *The International Journal of Language, Society and Culture, 16*. Retrieved on March 24, 2007, from the website: http://www.educ.utas.edu.au/users/tle/JOURNAL/ARTICLES/2006/16–1.htm.

Ko, C. (2002). *A very junior year abroad*. Time Magazine, April 15, Asia.

Koo, J. (2002). The term of address, 'You' in South Korea today, Korea Journal, 32, nl, 27.

Koo, M. H. (2005). The economics of English. Article 445, November 20. Retrieved on April 16, 2008, from the *SERI websit*e: http://www.seriworld.org/06/wldNewsV.html?mn=D&mncd=0406&key=20050523000029&sectno=.

Kowalski, C. (2002). *Choice, strategy and ownership: a sparrow's-eye view of learner autonomy*. In A. S. Mackenzie & E. McCafferty (Eds.). *Developing autonomy*. Proceedings of the JALT CUE Conference (2001) (pp. 245–248). Tokyo: The Japan association for language teaching college and university educators special interest group.

Kramsch, C. (2000). Second language acquisition, applied linguistics, and the teaching of foreign languages. *The Modern Language Journal*, 84, 311–326.

Krashen, S. D. (1982). *Principles and practices of second language acquisition*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Krashen, S. D. (2007). What is academic language proficiency? Retrieved on December 2, 2008, from the *Steven Krashen website*: http://www.sdkrashen.com/articles/Krashen_Brown_ALP.pdf.

Kumaravadivelu, B. (2002). Paying attention to inter-in intercultural communication. *TESOL Journal*, 11, 1, 3–4.

Kwon, O. (2000). Korea's English education policy changes in the 1990s: Innovations to gear the nation for the 21st century, *English Teaching*, 55, 1, 47–91.

Lafford, B. A. (2007). Second language acquisition reconceptualized? The impact of Firth and Wagner (1997). *The Modern Language Journal*, 91,735–756.

Lantolf, J. P. (2000). Second language learning as a mediated process. *Language Teaching*, 33, 79–86.

Lantolf, J. P. (2004). *Sociocultural theory and second language learning*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lantolf, J. P. (2007). Conceptual knowledge and instructed second language learning: a sociocultural perspective. In S. Fotos & H. Nassaji (Eds.). *Form-focused instruction and teacher education. Studies in honour of Rod Ellis*. (pp. 35–54). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lantolf, J. P. & Johnson, K. E. (2007). Extending Firth and Wagner's (1997) ontological perspective to L2 classroom praxis and teacher education. *Modern Language Journal*, 91, 875–890.

Lantolf, J. P. & Thorne, S. L. (2009). *Sociocultural theory and the genesis of second language development*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Larsen-Freeman, D. (2007). Reflecting on the cognitive–social debate in second language acquisition. *The Modern Language Journal*, 91, Focus Issue.

Lave, J. & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lee, E. J. (2001a). Interlanguage development with two Korean speakers of English with a focus on temporality. *Language Learning*, *51*, 591–633.Lee, H. J. (2000). Formative evaluation of college general English program. *English Teaching*, 55, 1, 93–118.

Lee, J. A. (2001b). *Korean speakers*. In M. Shaw & B. Smith (2nd Ed.) (2001). *Learner English: A teacher's guide to interference and other problem*s (pp. 325 – 342). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lee, J. K. (2002). *Korean higher education. A Confucian perspective*. Seoul: Jimoondang Publishing.

Lee, J. K. (2005). 수능 영역별 분석. . .EBS 의 직간접 연계된 출제 많아.Retrieved June 1, 2007 from the Hangyorae website: http://www.hani.co.kr/kisa/section-013001000/2005/11/013001000200511231959127.html.

Lee, S. (Producer), Lee, S. (Director). (1990). Do the right thing [Comedy drama]. The United States of America: 40 Acres & A Mule Filmworks.

Leeman, J. (2003). Recasts and second language development: Beyond negative evidence. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 25, 37–63.

