

Effective Teaching Techniques in Teaching English Through English

Myeong-hee Seong^{*}, Hyung-ji Chang

Eulji University, Sun Moon University

Seong, Myeong-hee & Chang, Hyung-ji. (2009). Effective teaching techniques in teaching English through English. *Modern English Education*, 10(1), 93-113.

This study explores more effective ways of implementing Teaching English Through English (TETE) in college EFL classrooms in Korea by investigating students' perceptions on teaching techniques affecting success in TETE. The basic assumption for the study is that abundant L2 input is indispensable for second (L2) language acquisition, but a language can be learned only if there is the proper sort of input. The main instruments employed in this study were questionnaires based on the research questions asking for (1) teaching techniques for making language features noticeable for comprehensible input in TETE, and (2) significant differences in the effectiveness of teaching techniques according to learner's language proficiency and contents comprehensibility in TETE. The findings show that appropriate classroom techniques should be taken into consideration according to students' language proficiency levels. A slow rate speech and error correction were teaching techniques which were required much more for the learners with low English proficiency, while restatement was for the learners with high English proficiency. English-only class was considered not effective for the learners with low English proficiency. The class partially supported by their native languages was perceived effective for both learners. The command among the techniques was not favored by all levels.

[TETE/input hypothesis/teaching techniques/perception/영어를 영어로 하는 수업/입력가설/교수기술/인식]

* First author

I. INTRODUCTION

Recently the idea of teaching English through English (TETE) has been spreading through all over Korea rapidly (Sung-Ae Kim, 2007; Jin-Hwa Lee, 2007). Despite the absence of clear evidence for the effectiveness of L2-only instruction, English-only instruction has been widely accepted by Korean universities. The rationale behind this movement is that teachers' obligatory use of English would provide more input and foster communicative interaction with students, and thereby ultimately lead to the communicative competence required today. Since the students in an EFL context spend only a short period of time in class on a weekly basis and they have little contact with the target language outside the classrooms, it is crucial for the teacher to use the target language as much as possible and provide the students with as many opportunities as possible for communicative language use. These views are based on Krashen's Input Hypothesis (1982, 1985), arguing that language is best acquired incidentally through extensive exposure to comprehensible L2 input. However, if learners don't understand the teacher-provided input or if an EFL teacher doesn't have enough English proficiency to be understood, the quantity of the input is too limited to enhance acquisition. Accordingly, without appropriate classroom techniques, the teacher's use of target language itself does not guarantee the development of communicative language ability for the students.

The purpose of this study is to explore a more effective way of implementing TETE in the Korean classroom. In order to identify specifically which teaching techniques in TETE can be beneficial to learners' English learning for language input to be comprehended, this study investigated students' perceptions about the effectiveness of TETE in typical college English classes according to learner's self-assessed English proficiency and contents comprehensibility (Refer to the Appendix).

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

1. An Integrated Methodology for Language Input

Language input plays a crucial role in language development (Krashen, 1982, 1985). It seems natural to believe that the more students are exposed to target language (TL) input, the more they will learn. However, according to SLA theory, mere exposure to TL input is not enough (Bragger, 1985; Swain, 1985). A language can be learned only if there is the proper sort of input.

According to the findings of recent research, the best way to provide input in the classroom context is to integrate form-focused instruction and communication because it leads to both acquisition of the target structure and better overall comprehension (Ellis, 1994; Fotos, 1994). The term 'focus on form' Long (1991) first used means planned, intensive focus on form rather than incidental, extensive focus on form which is the characteristic of many communicative classes. The effectiveness of focus on form via instructional intervention has been shown by many studies.

Pica (2002) points out that meaning-based interaction, such as discussions, which is the most common interactional activity in content-based classes, does not help learners focus on form-meaning relationship in input or move beyond their current level of L2 development. She suggests that meaning-based interactions need to be complemented with interactions that involve negotiation of meaning and form-focused intervention and instruction in order to help learners move beyond their current level of L2 development by noticing the form-meaning mapping in the input. Furthermore, Swain (1985, 1988), having observed low productive competence and inaccurate grammar among students in the Canadian immersion programs, suggests that comprehensible input be complemented by the focus on form in order to achieve both fluency and accuracy in L2. She recommends that within an approach mainly focusing on the learning of content knowledge, language instructors use a combination of diverse techniques to draw students' attention to target language structures. These pedagogical techniques can involve implicit or explicit teaching of language, and reactions to learners' errors.

