

How Do College Students React to TETE?*

Myonghee Kim

Sookmyung Women's University

Kim, Myonghee. (2009). How do college students react to TETE? *Modern English Education*, 10(3), 62-89.

The purpose of this study has been three-fold: to explore college students' overall reaction to TETE; to investigate any differences in the student reaction according to language proficiency level; to examine instructional, interactional strategies that the students perceived as useful in TETE. Data were collected through a questionnaire and interviews involving 37 freshmen enrolled in two classes. Data analysis showed that the students' overall perception of TETE were positive, particularly about 'increased opportunities to get exposed to language input,' 'to learn language naturally,' and 'to develop listening skills.' Regarding group differences, the high proficiency group showed more positive reaction at the significantly different level to 'enhanced interest in the English language,' 'psychologically shortened distance to English,' and 'willingness to take more TETE courses in the future.' As beneficial instructional strategies, the students chose small group activities, the professor's discursive practices, such as elaboration, exemplification, paraphrasing, and code-switching. Based on the findings, the present study offers considerations for better TETE courses and also future studies. (165 words)

[TETE/CBI/student perception
/영어로 하는 영어수업/내용중심교수법/학생인식]

I. INTRODUCTION

As English is widely used as the global language, teaching English through

* This study was supported by the Faculty Research Grant of Sookmyung Women's University in 2008.

English (TETE) is gaining prominence in Korea. Since the Ministry of Education announced the TETE policy in 2001, TETE has increasingly occurred at all school levels—from elementary to postsecondary schools. Currently, Korean English teachers are strongly recommended to use English for instruction. This change has been partially driven by the focus on the development of language learners' communicative competence.

Since the late 1970s, communicative language teaching (CLT) has been the motto in the field of language education. With the view that language primarily serves communicative functions, language education shifted its focus toward enhancing learners' ability to use language for communicative purposes. TETE instruction can be understood as a type of content-based instruction (CBI), which is one of the dominant, prevalent approaches grounded in CLT. In CBI courses, learners receive content instruction through the medium of the language being learned.

Previous studies of CBI in Korea can be categorized into several groups according to the focus of the study. The first line of research investigated comparative effectiveness of English-medium instruction and Korean-medium instruction. Eun-Ju Kim's study (2003), for example, showed that the students' interest and motivation were higher in English-medium courses than in Korean-medium ones. However, the English-medium students experienced greater difficulties in certain types of classroom participation (e.g., small group discussion, oral presentation, and small group activities), asking and answering questions, and listening. In a study that examined students' course evaluations on 72 courses, Jihyeon Chun (2002) reported that student reactions in both types of courses showed no significant differences except for the area of the study load. English-medium students felt that the study load was heavier than their counterparts.

The second line of research investigated how teachers working at elementary through high school settings perceived the TETE instruction. In a study involving middle school teachers, for instance, Young-in Moon and Kyu-seon Lee (2002) reported that the teachers had negative perceptions about TETE. Sung-Yeon Kim (2002) analyzed teacher responses according to the level of the school where they teach, years of teaching experiences, and the frequency of English use. One of

the significant findings is that the more frequently the teachers used English, the lower anxiety and more positive attitudes they had toward TETE.

Another line examined learners' reaction toward CBI at the college level. Overall, the studies produced mixed results. Jong-Bai Hwang's study (2002) reported that students showed positive reaction to CBI. The learners' anxiety decreased significantly over the semester. AeJin Kang (2007) also reported that students were highly interested and motivated in CBI courses. However, Young-Sook Shim (2006) reported negative voices of 23 college students taking English-medium courses based on the interviews. The students generally agreed that although English-medium courses may be beneficial, changes and improvement were necessary to achieve the intended course objectives. The students' uneasiness with English-medium instruction was reportedly caused by several factors, including an emphasis placed on English itself at the cost of the acquisition of content knowledge, students' lack of English ability, and instructors' nonnative-like proficiency in English.