Lefkowitz, N. & Hedgcock, J. (2006). Sound effects: Social pressure and identity negotiation in the Spanish language classroom. *Applied Language Learning*, 16, 1, 17–42.

Lessard-Clouston, M. (1997). Language learning strategies: An overview for L2 teachers. *The Internet TESL Journal, 3,* 12. Retrieved on December 2008, from the website: http://iteslj.org/Articles/Lessard-Clouston-Strategy.html

Li, D. (1998). It's always more difficult than you plan and imagine: Teachers' perceived difficulties in introducing the communicative approach in South Korea. *TESOL Quarterly*, 32, 2, 677–703.

Lidz, C. S. (1991). *Practitioner's guide to dynamic assessment.* New York: Guilford Publications.

Lightbown, P. M. & Spada, N. (2006) 3rd Edition. *How languages are learned*. Oxford. Oxford University Press.

Lim, H. Y. & Griffith, W. I. (2003). Successful classroom discussions with adult Korean ESL/EFL learners. *The Internet TESL Journal*, IX, 5. Retrieved on December 20, 2007, from the *ITESL website*: http://iteslj.org/Techniques/Lim-AdultKoreanshtml

Littlewood, W. (1981). *Communicative language teaching*. Cambridge. Cambridge University Press.

Litz, D. R. A. (2005). Textbook evaluation and ELT management: A South Korean case study. Retrieved on August 8, 2008, from the *Asian EFL journal website*: http://www.asian-efl-journal.com/Litz_thesis.pdf.

Liu, M. & Jackson, J. (2008). An exploration of Chinese EFL learners' unwillingness to communicate and foreign language anxiety. *The Modern Language Journal*, 92, 1, 71–86.

Liu, Y. T. (2001). Use of mnemonics in learning novel foreign vocabulary: Help or hindrance? Working papers in TESOL & applied linguistics. Retrieved on August 10, 2007, from the *University of Columbia website*: http://www.tc.columbia.edu/academic/tesol/webjournal/archives2–1.html.

Livingston, J. (Producer), Livingston, J. (Director). (1990). *Paris is burning* [Documentary]. The United States of America: Miramax.

Long, M. H. (1981). Input, interaction, and second language acquisition. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 379, 250–278.

Long, M. H. (1996). The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition. In W. Ritchie & T. K. Bhatia (Eds.). *Handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 413–468). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Long, M. H. (2000). *Focus-on-form in task-based language teaching*. In R. L. Lambert & E. Shohamy (Eds.). *Language policy and pedagogy* (pp. 179–192). Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Luke, A., Freebody, P. & Land, R. (2000). *Literate futures: Review of literacy education*. Brisbane, Qld. Education Queensland.

Luria, A. R. (1961). Study of the abnormal child. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry. A Journal of Human Behaviour,* 31, 1–16.

Lutz, J., Briggs, A. & Cain, K. (2003). An examination of the value of the generation effect for learning new material. *The Journal of General Psychology*, 130, 2, 171–189.

Macaro, E. (2006). Strategies for language learning and for language use: Revising the theoretical framework. *The Modern Language Journal*, 90, iii, 320–337.

Macdonough, J. & Shaw, C. (2003). *Materials and methods in ELT: A teacher's guide*. Massachusetts: Blackwell publishing.

Macintyre, P. D. (2007). Willingness to communicate in the second language: Understanding the decision to speak as a volitional process. *The Modern Language Journal*, 91, 4, 564–576.

Mackey, A. & Gass, S. (2005). *Second language research: Methodology and design*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Masgoret, A. M. & Gardner, R. C. (2003). Attitudes, motivation, and second language learning: A meta-analysis of studies conducted by Gardner and associates. *Language Learning*, 53, 123–163.

McCarthy, M., McCarten, J. & Sandiford, H. (2006). *Touchstone.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mclaughlin, M. & Sharp, K. (Producers), Mclaughlin, M. (Director). (2005). *Disco-Spinning the story* [Documentary]. The United States of America: Passport Int'l.

Medgyes, P. (1994). *The non-native speaker teacher.* London: Macmillan.