The implications we can get from these studies are that it is appropriate to let learners be engaged in meaningful language use for their exposure to the target language and it is necessary to let learners draw attention to particular language features and their errors after they have used the language for interaction.

2. Factors for Comprehensible Language Input

A great deal of current literature confirms that the learner should receive 'comprehensible input' to get input of the right sort. In the aspect of comprehensible input, some of the techniques of the caretaker speech spoken to the child could be applied in the TETE classroom, since its main concern is comprehensible input. Caretaker speech is slow in speed and consists of similar phrases and sentences in syntax. It is often used with non-verbal acts. It is repetitive and the themes of caretaker speech concern about the activities s/he is doing, or the things or concepts s/he already knows. It appears that repetitive characteristics on a caretaker speech also contain a strategy of focus on form, since, as explained in Ellis, Basturkman, and Loewen (2001), focus on form involves repetitive exposure to a single preselected linguistic feature rather than nonrepetitive exposure to numerous linguistic features within a single lesson.

Ever since language pedagogy made its first appearance, with an ever-increasing variety of language teaching situations, language teaching techniques have changed (Cha & Narang, 2008). However, there exists an agreement in the fact that learner-related factor to be considered is language proficiency. Thereby, the language input should adjust to the proficiency or comprehensible level of students. Through the research, this study addressed the following questions:

Question 1: Which teaching techniques can make language features noticeable for comprehensible input in TETE?

Question 2: Are there significant differences in the effectiveness of teaching techniques according to learner's language proficiency in TETE?

III. METHOD

1. Participants

A total of 117 Korean college students participated in a survey. The college they are attending is located in the suburban area of Seoul, Korea. Their ages ranged from 19 to 25 and about three fourths of the students were female. The average score of their preliminary TOEIC test they took in the beginning of the spring semester in 2008 was around 400 points, with the highest being 560 and the lowest 295. The course they took was a Hotel & Restaurant English taught by the author in three separated classes.

2. Instruments

The main instruments employed in this study were questionnaires (attached in Appendix) based on the research questions asking for (1) teaching techniques for making language features noticeable for comprehensible input in TETE, and (2) significant differences in the effectiveness of teaching techniques according to learner's language proficiency in TETE. The questionnaires were translated into Korean. Questions consisted of 13 items. They are 'the moments supported in Korean', 'previewing', 'English with pictures and drawing', 'English with gesture', the very features of caretaker speech such as 'repetition', 'slow speech', 'restatement', 'expansion', 'error correction', 'command' and 'imitation' and other factors such as 'discussion', or 'meaning-based interactions' and 'translating Korean into English' whenever learners happen to utter Korean in TETE.

3. Procedure

The participants took a course of Hotel and Restaurant English for the first semester in 2008. The course was designed to provide practical situational English used by hotel & restaurant employees and guests, and to enhance students' communication ability in English in the field of tourism. Focus is placed on real, meaningful and purposeful English frequently used in tourism. A total of 117 participants were surveyed at the end of semester. Among them, data from four students were eliminated because they did not finish the questionnaires. As a result, data from 113 students were included in this analysis. All data were divided into three groups based on the mean scores of their self-assessed English

competence. Soyeon Kang and Hyeson Park (2005), in their survey on students' perception of the effectiveness of English mediated classes at a Korean university, found a strong positive correlation between the students' self-assessed English proficiency and learning outcomes in English mediated classes.

In order to identify factors affecting students' perceptions about the effectiveness of using English as a language of instruction, frequency analysis and a series of chi-square test were carried out on individual students' responses. The chi-square values were set at .05 and .01.

IV. RESULTS

1. Factors Making Language Features Noticeable for Comprehensible Input in TETE

1) When Is It Good to Be Supported by a Korean Language in TETE?

For the question, "When is it good to be supported by a Korean language during classes?" three choices were provided: English only, after finishing one topic, and for every sentence.

English-only class showed significant differences not only according to English proficiency ($p < .05$, High: 62.5%, I: 77%, Low: 42.8%), but also contents comprehensibility ($p < .001$, H: 83%, I: 68.3, L: 26.6%) among levels as the Tables 1 and 2 below show. This implies English-only class was considered important by the high level learners but not by the low level learners. This result is similar to that of Soyeon Kang and Hyeson Park (2005) arguing that students with low English proficiency disfavored the expansion of TETE courses.