The present study, an extension of the earlier studies of CBI, particularly the third line of research, explores Korean college students' perception of TETE while partially addressing the following gaps in the literature. First, the previous studies examined the students' perception irrespective of their proficiency level. However, it is assumable that the differences in language proficiency may lead to different reaction. The present study will investigate how differently college students perceive TETE depending on their level of English proficiency. In addition, this study intends to address the need for more information on the students' perception of TETE. Earlier, Young-Sook Shim (2006) pointed out that the voices of students attending CBI courses have not been sufficiently heard. With the current trend of a sharp increase in CBI and also their expected potential for language learning, extensive and in-depth information grounded in many empirical studies is needed. How do the students interpret their learning experiences in TETE courses? What values do they see in TETE? What instructional or interactional practices do they perceive as useful and meaningful? Answers to these questions will serve for the design and implementation of sound TETE. Finally, many of the studies in this area used questionnaire as the sole method of data collection. It is likely that questionnaire will miss many important aspects of

student perception, which are hard to describe in numbers. In order to capture a wider spectrum of student responses in greater detail, the present study will use both questionnaire and interviews.

Given the need for more research studies from varying perspectives, this study asks the following research questions:

- 1) Overall, how did the students perceive TETE?
- 2) Did the students perceive TETE differently depending on the English proficiency levels?
- 3) What instructional, interactional strategies did the students perceive as useful?

II. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

TETE, which is the focus of the present study, is grounded in three theoretical underpinnings: Input hypothesis, CLT, and CBI.

1. Input Hypothesis

Krashen (1982) claimed that one acquires language only by receiving sufficient amount of comprehensible input. According to Krashen, comprehensible input is “the only true cause of second language acquisition” (1984, p. 61). Only when input contains structures and forms that are a little bit beyond the learner’s current level of language development (i.e., $i+1$ in Krashen’s terms) is the input comprehensible to learners and beneficial to their language learning. In other words, only the language, most of which is understandable to learners, but which is still challenging, can contribute to language acquisition. In contrast, too difficult input, which is far beyond the learner’s current level (i.e., $i+2$), is overwhelming while too easy input, which does not contain any structures to learn (i.e., $i+0$), is not challenging at all. Thus, these types of input do not lead to language acquisition.

Krashen's Input hypothesis gives theoretical support to the TETE instruction. It

is well known that in English as a foreign language (EFL) context, most of the language learners are not sufficiently exposed to language input in a natural way. One of the premises of TETE is that such type of instruction can provide much language input for students. In a TETE class, students can receive extensive amount of language input from the instructors naturally. According to the Input hypothesis, meanwhile, comprehensible input will lead to language acquisition. Considering that language classroom is one of the places where the EFL learners can get much input, TETE deserves attention.

2. Communicative Language Teaching (CLT)

CLT is an approach that views language as communication and thus aims to develop communicative competence. In the mid 1960s, structure-oriented approaches, such as grammar translation method and audiolingualism, which focused on the mastery of sentence-level grammar, were largely rejected (Larsen-Freeman, 2000) because of their failure to prepare learners for spontaneous, contextualized language use. Instead, since 1970s, language teaching field has focused on communicative proficiency or communicative, functional dimension of language. In the process, a comprehensive approach to language teaching—CLT—has gradually emerged.

Influences on the development of CLT have come from several directions. Hymes (1967, 1972), for example, highlighted the need for focusing on language usage in context, not on abstract features of language in an ideal situation as reflected in the Chomsky's notion (1965) of competence. To Hymes, communicative competence includes knowledge of appropriate and effective as well as correct language behavior for certain communicative goals. In Britain, Halliday (1973, 1978) focused on functions that language performs, such as requesting, complaining, apologizing, and greeting. He also highlighted the language use and importance of context. Such functional descriptions of language heavily influenced the development of notional-functional syllabus by Wilkins (1976). Notional-functional syllabuses are the ones organized surrounding notions (e.g., friendship, peace, negotiation) and functions (e.g., praising, introducing) that language learners are expected to learn to express. Later, Canale and Swain

(1980) explained communicative competence in terms of four dimensions: grammatical competence, sociolinguistic competence, discourse competence, and strategic competence. In this view, grammatical competence which used to receive the single most attention was relegated to the position as 'one' of the components of communicative competence. Each of the ideas discussed so far has made contribution to the emergence and prominence of CLT to varying degrees.