MEST. (2008). Retrieved on April 19, 2008, from the *Ministry of Education, Science and Training website*: www.english.mest.go.kr.

Molinsky, D. & Bliss, B. (2000). *Side by side*. New York: Prentice Hall.

Mori, J. (2007). Border crossings? Exploring the intersection of second language acquisition, conversation analysis, and foreign language pedagogy. *The Modern Language Journal*, 91, Focus Issue.

Morita, N. (2004). Negotiating participation and identity in second language academic communities. *TESOL Quarterly*, 38, 4, 573–603.

Morris, F. A. (2002). Negotiation moves and recasts in relation to error types and learner repair in the foreign language classroom. *Foreign Language Annals*, 35, 395–404.

Muller, C. (2000). *Analects Of Confucius*. Retrieved on October 21, 2008, from the website http://www.human.toyogakuen-u.ac.jp/~acmuller/contao/mencius.htm.

Murray, B. K. (2005). *The Korean learner, according to self-determination theory in a collectivist educational context: motivation of Korean students studying English as a foreign language*. PhD Dissertation at the University of Texas, Austin.

Nakahama, Y., Tyler, A. & Van Lier, L. (2001). Negotiation of meaning in conversational and information gap activities: A comparative discourse analysis. *TESOL Quarterly, 35,* 3, 377–405.

Nation, P. (2003). The role of first language in foreign language learning. *The Asian EFL Journal*, 5, 2. Retrieved on February 10, 2005 from the *Asian EFL website*: http://www.asian-efl-journal.com/june_2003_PN.php.

National Research Council. (1999). *Improving student learning: A strategic plan for education research and its utilization.* Washington, DC. National Academy Press.

Naughton, D. (2006). Cooperative strategy training and oral interaction: Enhancing small group communication in the language classroom. *The Modern Language Journal*, 90, 2, 169–184.

Norman, D. G. (2006). Effects on student achievement, motivation, and attitudes toward cooperative learning. Retrieved on December 25, 2007, from *The Asian EFL Journal*: http://www.asian-efl-journal.com/Norman_thesis_2006.pdf.

Norris-Holt, J. (2001). Motivation as a contributing factor in second language acquisition. *The Internet TESL Journal*, VII, 6, June. Retrieved on July 7, 2005, from *The Internet TESL Journal website*: http://iteslj.org.

Nunan, D. (1988). *Syllabus design*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Nunan, D. (1999). *Second language teaching and learning*. Boston: Heinle and Heinle Publishers.

Nunan, D. (2005). Important tasks of English education: Asia-wide and beyond. *Asian EFL Journal*, 7, 3, September.

OECD. (2007). Retrieved on January 7, 2007, from the *OECD website*: http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/42/51/1941679.pdf.

Ohata, K. (2005). Language anxiety from the teacher's perspective: Interviews with seven experienced ESL/EFL teachers. *Journal of Language and Learning*, 3, 1, 133 - 155.

Ochs, E. (1986). Introduction. In B. B. Schieffelin & E. Ochs (Eds.). *Language socialization across cultures* (pp. 1–13). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Ohta, A. S. (1995). Applying sociocultural theory to an analysis of learner discourse: Learner-learner collaborative interaction in the zone of proximal development. *Issues in Applied Linguistics, 6,* 93–122.

Ohta, A. S. (2004). Rethinking interaction in SLA: Developmentally appropriate assistance in the zone of proximal development and the acquisition of L2 grammar. In J. P. Lantolf, *Sociocultural theory and second language learning* (pp. 51–78). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Oka, H. A. (2004). Non-native approach to ELT: Universal or Asian? *Asian EFL Journal*, 6, 1, 1, March.

Oxford, R. L. (1990). *Language learning strategies*. Boston: Heinle and Heinle.

Oxford, R. L. (2006). Task-based language teaching and learning: An overview. *The Asian TEFL Journal*, 8, 3, 5. Retrieved on May 3, 2007 from the *Asian EFL website*: http://www.asian-efl-journal.com.