'To be supported by Korean at the moment changing into another topic did not show significant differences according to their English proficiency. Regardless of their levels, most of participants replied the technique was important (H: 87.5%, I: 77%, L: 80.9% in English Proficiency level; H: 82.3%, I: 77.5%, L: 100% in contents comprehensibility level). Translation of every English utterance also showed significance ($p < .05$, H: 27.7%, I: 41%, L: 60%) according to contents comprehensibility as the Table 2 below shows, although translation for

every English sentence did not show significant differences according to their English proficiency (H: 50%, I: 31.9%, L: 52.3%). Participants with the low level of English proficiency showed high level of dissatisfaction about TETE, where no native language input existed. This implies that using English in the English instruction would be adjusted to learners' level of proficiency in English.

Table 1
Learner's Perception on Moments Supported in Korean in TETE: Based on English Proficiency

		Frequency(%)					
		Very important	Important	Mediocre	Hardly important	Not important	(p)
English only	H	3(37.5)	2(25.0)	3(37.5)			16.072 (.041*)
	I	22(29.7)	35(47.3)	16(21.6)	1(1.4)		
	L	4(19.0)	5(23.8)	10(47.6)		2(9.5)	
A moment changing into another topic	H	2(25.0)	5(62.5)	1(12.5)			1.473 (.961)
	I	16(21.6)	41(55.4)	14(18.9)	3(4.1)		
	L	5(23.8)	12(57.1)	4(19.0)			
For every English sentence	H	1(12.5)	3(37.5)	3(37.5)	1(12.5)		7.075 (.529)
	I	5(6.9)	18(25.0)	24(33.3)	19(26.4)	6(8.3)	
	L	4(19.0)	7(33.3)	7(33.3)	3(14.3)		

* $p < .05$, H: High, I: Intermediate, L: Low

Table 2
Learner's Perception on Moments Supported in Korean in TETE: Based on Contents Comprehensibility

		Frequency(%)					
		Very important	Important	Mediocre	Hardly important	Not important	(p)
English only	H	21(44.7)	18(38.3)	8(17.0)			36.132 (.000***)
	I	6(14.6)	22(53.7)	13(31.7)			
	L	2(13.3)	2(13.3)	8(53.3)	1(6.7)	2(13.3)	
A moment changing into another topic	H	9(19.1)	25(53.2)	10(21.3)	3(6.4)		8.403 (.210)
	I	9(22.5)	22(55.0)	9(22.5)			
	L	5(31.3)	11(68.7)				
For every English sentence	H	3(6.4)	10(21.3)	15(31.9)	15(31.9)	4(8.5)	17.487 (.025*)
	I	2(5.1)	14(35.9)	16(41.0)	6(15.4)	1(2.6)	
	L	5(33.3)	4(26.7)	3(20.0)	2(13.3)	1(6.7)	

* $p < .05$, *** $p < .001$

2) Previewing

According to the Table 3, 62.5% of the learners with high proficiency, 85.1% of intermediate, and 85.7% of low level learners considered previewing contents important. According to the comprehensibility level, 85.1% of high level learners, 85.4% of intermediate, and 73.4% of low level learners perceived previewing was important. Overall, 60% of learners thought that previewing contents was a helpful strategy for understanding contents.

Table 3
Previewing

		Very important	Important	Mediocre	Hardly important	Not important	(p)
English Proficiency	H	3(37.5)	2(25.0)	3(37.5)			5.287 (.727)
	I	31(41.9)	32(43.2)	9(12.2)	1(1.4)	1(1.4)	
	L	7(33.3)	11(52.4)	3(14.3)			
Contents Comprehensibility	H	21(44.7)	19(40.4)	6(12.8)		1(2.1)	7.650 (.468)
	I	13(31.7)	22(53.7)	5(12.2)	1(2.4)		
	L	7(46.7)	4(26.7)	4(26.7)			

3) English Input with Drawing/Pictures

As the Table 4 shows, over half of the participants (H: 62.5%, I: 60.8%, L: 71.55% according to English proficiency; H: 53.2%, I: 73.2%, L: 66.7%, according to contents comprehensibility) perceived using English with drawings or pictures important for understanding contents in TETE class.