Richards and Rodgers (2001) claim that CLT is best viewed not as a teaching method but as an approach that shares many features with several different teaching methods, including task-based language teaching, CBI, and cooperative language learning. Nonetheless, language classes guided by CLT have some features in common, such as activities that require frequent interaction, use of authentic texts and communication activities linked to "real-world" contexts, and learner-centered approaches (Wesche & Skehan, 2002).

Importantly, Howatt (1984) made a distinction between 'strong' and 'weak' versions of CLT. Weak forms of CLT incorporate practice of language forms for expressing certain language functions. A set of classroom practices are used to explicitly describe relationships between forms and functions. Nonetheless, however, form-based activities for their own sake are rejected. In contrast, strong versions of CLT are based on the assumption that language learners develop communicative competence by communicating with others in that language. Consequently, instruction is organized surrounding situations, materials, or tasks that require communicative language use. CBI, which will be discussed below, is an example of this strong form of CLT.

3. Content-Based Instruction (CBI)

CBI is one of the relatively recent approaches to language instruction that conform to CLT principles (Weshe & Skehan, 2002). Since Mohan (1986) first explicitly proposed CBI in the 1980s, CBI has gained wide prominence over the past four decades. Mohan claimed that "What is needed is an integrative approach which relates language learning and content learning, considers language as a medium of learning, and acknowledges the role of context in communication" (p. 1).

What CBI specifically entails has been the topic of discussion (Snow, 2005). In spite of various definitions and types of CBI proposed, however, it has a couple of distinct features. First of all, learners in CBI environments learn academic content and language at the same time. According to Wesche and Skehan (2002), "learners in some sense receive 'two for one,' that is, content knowledge and increased language proficiency" (p. 221). Second, content is an organizing principle of a CBI course. Its fundamental organization comes from subject matter, not language forms or functions. Third, CBI creates a natural context in which learners process and use the target language meaningfully. The learners constantly encounter language forms and convey concepts through the language. Meanwhile, context gives meaning and also communicative value to the language embedded in it, without which language items practiced are mostly abstractions (Snow, Met, & Genesee, 1989).

To date the literature has documented the benefits of CBI with respect to language learning. Most of all, it is well recognized that CBI maximizes learners' exposure to the contextualized language by providing language input in the form of academic content (Wesch & Skehan, 2002). As mentioned earlier, this benefit is appealing particularly to EFL learners because they generally lack language input. In addition, CBI can provide the motivating purpose for language learning (Richards & Rodgers, 2001). In CBI courses, learners generally have urgent needs for content learning. They are aware that successful content learning can be achieved with the support of appropriate language competence. This awareness can motivate the students for learning language as a necessary tool. In the meantime, many empirical studies lent support to the above-mentioned conceptualized benefits, particularly as reflected in the improvement of the content knowledge and of the written and oral production of grammatical forms (e.g., Rodgers, 2006), enhanced speaking and listening skills (e.g., Hye-Sook Park, 2006), increased interest and confidence in English (e.g., AeJin Kang, 2007), and enhanced motivation and production skills (e.g., DongHo Kang, 2008).

Like CLT, CBI has its own 'stronger' and 'weaker' forms (Wesche & Skehan, 2002). Stronger forms include content courses in nonlanguage disciplines, such as psychology and history. The primary goal of these courses is the mastery of content knowledge (Brinton, Snow, & Wesch, 1989). Because of this feature, Met

(1998) called the stronger forms content-driven approaches. This form of CBI courses generally proceeds without conscious, systematic language instruction. On the other hand, the weaker forms of CBI include language courses whose primary goal is the development of language proficiency through learning about some information. This weaker form is a language-driven approach in Met's words. Seen in terms of this distinction, the TETE courses where the present study was conducted are weaker forms of CBI. Met envisioned a continuum of all CBI forms where stronger forms or content-driven approaches such as total immersion are placed on one extreme and weaker forms or language-driven approaches such as TETE courses on the other. Other forms of CBI fall somewhere along the continuum.

III. METHODOLOGY

1. Context of the Study

The present study was conducted in an English reading course for freshmen titled *Reading and Discussion* at a women's university. This course is one of the mandatory General English Program (GEP) courses of the university. The primary purpose of the GEP courses is to enhance students' overall English proficiency.