Pae, T. I. (2008). Second language orientation and self-determination theory: A structural analysis of the factors affecting second language achievement. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 27, 1, 5–27.

Pak, Y. H. (1999). College English textbooks: An analysis of their cultural content. *English Teaching*, 54, 1, 43–66.

Park, C. W. (2000). Peer pressure and learning to speak English: Voices from the selected learners. *English Teaching*, 55, 4, 231–268.

Park, J. K. (1999a). Teaching English: Korean culture and context. *English Teaching*. 54, 3, 3–21.

Park, S. H. (2005). *Language learning strategies and the relationship of these strategies to motivation and English proficiency among Korean EFL students*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation from The University of Kansas.

Park, Y. Y. (1999b). An analysis of interrelationship among language learning strategies, learning styles, and learner variables of university students. *English Teaching*, 54, 4, 281–308.

Pennycook, A. (1994). Beyond (f)utilitarianism: English 'as' academic purpose. *Hong Kong Papers in Linguistics and Language Teaching*, 17, 13–23.

Pennycook, A. (2007). *Global Englishes and transcultural flows.* London: Routledge

Pennycook, A. & Coutand-Marin, S. (2004). Teaching English as a missionary language. *Discourse: Studies in the cultural politics of education*, 24, 3, 337–53.

Pica, T. (1994). Research on negotiation: What does it reveal about second-language learning conditions, processes, and outcomes? *Language Learning: A Journal of Applied Linguistics,* 44, 3, 493–527.

Pratt, D. D. (1998a). *The social construction of Chinese models of teaching*. Paper presented at the 1998 EARC Proceedings, University of British Columbia, Canada.

Pratt-Johnson, Y. (2006). Communicating cross-culturally: *What teachers should know*. *The Internet TESL Journal*, XII, 2, February. Retrieved January 9, 2008, from the *Internet TESL website*: http://itesl.org.

Rappaport, D., Rotenburgm M. & Judge, M. (Producers), Judge, M. (Director). (1999). *Office Space* [Comedy]. The United States of America: Twentieth Century Fox Film, Corporation.

Razmjoo, S. A. & Riazi, M. (2006). Is communicative language teaching practical in the expanding circle? *Journal of Language and Learning*, 4. Retrieved on March 12, 2008, from the *Journal of Language and Learning website*: http://www.jllonline.co.uk/journal/jllearn/4_2/LEARN%202.pdf.

Reznitskaya, A., Anderson, R. C. & Kuo, L. (2007). Teaching and learning argumentation, *The Elementary School Journal*, 107, 5, 449–472.

Richard-Amato, P. (2003). *Making it happen*. New York: Pearson Education.

Richards, J. C. (2003). *New Interchange*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Richards, J. C. & Lockhardt, C. (1999). *Reflective teaching in second language classrooms*. 5th Ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Richards, J. C. & Rodgers, T. S. (2000). *Approaches and methods in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Richards, J. C. & Rodgers, T. S. (2001). *Approaches and methods in language teaching*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Robertson, P. (2002). The pervading influence of neo-Confucianism on the Korean education system. Confucius and Mencius: Their influence in modern day EFL. *The Asian EFL Journal*, 4, 2, 1. Retrieved on January 3, 2005, from the *Asian EFL Journal website*: http://www.asian-efl-journal.com/june2002.conf.php.

Robertson, P. (2005). The critical age hypothesis: A critique of research methodology. *Asian EFL Journal*, Paper presented at the 2005 conference.

Robertson, M., Line, M., Jones, S. & Thomas, S. (2000). International students, learning environments and perceptions: A case study using the Delphi technique. *Higher Education Research and Development, 19*, 1, 89–102.

Robinson, M. (2000). *Broadcasting, cultural hegemony, and colonial modernity in Korea, 1924–1945*. In G. W. Shin & M. Robinson (Eds.). *Colonial modernity in Korea* (pp. 52–69). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Roebuck, R. (2004). Subjects speak out: How learners position themselves in a psycho linguistic task. In J. P. Lantolf (Ed.). *Sociocultural theory and second language learning* (pp. 79–96). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Rossiter, M. J. (2005). Developmental sequences of L2 communication strategies. *Language Learning*, 15, 1 & 2, 55–66.