Table 4
English Input with Drawing/Pictures

		Very important	Important	Mediocre	Hardly important	(p)
English Proficiency	H	3(37.5)	2(25.0)	3(37.5)		8.978 (.175)
	I	10(13.5)	35(47.3)	24(32.4)	5(6.8)	
	L	1(4.8)	14(66.7)	6(28.6)		
Contents Comprehensibility	H	6(12.8)	19(40.4)	19(40.4)	3(6.4)	5.130 (.527)
	I	7(17.1)	23(56.1)	10(24.4)	1(2.4)	
	L	1(6.7)	9(60.0)	4(26.7)	1(6.7)	

4) English Input with Gesture

In the responses on English input with gesture for understanding contents of class, over 60% participants (H: 75%, I: 72.9%, L: 61.9%, according to English proficiency; H: 70.2%, I: 65.9%, L: 86.7% according to contents comprehensibility) perceived English input with gesture important. Table 5 illustrates the responses of each level of learners.

Table 5
English Input with Gesture

		Very important	Important	Mediocre	Hardly important	(p)
English Proficiency	H	5(62.5)	1(12.5)	2(25.0)		9.696 (.138)
	I	22(29.7)	32(43.2)	19(25.7)	1(1.4)	
	L	2(9.5)	11(52.4)	7(33.3)	1(4.8)	
Contents Comprehensibility	H	14(29.8)	19(40.4)	14(29.8)		5.744 (.452)
	I	9(22.0)	18(43.9)	12(29.3)	2(4.9)	
	L	6(40.0)	7(46.7)	2(13.3)		

5) Repetition

Repetition was absolutely welcomed in TETE class for contents understanding, as the Table 6 below shows, not only in English proficiency (H: 75%, I: 91.9%, L: 100%) but also in contents comprehensibility (H: 89.49%, I: 92.7%, L: 100%). There were no significant differences among English proficiency levels to use repetition for understanding contents in the TETE class.

Table 6
Repetition

		Very important	Important	Mediocre	(p)
English Proficiency	H	4(50.0)	2(25.0)	2(25.0)	8.893 (.064)
	I	53(71.6)	15(20.3)	6(8.1)	
	L	12(57.1)	9(42.9)		
Contents Comprehensibility	H	35(74.5)	7(14.9)	5(10.6)	6.365 (.174)
	I	25(61.0)	13(31.7)	3(7.3)	
	L	9(60.0)	6(40.0)		

6) Slow Rate Speech

As the Table 7 shows, a slow rate speech in TETE class was recognized as an important technique for understanding contents ($p < .01$, H: 37.5%, I: 73.4%, L: 81% according to English proficiency; $p < .001$, H: 55.3%, I: 83%, L: 93.8% according to contents comprehensibility), showing significant differences among levels. The responses imply that a slow rate speech could be required much more for the low level learners rather than the high level learners.

7) Restatement

Most participants (H: 100%, I: 81.33%, L: 71.4%) regarded restatement as a useful technique in TETE class (Table 8). In the aspect of contents comprehensibility, restatement was also considered a strategic method to promote the comprehensibility of learners, and it is especially more effective for learners with high level ($p < .05$, H: 93.6%, I: 75.6%, L: 56.3%).

8) Expansion

Expansion, supplementing learners' incomplete words or sentences, to help them understand contents in TETE class, was considered a useful technique according to English proficiency level (H: 100%, I: 85.3%, L: 76.2%) as Table 9 shows. Over 80% of participants according to a comprehensibility level responded that expansion could be an important strategic method to promote their understanding contents (H: 83%, I: 85.4%, L: 87.6%).

9) Error Correction

The strategy of error correction for understanding contents in TETE class was considered important by most participants (Table 10). However, the learners with low English proficiency perceived error correction more important than those with higher levels, showing significant differences ($p < .05$, H: 75%, I: 90.6%, L: 85.8%). In the aspect of contents comprehensibility, most participants (H: 87.3%, I: 87.8%, L: 93.8%) perceived error correction was an important technique for contents comprehension.