All the freshmen of the university are required to take the *Reading and Discussion* course in their first semester. Approximately 30 classes of the course are offered in one semester. All the sections use the same required textbook developed by the textbook committee of the university according to the school policy. Regarding the instructor, most professors are native speakers of English, but a few of them are Koreans.

Two classes participated in this study: one class identified as a high proficiency group and the other as a low proficiency one. For the *Reading and Discussion* course, a class is generally composed of the students majoring in the same academic discipline. The two classes where this study took place were different in terms of the student major. And it turned out that the classes showed great differences in the students' English proficiency level. Both classes were taught by

the same professor who conducted this research study.

In the class, English was used to teach English. Students read reading materials and worked with vocabulary words and grammar. Students were also sometimes involved in communicative activities both in small groups and in whole group settings. For example, the students talked about a picture that they had brought to the class in small groups. They conducted interviews with each other about their family members.

2. Participants

A total of 37 female freshmen participated in this study: 20 in a high proficiency class and 17 in a low proficiency class.

In order to judge whether the two groups of students are validly heterogeneous in terms of their English proficiency, the present study conducted independent samples t-tests using the scores of the mid-term exam, final exam, and their combination respectively. The significance level was set at .05. Results of the t-test show that the group differences are statistically significant in all the three situations. Based on this, I labeled one class as high proficiency group and the other as low proficiency group. Table 1 summarizes mean scores, standard deviations of the two groups, t-scores, and p-values.

Table 1
Group Differences in the Test Scores

Exam	Group	Mean	SD	t	p
Mid-term	Low	52.14	18.02	7.36	0.00
	High	85.79	10.70		
Final	Low	41.33	22.91	7.10	0.00
	High	82.36	13.30		
Total	Low	36.74	10.84	7.65	0.00
	High	84.07	19.57		

A total of 27 students (73%) from the two classes answered that they had previous experiences in taking TETE courses before they entered the university.

Most of them reported that their previous TETE experiences had happened in their high schools or language institutes. Regarding overseas learning experiences, 7 students (22%) answered 'yes.'

3. Data Collection

Data for this study were collected through a questionnaire and interviews. The questionnaire (See Appendix 1) was administered among the students on the last day of the spring semester, 2008. I asked the students to complete the survey anonymously and made it sure that the result would not affect their course grade at all.

There were three sections in the questionnaire. In the first part, two questions asked about the students' previous TETE experiences and also overseas learning experiences. In the second section, 15 items were designed to measure the students' perceptions of their experiences in the TETE courses. The items were on a 5-point Likert scale, ranging from *strongly disagree* to *strongly agree*. Students rated 1 for *strongly disagree* and 5 for *strongly agree*. In the last section of the questionnaire were four open-ended questions, three of which asked about the types of instructional strategies that worked well for the students.

After the whole course was completed, I conducted interviews with 14 students: seven students from the high proficiency group and seven from the low group. In the classes, I asked for volunteers for an interview and the vast majority of the students volunteered. However, I eventually interviewed only 14 students of the two classes (i.e., seven students from the high group and seven from the low group) because during the interview process I realized that the students' responses were similar in many aspects and that it yielded recurrent themes. Interviews were conducted in my office and tape-recorded. For the interviews, I used semi-structured interview questions (See Appendix 2).

4. Data Analysis

For the first part of the questionnaire (i.e., students' previous TETE and overseas learning experiences), frequency analysis was conducted. The result of

the analysis was already reported in the section about participants above. For the second part of the questionnaire (i.e., 15 items about the perceptions of their TETE experiences), mean score and standard deviation for each item were first calculated for the two groups together to identify the students' overall reaction. Then, independent samples t-test was conducted to see whether there were any statistically significant group differences on each of the 15 items. All statistical analyses were done using SPSS. The significance level was set up at .05. Answers to four open-ended questions were analyzed in terms of any thematic topics. Regarding the interview data, I read the transcripts repeatedly and analyzed the content for recurrent themes about their TETE experiences and instructional strategies that they perceived useful. The results of the data analysis were compared and contrasted with each other for an accurate explanation of the student responses to TETE.