Rubdy, R. (2009). Reclaiming the local in teaching EIL. *Language and Intercultural Communication*, 9, 3, 156–174.

Rubenfeld, S., Clément, R., Vinograd, J., Amireault, D., L., Auger, R. & Lebrun, M. (2007). Becoming a cultural intermediary: A further social corollary of second-language learning. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 26, 2, *182–203*.

Ryan, R. M. & Deci, E. L. (2000). Intrinsic and extrinsic motivations: Classic definitions and new directions. *Contemporary Educational Psychology***,** 25**,** 54–67.

Rydland, V. & Aukrust, V. G. (2005). Lexical repetition in second language learners' peer play interaction. *Journal of Language Learning*, 55, 2, 229–274.

Rysiewicz, J. (2008). Cognitive profiles of (un)successful FL learners: A cluster analytical study. *The Modern Language Journal*, 92, 1, 87–99.

Savignon, S. (2002). *Interpreting communicative language teaching: Contexts and concerns in teacher education*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Scarcella, R. & Oxford, R. (1992). *The tapestry of language learning: The individual in the communicative classroom*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Schmenk, B. (2005). Globalizing learner autonomy. *TESOL Quarterly*, 39, 1, 107–118.

Schumann, J. H. (1978). *The acculturation model for second language acquisition*. In R. C. Gingras (Ed.). *Second language acquisition and foreign language learning*. Washington, D. C. Center for Applied Linguistics.

Scollon, R. & Scollon, S. (1994). *The post-Confucian confusion*. Research Report No. 37. City Polytechnic of Hong Kong, Department of English.

SERI. (2005). English education suffering, Retrieved on June 10, 2008, from the *SERI website*: http://www.seriworld.org/06/wldNewsV.html?mn=D&mncd=0406&key=20050705000037&sectno=.

SERI. (2006). The economics of English. Retrieved on November 3, 2008, from the *SERI website*: http://www.seriworld.org/03/wldKetV.html?mn=E&mncd=0302&key=db20061120001&sectno=3.

SERI. (2007). Retrieved on October 3, 2008, from the *SERI website*: www.seriworld.org.

SERI. (2008). Retrieved on January 28, 2009, from the *SERI website*: www.seriworld.org.

Shin, G. G. (2001). English language teaching system change to enhance the social justice and the efficiency of the national economy. *English Teaching*, 56, 2, 193–218.

Shin, G. W. (2006). Ethnic Nationalism in Korea: Genealogy, Politics, and Legacy. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Shin, G. W. & Han, D. H. (2000). *Colonial corporatism: The rural revitalization campaign*, 1932–1940. In G., W. Shin & M. Robinson (Eds.). *Colonial modernity in Korea* (pp. 70–96). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Shin, G. W. & Robinson, M. (2000). *Colonial modernity in Korea*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

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

Smith, A. (2004). *The antiquity of nations*. Cambridge. Polity.

Soars, L. & Soars, J. (2001). *Headway*. Oxford, United Kingdom: Oxford University Press.

Sorensen, C. (2000). *National identity and the creation of the category "peasant" in colonial Korea*. In G. W. Shin & M. Robinson (Eds.). *Colonial modernity in Korea* (pp. 288–310). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Spielmann, G. & Radnofsky, M. L. (2001). Learning language under tension: New directions from a qualitative study. *Modern Language Journal, 85*, 259–278.

Sternberg, R. J. & Grigorenko, E. L. (2002). *Dynamic testing. The nature and measurement of learning potential.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sullivan, P. N. (2004). Playfulness as mediation in communicative language teaching in a Vietnamese classroom. In J. P. Lantolf. (Ed.). *Sociocultural theory and second language learning* (pp. 115–132). Oxford: Oxford.