Table 7
Slow Speech

		Very important	Important	Mediocre	Hardly important	(p)
English Proficiency	H	2(25.0)	1(12.5)	3(37.5)	2(25.0)	27.344 (.000***)
	I	17(22.7)	38(50.7)	20(26.7)		
	L	6(28.6)	11(52.4)	4(19.0)		
Contents Comprehensibility	H	8(17.0)	18(38.3)	19(40.4)	2(4.3)	17.794 (.007**)
	I	9(22.0)	25(61.0)	7(17.1)		
	L	8(50.0)	7(43.8)	1(6.3)		

** p<.01, *** p<.001

Table 8
Restatement

		Very important	Important	Mediocre	Hardly important	Not important	(p)
English Proficiency	H	4(50.0)	4(50.0)				4.080 (.850)
	I	25(33.3)	36(48.0)	11(14.7)	2(2.7)	1(1.3)	
	L	7(33.3)	8(38.1)	5(23.8)	1(4.8)		
Contents Comprehensibility	H	19(40.4)	25(53.2)	1(2.1)	2(4.3)		18.829 (.016*)
	I	13(31.7)	18(43.9)	8(19.5)	1(2.4)	1(2.4)	
	L	4(25.0)	5(31.3)	7(43.8)			

* p<.05

Table 9
Expansion

		Very important	Important	Mediocre	(p)
English Proficiency	H	2(25.0)	6(75.0)		7.082 (.132)
	I	31(41.3)	33(44.0)	11(14.7)	
	L	11(52.4)	5(23.8)	5(23.8)	
Contents Comprehensibility	H	15(31.9)	24(51.1)	8(17.0)	4.156 (.385)
	I	20(48.8)	15(36.6)	6(14.6)	
	L	9(56.3)	5(31.3)	2(12.5)	

Table 10
Error Correction

		Very important	Important	Mediocre	Hardly important	(p)
English Proficiency	H	2(25.0)	4(50.0)	1(12.5)	1(12.5)	13.169 (.040*)
	I	34(45.3)	34(45.3)	7(9.3)		
	L	9(42.9)	9(42.9)	3(14.3)		
Contents Comprehensibility	H	21(44.7)	20(42.6)	5(10.6)	1(2.1)	2.154 (.905)
	I	16(39.0)	20(48.8)	5(12.2)		
	L	8(50.0)	7(43.8)	1(6.3)		

* $p < .05$

10) Command/Request

The majority of participants did not prefer the technique provided by command/request (H: 25%, I: 37.9%, L: 42.8% according to English proficiency level; H: 36.2%, I: 36.6%, L: 46.6% according to comprehensible level) as Table 11 shows. It implies that in a caretaker speech, mostly used for children, was not a worthwhile technique for college learners and not to be considered as a recommended technique in TETE class.

Table 11
Command/Request

		Very important	Important	Mediocre	Hardly important	Not important	(p)
English Proficiency	H		2(25.0)	5(62.5)		1(12.5)	5.573 (.695)
	I	9(12.2)	19(25.7)	37(50.0)	7(9.5)	2(2.7)	
	L	2(9.5)	7(33.3)	10(47.6)	2(9.5)		
Contents Comprehensibility	H	3(6.4)	14(29.8)	23(48.9)	5(10.6)	2(4.3)	4.614 (.798)
	I	6(14.6)	9(22.0)	21(51.2)	4(9.8)	1(2.4)	
	L	2(13.3)	5(33.3)	8(53.3)			

11) Imitation

In TETE class, the technique, imitation, which focuses on the form of sentences in order to facilitate learners' language production, was reviewed (Table 12). The result showed that approximately the half of the participants perceived the imitation important (H: 37.5%, I: 54.8%, L: 71.4% in English proficiency; H: 60.9%, I: 56%, L: 46.6% in contents comprehensibility).

Table 12

Imitation

		Very important	Important	Mediocre	Hardly important	Not important	(p)
English Proficiency	H	2(25.0)	1(12.5)	5(62.5)			7.433 (.491)
	I	16(21.9)	24(32.9)	25(34.2)	7(9.6)	1(1.4)	
	L	5(23.8)	10(47.6)	6(28.6)			
Contents Comprehensibility	H	15(32.6)	13(28.3)	15(32.6)	3(6.5)		7.728 (.460)
	I	6(14.6)	17(41.5)	15(36.6)	2(4.9)	1(2.4)	
	L	2(13.3)	5(33.3)	6(40.0)	2(13.3)		

12) Discussion/Small Group Activities

The question on the effectiveness of discussion and small group activities to develop sentence production in a meaningful situation was reviewed. The importance of discussion/small group activities was indicated by approximately the half of the participants (H: 37.5%, I: 60.2%, L: 57.2% in English proficiency; H: 63.1%, I: 53.7%, L: 53.4% in contents comprehensibility) as Table 13 shows.