IV. FINDINGS

1. Students' Overall Perception of TETE

In order to examine students' overall perception of TETE, mean score of each item from the combined group was calculated, as mentioned earlier. Regarding the level of anxiety in a TETE course compared with regular courses, the student response was somewhat close to neutral ($M=3.05$). Meanwhile, responses to an open-ended question (i.e., Question 18 *What kinds of difficulties/problems did you have in the TETE course?*) provided the information on the possible sources of the anxiety. The majority of the students reported that they were particularly nervous about language use - asking and talking in English. They were also afraid that they might not catch up with the TETE instruction. Then, in response to Question 4 *As time went by, anxiety gradually decreased*, the students showed moderate agreement ($M=3.41$). Table 2 illustrates these results.

With regard to their experiences in small group work, as Table 3 shows, the students generally agreed that they experienced less anxiety about speaking in small group settings than in whole group settings ($M=3.84$).

Table 2
Overall Reaction to Anxiety in TETE

Item	Mean	SD
3. I felt anxious in a TETE course, compared with regular courses.	3.05	1.13
4. As time went by, anxiety gradually decreased.	3.41	1.04

Table 3
Overall Perception of Small Group Activity

Item	Mean	SD
5. Speaking in small group caused less anxiety than speaking in a whole class setting.	3.84	0.93

Many of the students interviewed talked similarly about that experience. In an interview, for example, Minju said as follows:

At ordinary situations, we do not have any chances to speak in English. But small group activities gave us opportunities to talk freely. I was not that nervous when talking in small groups. And I felt I was getting better as I kept speaking in small groups though sentences were frequently ungrammatical. (06/25/2008, low proficiency group)

This finding is in line with the results of many research studies of small group work (e.g., Long, Adams, McLean, & Castaños, 1976; Long & Porter, 1985; Pica, 1994; Pica & Doughty, 1985). Values of small group work have long been documented in the field of language education. In their seminal work on small group activity, Long and Porter (1985), for example, discussed the values in terms of five dimensions: increased language practice opportunities, improved quality of student talk, individualized instruction available, a positive affective climate, and enhanced motivation for learning.

The present study examined the students' perceived benefits of TETE in terms of 11 aspects. There was a range of attitudes toward potential of TETE. Mean scores of eight areas (*increased opportunities to get exposed to English, development of overall English skills, enhancing speaking skills, enhancing*

listening skills, opportunities to learn English more naturally, enhanced interest in the English language, increased motivation for English study, less distance to English) were higher than 3 while those of the remaining three areas (*development of vocabulary knowledge, enhancing interest in the culture of English-speaking countries, increase in the level of concentration on the lesson*) were not. Table 4 shows the results.

Table 4
Overall Perception of the Benefits of TETE

Item	Mean	SD
6. TETE provides more opportunities to get exposed to English.	3.97	0.99
7. TETE contributes to the development of overall English proficiency.	3.51	1.12
8. TETE contributes to the development of speaking skills.	3.35	1.03
9. TETE contributes to the development of listening skills	3.69	0.82
10. TETE contributes to the development of vocabulary knowledge.	2.76	0.89
11. TETE contributes to learning English naturally.	3.62	0.92
12. TETE contributes to enhancing interest in English.	3.16	0.96
13. TETE contributes to enhancing interest in the culture of English-speaking countries.	2.95	1.08
14. TETE increases motivation for studying English.	3.17	1.00
15. TETE increases the level of concentration on the lesson.	2.97	1.14
16. TETE contributes to shortening the psychological distance to English.	3.41	0.93

The present study identified three most-highly-valued and three least-valued benefits respectively. The most-highly-valued ones were *increased opportunities to get exposed to English* (M=3.97), *development of listening skills* (M=3.69), and *opportunities to learn English more naturally* (M=3.62) in a decreasing order. Significantly, these three benefits resemble the underlying assumption of CBI: CBI will provide extensive language input in context, which will facilitate the process

of natural language learning. Meanwhile, the students disagreed, albeit slightly, on the *development of vocabulary knowledge* (M=2.76), *enhanced interest in the culture of English-speaking countries* (M=2.95), and *increased concentration level* (M=2.97). In particular, the students' not-that-positive response to the enhanced interest in the culture of English-speaking countries is consistent with Kramsch's claim (1993) that culture learning does not automatically happen in a language class. As Kramsch suggested, even in a TETE class where students were extensively exposed to the target language, their interest in the target culture may not have been aroused sufficiently. Considering that language and culture are inseparable, it may be necessary to incorporate cultural elements into a lesson. Besides, cultural components can provide substantial, interesting topics to engage students (Enright & McCloskey, 1985), which may then enable them to communicate in English for meaningful purposes.