Swain, M. & Lapkin, S. (1998). Interaction and second language learning: Two adolescent French immersion students working together. *The Modem Language Journal, 82, 3,* 320–337.

Swain, M. (2004). The output hypothesis and beyond: Mediating acquisition through collaborative dialogue. In J. P. Lantolf (Ed.), *Sociocultural theory and second language learning* (pp. 97 – 114). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Swan, M. & Smith, B. (2008). *Learner English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Triandis, H. (1977). *Interpersonal Behaviour*. Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole

Triandis, H. C. (1995). *Individualism and collectivism*. San Francisco, CA: Westview Press.

Trofimovich, P. & Gatbonton, E. (2006). Repetition and Focus-on-form in processing L2 Spanish Words: Implications for pronunciation instruction. *The Modern Language Journal*, 90, 4, 519–535.

Tu, W. (2002). *Confucianist traditions in East Asian modernity*. The Korean Times newspaper, March 2, 3.

Vallow, K. Barker, M. Weitzman, M. (Producers), Povenmire, D. (Director). (2001). *Family guy: To live and die in Dixie* [Animated film]. The United States of America: 20th Century Fox Animation.

van Lier, L. (2004). *The ecology and semiotics of language learning. A sociocultural perspective*. Norwell, MA: Kluwer Academic.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychotopical processes.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1989). Concrete human psychology. *Soviet Psychology*, 27, 2, 53–77.

Watanabe, Y. & Swain, M. (2007) Effects of proficiency differences and patterns of pair interaction on second language learning: collaborative dialogue between adult ESL learners. *Language Teaching Research*. 11, 2, 121–142.

Watson-Gegeo. K. A. (2004). Mind, language, and epistemology: Toward a language socialization paradigm for SLA. *The Modern Language Journal*, 88, 3, 331–350.

Weitz, C. & Weitz, P. (Producers), Weitz, P. (Director). (2004). *In good company* [Comedy drama]. The United States of America: Universal Pictures.

Wenden, A. & Rubin, J. (1987). *Learner strategies in language learning*. London: Prentice Hall International.

Wertsch, J. V. (1998). *Mind as Action.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wesche, M. & Skehan, P. (2002). *Communicative, task-based, and content-based language instruction*. In R. Kaplan (Ed.) (2002). *The Oxford handbook of applied linguistics* (pp.207–228). New York. Oxford University Press.

Wilkins, D. (1976). *Notional syllabuses*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wilson, K. (2007). *Smart choice*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wong, N. Y. (2004). Mathematics education and culture: *The "CHC" Learner Phenomenon*. Retrieved February 1, 2007, from the website: http://www.math.admu.edu.ph/tsg22/wong.html.

Wood, D. (2006). Uses and functions of formulaic sequences in second language speech: An exploration of the foundations of fluency. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 63, 1, 13–33.

Woodrow, L. J. (2006). A model of adaptive language learning. *The Modern Language Journal*, 90, 3, 297–319.

Yamanaka, N. (2006). An evaluation of English textbooks in Japan from the viewpoint of nations in the inner, outer, and expanding circles. *JALT Journal*, 28, 1, 57–76.

Yim, S. W. (2003). *Globalization and national identity: English language textbooks of Korea.* A thesis submitted in fulfilment of a PHD program. Department of humanities and social sciences. New York University, Steinhardt School of Education.

Yoon, K. E. (2004). CLT Theories and practices in EFL curricula. A case study of Korea. *Asian EFL Journal*, 6, 3, September, 1. Retrieved April 19, 2007, from the *Asian-EFL website:* http://www.asian-efl-journal.com/september_04_yke.php.

Yu, J. M. (1999). Comparison of conversational English and Korean EFL textbook dialogues. *English Teaching*, 54, 2, 133–148.

Yu, L. M. (2001). Communicative language teaching in China: Progress and resistance. *TESOL Quarterly*, 35, 1, 194–198.

Zuengler, J. & Miller, E. R. (2006). Cognitive and sociocultural perspectives: Two parallel SLA worlds? *TESOL Quarterly*, 40, March, 1, 35–58.