Table 13

Discussion/Small Group Activities

		Very important	Important	Mediocre	Hardly important	Not important	(p)
English Proficiency	H	3(37.5)		4(50.0)		1(12.5)	12.136 (.145)
	I	12(16.4)	32(43.8)	24(32.9)	4(5.5)	1(1.4)	
	L	3(14.3)	9(42.9)	7(33.3)	2(9.5)		
Contents Comprehensibility	H	12(26.1)	17(37.0)	12(26.1)	3(6.5)	2(4.3)	8.077 (.426)
	I	5(12.2)	17(41.5)	17(41.5)	2(4.9)		
	L	1(6.7)	7(46.7)	6(40.0)	1(6.7)		

13) Instantaneous Translation into English

Whenever learners happen to utter Korean in TETE, the instructor translated Korean into English. Instantaneous translation into English in TETE class was favored by most participants (H: 87.5%, I: 76.4%, L: 89.5%; H: 81.4%, I: 80.0%, L: 75.1%) as Table 14 shows.

Table 14
Instantaneous Translation into English

		Very important	Important	Mediocre	Hardly important	Not important	(p)
English Proficiency	H	1(12.5)	6(75.0)	1(12.5)			5.700 (.681)
	I	21(29.2)	34(47.2)	15(20.8)	1(1.4)	1(1.4)	
	L	9(47.4)	8(42.1)	2(10.5)			
Contents Comprehensibility	H	14(32.6)	21(48.8)	8(18.6)			3.723 (.881)
	I	12(30.0)	20(50.0)	6(15.0)	1(2.5)	1(2.5)	
	L	5(31.3)	7(43.8)	4(25.0)			

In summary, learners believe that strategic methods such as previewing, English input with pictures/drawing and gesture, repetition, speaking speed, translation were important in TETE class for improving contents understanding. Especially, slow speech, repetition and error correction were highly regarded as effective teaching techniques for improving the ability of low level learners. Restatement technique was considered a worthwhile method especially for high level learners to facilitate comprehensible input during the instruction. On the other hand, command/request, a typical and widely used caretaker speech technique for children was not perceived as an effective method to develop the comprehensible input in TETE class by college level learners.

2. The Comparative Analysis According to Learner's Level of Proficiency and Comprehensibility

A research question 2, "Are there significant differences in teaching techniques in TETE according to learner's language proficiency?" was reviewed using the

techniques used in research question 1, "Which teaching techniques can make language features noticeable for comprehensible input in TETE?". Thirteen techniques were analyzed according to the level of English proficiency and contents comprehensibility of learners.

1) High Level Learners of English Proficiency/Comprehensibility

Participants with high English proficiency/comprehensibility replied about the importance of each technique in the following order as shown in Table 15 and 16.

Table 15

Perception on Teaching Techniques in TETE according to English Proficiency

100% - 90%	89% - 80%	79% - 70%	69% - 60%	59% -
•Restatement(100) •Expansion(100)	•Translation(87.5) •Using Korean(87.5)	•Gesture(75) •Repetition(75) •Correction(75)	•Picture/drawing (62.5) •Previewing (62.5)	•Slow speech(37.5) •Imitation(37.5) •Discussion(37.5) •Command (25)

Table 16

Perception on Teaching Techniques in TETE according to Contents Comprehensibility

100% - 90%	89% - 80%	79% - 70%	69% - 60%	59% -
•Restatement(93.6)	•Repetition(89.4) •Error correction(87.3) •Previewing(85.1) •Expansion(83) •English only(83) •Translation(81.4)	•Gesture (70.2)	•Discussion (63.1) •Imitation (60.9)	•Slow speech(55.3) •Picture/drawing(53.2) •Command(36.2)

High level learners of proficiency and comprehensibility considered a restatement as the primary technique for comprehensible input (100% in English proficiency, 93.6% in contents comprehensibility). Next, expansion (100%, 83%), repetition (75%, 89.4%), being assisted by Korean (87.5%), English-only (83%), translation (87.5%, 81.4%), and error correction (75%, 87.3%) were considered

important for comprehensible input. However, command was not considered as an important technique (25%, 36.2%).