As for the possibility of taking future TETE courses (i.e., Question 17 *I would like to take more TETE courses in the future*), the students showed somewhat favorably disposed response (M=3.65). Table 5 shows the result.

Table 5
Overall Reaction to Future TETE Courses

Item	Mean	SD
17. I would like to take more TETE courses in the future.	3.65	1.23

2. Group Differences in the Students' Perception of TETE

To answer this question, responses of the two groups were compared. Regarding the anxiety level (i.e., Question 3), the students in the low proficiency group experienced slightly more anxiety than those in the high proficiency group (M=3.12 for low group vs. M=3.00 for high group) as shown in Table 6. To look at the group differences in terms of percentage, in the low group, 12 percent of the students rated *strongly disagree*, 12 *disagree*, 35 *neither disagree nor agree*, 35 *agree*, and 6 *strongly agree* whereas in the high proficiency group 5 percent rated *strongly disagree*, 35 *disagree*, 30 *neither disagree nor agree*, 15 *agree*, and 15 *strongly agree*. 40 percent of the students in the low group

answered they had felt more anxious in TETE courses whereas 30 percent in the high group answered so. However, the results of t-test show that the differences are not statistically significant.

With respect to Question 4 *the anxiety gradually decreased over time*, the high proficiency group rated it as a little higher than its corresponding group (M=3.50 for high group vs. M=3.29 for low group). It could mean that high proficiency students dealt with their anxiety in TETE more successfully over time. But these differences were not statistically significant as shown in Table 6.

Table 6
Group Differences in the Level of Anxiety

Item	Group	Mean	SD	t	p
3. I felt anxious in a TETE course, compared with regular courses.	Low	3.12	1.11	0.31	0.76
	High	3.00	1.17		
4. As time went by, anxiety gradually decreased.	Low	3.29	0.85	-0.60	0.56
	High	3.50	1.19		

Regarding small group activities, as Table 7 shows, both groups of students showed somewhat favorable reactions (M=3.64 for low group; M=4.00 for high group). They reported that they had experienced less anxiety in speaking in small groups than in whole class situations. As for the group differences, although the mean score of the high proficiency group was higher, there was no statistically significant difference.

Table 7
Group Differences in the Perception of Small Group Activity

Item	Group	Mean	SD	t	p
5. Speaking in small group caused less anxiety than speaking in a whole class setting.	Low	3.64	1.06	-1.16	0.26
	High	4.00	0.79		

In respect of the potential benefits of TETE, as shown in Table 8, examination of group differences revealed that the high proficiency group rated all of areas provided as higher than the low proficiency group, except for one (i.e., Question

6 TETE provides more opportunities to get exposed to English). However, only two of the benefits showed statistically significant differences: *enhanced interest in the English language* ($t=2.07$, $p=0.04$); *psychologically shortened distance to English* ($t=3.14$, $p=0.003$). The high proficiency students perceived TETE more helpful in arousing interest in English and making them feel close to it.

Table 8
Group Differences in the Perception of the Values of TETE

Item	Group	Mean	SD	t	p
6. TETE provides more opportunities to get exposed to English.	Low	4.00	0.94	0.15	0.88
	High	3.95	1.05		
7. TETE contributes to the development of overall English proficiency.	Low	3.47	1.18	-0.21	0.83
	High	3.55	1.10		
8. TETE contributes to the development of speaking skills.	Low	3.12	1.11	-1.28	0.21
	High	3.55	0.94		
9. TETE contributes to the development of listening skills	Low	3.69	0.87	-0.05	0.97
	High	3.70	0.80		
10. TETE contributes to the development of vocabulary knowledge.	Low	2.53	1.07	-1.45	0.16
	High	2.95	0.69		
11. TETE contributes to learning English naturally.	Low	3.53	0.87	-0.56	0.58
	High	3.70	0.98		
12. TETE contributes to enhancing interest in English.	Low	2.80	0.88	-2.07	0.04
	High	3.45	0.94		
13. TETE contributes to enhancing interest in the culture of English-speaking countries.	Low	2.76	1.03	-0.94	0.35
	High	3.10	1.12		
14. TETE increases motivation for studying English.	Low	2.88	1.02	-1.60	0.12
	High	3.40	0.94		
15. TETE increases the level of concentration on the lesson.	Low	2.88	1.17	-0.44	0.66
	High	3.05	1.15		
16. TETE contributes to shortening the psychological distance to English.	Low	2.94	0.83	-3.14	0.003
	High	3.80	0.83		

Data analysis identified the three most positive and the three least positive responses of the two groups respectively. The low proficiency group showed the most positive responses toward *increased opportunities to get exposed to English*

(M=4.00), *development of listening skills* (M=3.69), and *opportunities to learn English more naturally* (M=3.53) in a lessening order. The mean score of the *increased opportunities to get exposed to English* was 4.00, which was the highest of all the responses in that group. Interestingly, the high proficiency group showed similar reactions to the three aspects (M=3.95, M=3.70, M=3.70 respectively). Meanwhile, with respect to the least positive responses, in the low proficiency group, the mean score of *improvement of vocabulary knowledge* was lowest at 2.53, followed by *enhanced interest in the culture of English-speaking countries* at 2.76, and then *enhanced interest in the English language* at 2.80. In the high proficiency group, *improvement of vocabulary knowledge* was also ranked as the lowest (M=2.95). *increased level of concentration* and *enhanced interest in the culture of English-speaking countries* were ranked as the second and the third lowest at 3.05 and 3.10 respectively.

In response to Question 17 *I would like to take more TETE courses in the future*, as Table 9 shows, both groups rated it as higher than 3 points (M=3.18 for low group vs. M=4.05 for high group). In particular, the students in the high group considered the possibility very positively as reflected in the mean score of 4.05. This score is the highest of all the means obtained in the questionnaire. It implied that the high proficiency students are pretty convinced of the value of TETE in their language learning process and choose to take more TETE courses in the future. The results of t-test show that there are significant differences between the groups.

Table 9
Group Differences in the Reaction to Future TETE Courses

Item	Group	Mean	SD	t	p
17. I would like to take more TETE courses in the future.	Low	3.18	1.33	-2.28	0.03
	High	4.05	1.00		

Regarding this possibility, Sojin made a following comment in the interview:

Living in Korea, it's hard to express myself in English. I figure out how to speak in my brain but it doesn't come out of my mouth. But in a TETE class, we are required to speak so we have opportunities to use English even though it is just a simple word. I think I will take more English-medium courses.

(06/23/2008, high proficiency group)

In this section, results of the data analysis were presented regarding the students' differentiated reaction to TETE depending on their proficiency level. Putting students in a TETE course does not automatically guarantee successful language learning. To better serve both low proficient and high proficient students, serious instructional attempts need to be made. The following section may provide several useful clues.

3. Students' Preferred Instructional, Interactional Strategies

In order to answer this question, responses to open-ended questions and interview data were examined for recurrent themes. Data analysis identified three themes relevant to this research question.

First, the students particularly favored pair or small group work. In the questionnaire, the students reported that when working in pair or small group settings, they felt much less anxiety and enjoyed the activity. They even perceived the value of small group work as an opportunity to help each other. This result is consistent with the students' highly positive evaluation of small group work manifested in the analysis of the Likert-scaled items. As mentioned earlier, the high proficiency group rated their preference of small group work as $M=4.00$ and low proficiency group as $M=3.64$. This finding is supported by the interview data. All the students interviewed strongly agreed on the value of small group work. For example, Sojung said,

I enjoyed small group work a lot. When I had to talk in the whole class setting, I was scared of making mistakes and getting shameful. Sometimes I asked myself, 'what if other students would laugh at my mistakes?' 'what if other students' expressions are much better than mine?' However, in partner or small group work, I was much less scared and had more courage to express myself freely. Another good thing is that when I asked questions about words or idioms, group members frequently helped me and so I could make much better sentences. (06/15/2008, high proficiency group)

Sunjoon also made comments on the value of the peer help available. She said, "One of the benefits of small group work was to offer and receive feedback to each other on language performance and to have opportunities to discuss possible ways of expression together" (06/18/2008, low proficiency group). JungA talked about small group work from another perspective. "I liked small group work because I could get closer to classmates and enhance a sense of responsibility for learning" (06/19/2008, low proficiency group).