2) Intermediate Level of English Proficiency/Comprehensibility

Intermediate level learners of English proficiency/comprehensibility replied in the following order as shown in Tables 17 and 18.

Table 17

Perception on Teaching Techniques in TETE according to English Proficiency

100% - 90%	89% - 80%	79% - 70%	69% - 60%	59% -
•Repetition(91.9)	•Expansion(85.3)	•Using English(77)	•Picture (60.8)	•Imitation (54.8)
•Error Correction(90.6)	•Previewing(85.1)	•Translation(76.4)	•Discussion	•Command
	•Restatement(81.3)	•Slow speech(73.4)	(60.2)	(37.9)
		•Gesture(72.9)		

Table 18

Perception on Teaching Techniques in TETE according to Contents

Comprehensibility

100% - 90%	89% - 80%	79% - 70%	69% - 60%	59% -
	•Error correction(87.8)			
	•Previewing(85.4)	•Using Korean(77.5)	•Gesture(65.9)	•Imitation(56.1)
•Repetition (92.7)	•Expansion(85.4)	•Restatement(75.6)		•Discussion(53.7)
	•speech(83)	•Picture(73.2)		•Command(36.6)
	•Translation(80.0)			

Like high level groups of proficiency and comprehensibility, repetition was considered as a very important strategic method in each group of learners (91.9% in English proficiency, 92.7% in contents comprehensibility). Other important techniques were error correction (90.6%, 87.8%), previewing (85.1%, 85.4%), expansion (85.3%, 85.4%), and translation into English whenever a learner happens to utter Korean (76.4%, 80%). In addition, like high level groups, there were high percentage of responses that command was not regarded important in both proficiency and comprehensibility levels of learners (37.9%, 36.6%).

3) Low Level of English Proficiency/Comprehensibility

Low level learners of English proficiency/comprehensibility showed in the following order as shown in Table 19 and 20.

Table 19

Perception on Teaching Techniques in TETE according to English Proficiency

100% - 90%	89% - 80%	79% - 70%	69% - 60%	59% -
• Repetition(100)	• Translation(89.5) • Error correction(85.8) • Previewing(85.7) • Slow speech(81) • Using English (80.9)	• Expansion(76.2) • Picture(71.5) • Restatement(71.4) • Imitation(71.4)	• Gesture (61.9)	• Discussion(57.2) • Command(46.6)

Table 20

Perception on Teaching Techniques in TETE according to Contents Comprehensibility

100% - 90%	89% - 80%	79% - 70%	69% -60%	59% -
• Repetition(100)	• Expansion (87.6)	• Translation(75.1)	• Picture(66.7)	• Restatement(56.3) • Discussion(53.4) • Command(46.6) • Imitation(46.6)
• Using Korean(100)	• Gesture (86.7)	• Previewing(73.4)		
• Slow speech(93.8)				
• Error correction (93.8)				

Being similar to high and intermediate English proficiency and comprehensibility levels, repetition (100% in English proficiency, 100% in English comprehensibility) was a highly recommended technique for English production. Instead of English-only class, being assisted by Korean (80.9%, 100%), error correction (85.8%, 93.8%), and slow speech (81%, 93.8%) were perceived as useful techniques. Precisely, for low level learners, the recommended teaching method for instructors was slow speech (81%, 93.8%). Adult learners in high/intermediate levels of English proficiency and comprehensibility didn't support the importance of command during the English instructions.

V. CONCLUSION

Developing communicative language ability is the goal of our English language education in the global society these days. In order to achieve the goal, various

attempts have been made including the administrative encouragement for the implementation of the TETE class, which requires the teacher to use the target language exclusively and does not allow the students to use their native language. However, the teacher's use of target language itself does not guarantee the development of the students' communicative language ability, unless the appropriate classroom techniques are employed.

In the view of learners' perception about teaching techniques affecting TETE, the following conclusion can be drawn. Students' English proficiency should be regarded for English-only class or the class partially supported by their native language. Classes which are supported by their native language are more reasonable for low English proficiency students.

Some of the features of the caretaker speech could be adopted in TETE, and yet might be applied in a slightly different way according to students' English proficiency. Previewing, pictures/drawing, gesture, repetition, restatement, error correction and translating Korean into English are good teaching techniques in TETE for comprehensible input which were required by both high and low proficiency levels in this research. Among them, slow speech and error correction were techniques which were required much more for the low English proficiency, while restatement was for the learners with high English proficiency. The command among the techniques was not favored by all levels.

Despite the contributions of this study to research on TETE, several limitations of this study need to be addressed for the future research. First of all, it was conducted by only one instructor. A small number of learners participated in this study. Larger data collected from more diverse populations of EFL learners need to be included in the statistical analysis. Also, the proficiency was only on the base of self-assessed evaluation. Taking these limitations into account, the above things should be considered in future studies.

REFERENCES

- Bragger, J. D. (1985). The development of oral proficiency. In A. C. Omaggio (Ed.), *Proficiency, curriculum, articulation: The ties that bind* (pp. 41-75).

- Middlebury, VT: The Northeast Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Language.
- Cha, M. & Narang, V. (2008). Factors in development of language teaching methods. *Modern English Education*, 9(2), 1-20.
- Ellis, R. (1994). *The study of second language acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ellis, R., Basturkman, H., & Loewen, S. (2001). Preemptive focus on form in the classroom. *TESOL Quarterly*, 35(3), 407-432.
- Fotos, S. S. (1994). Integrating tasks for grammar instruction and communicative language use through grammar consciousness-raising tasks. *TESOL Quarterly*, 28(2), 323-351.
- Kang, Soyeon & Park, Hyeson. (2005). English as the medium of instruction in Korean engineering education. *Korean Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 21(1), 155-174.
- Kim, Sung-Ae. (2007). The quality of language input as revealed in teacher talks and classroom activities. *Modern English Education*, 8(3), 85-100.
- Krashen, S. (1982). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*. London: Pergamon.
- Krashen, S. (1985). *The input hypothesis: Issues and implications*. New York: Longman.
- Lee, Jin-Hwa. (2007). Where to start teaching English through English: Based on perceived effectiveness of teachers' English use. *English Teaching*, 62(4), 335-354.
- Long, M. (1991). Focus on form: A design feature in language teaching methodology. In K. de Bot, R. Ginsberg, & C. Kramsch (Eds.), *Foreign language research in cross-cultural perspective* (pp. 39-52). Amsterdam: John Benjamin.
- Pica, T. (2002). Subject-matter content: How does it assist the interactional and linguistic needs of classroom language learners? *Modern Language Journal*, 86(1), 1-19.
- Swain, M. (1985). Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensive output in its development. In S. Gass & C.

Madden (Eds.), *Input in second language acquisition* (pp. 235-253).
Rowley, MA: Newbury.

Swain, M. (1988). Manipulating and complementing content teaching to maximize second language learning. *TESL Canada Journal*, 6(1), 68-83.

APPENDIX

Questionnaires

1. Gender () 2. Age ()
3. My English Proficiency Level : Upper () / Average() /Low()
4. Contents Comprehensibility of the Course:
High () /Upper-intermediate() /Average() /Lower-intermediate() /Low()

1. How much should Korean be included in English teaching for the development of English communicative ability?

VI I M HI NI

(1) English only

(2) Whenever changing a topic

(3) For every sentence

VI: Very Important, I: Important, M: Mediocre, HI: Hardly Important, NI: Not Important

2-13. How much do you think the following items are important for the contents comprehensibility which enhances the development of English communicative ability in TETE?

VI I M HI NI

2. Previewing

3. Pictures/Drawing

4. Gesture

5. Repetition

6. Slow Rate Speech

7. Restatement

8. Expansion

9. Error Correction

10. Command/Request

11. Imitation

12. Discussion

13. Translation into English

Myeong-Hee Seong
Dept of Leisure Design
Eulji University
212 Yangji-dong Sujeong-gu
Seongnam-si, Gyeonggi-do, 461-713, Korea
Tel: 031-740-7255
Email: seong@eulji.ac.kr

Hyung-ji Chang
Dept of General Studies, TESOL
Sun Moon University
100 Kalsan-ri Tangeon-myeon
Asan-si, Chungnam, 336-708, Korea
Tel: 041-530-2488
Email: maria07@sunmoon.ac.kr

Received 7 February 2009

Reviewed 14 February 2009

Revised version received 5 April 2009