According to Krashen's affective filter hypothesis (1984), more effective language learning can take place when learners' affective filter, such as anxiety, tension, and nervousness, is lowered and thus they can learn in a more comfortable, anxiety-reduced environment. Reportedly, TETE instruction caused anxiety among the students, but pair and small group work contributed to lowering the anxiety level. Based on this finding, the present study recommends the judicious use of small group activities wherever appropriate.

Second, the students reported that several discursive practices of the professor's helped them to better perform in the TETE class. For example, they listed the use of easy, simple words, slow pace of speech, repetition, and exemplification. In an interview, Heeyeon said, "I could understand much better when the professor explained something using easier words or related expressions, such as synonyms and antonyms. Listening to the professor's simple and short sentences worked very well for me" (06/18/2008, high proficiency group).

Studies of the foreigner talk (e.g., Ferguson, 1971, 1975; Hatch, Shapira, & Wagner-Gough, 1978) reported that native speakers of a language tend to adjust their speech when communicating with non-native speakers, so that the language input may be comprehensible to the non-native speakers. The foreigner talk display characteristics, such as slow speech, simplification, regularization, and repetition. Significantly, the students in this study perceived such features that frequently appear in the foreigner talk as beneficial to their learning as well.

Teacher talk has a great impact on student learning (Baker, 1992; Bowers & Flinders, 1990; Cazden, 1988; Gibbons, 1998, 2003; Halls & Verplaetse, 2000; Myonghee Kim, 2009; Wells, 1993, 1996). How teacher talks in a class can shape the quantity and quality of student learning to a great extent. In a TETE class where students rely heavily on teacher's input in the target language for

their learning, the importance of teacher talk will get bigger.

Another point worth mentioning regarding the discursive practices is that about 47 percent of the students surveyed indicated that the professor's code-switching helped to promote their comprehension of the lesson content. Whether code-switching is beneficial or not is one of the issues under debate. And this question surely requires ongoing discussion and further research. However, this study points out that code-switching served as a facilitator of student learning at least in the TETE courses under study. This finding supports Sung-Ae Kim's (2002) claim that for effective TETE instruction, students' native language should be judiciously used.

Third, the students responded that the professor's interactional strategies helped to relieve their tension and motivated them to speak more. They pointed out the importance of creating comfortable environments where they could try language freely. In an interview, Yejin said, "I think the most important thing is to create comfortable, relaxing atmosphere where we can use English without great anxiety" (06/20/2008, low proficiency group). Again, this quote is a reflection of Krashen's Affective Filter hypothesis. With regard to specific ways to make it happen, some of the students mentioned that they felt comfortable when the professor gave them encouragement and compliments, called individual students' names, and also told jokes and personal stories. These interactional strategies helped to establish friendly relationships between the professor and the students, which may eventually stimulate the students for language practice.

V. DISCUSSION

The present study examined college students' overall perception of TETE and also differentiated perception according to their English proficiency level. This study also investigated instructional, interactional strategies that the students perceived as beneficial.

This study found out that the students recognized the potential of TETE to some extent. They perceived TETE as helpful, particularly with regard to 'increased opportunities to get exposed to English,' 'development of listening

skills,' and 'opportunities to learn English more naturally.' These three benefits reflect the theoretical foundations of CBI: by receiving extensive amount of language input presented in the format of content, students will be in acquisition-rich environment where they will learn language naturally (Brinton et al., 1989; Grabe & Stoller, 1997; Mohan, 1986; Snow et al., 1989; Wesch & Skehan, 2002). It is also a tenet of Input hypothesis. Significantly, the students experienced the proclaimed values of CBI. They perceived and personalized the values themselves. Currently, many Korean colleges require students to take a TETE course, which is a weak form of CBI, in their freshman year. For the upcoming school years, however, there are few requirements for other CBI courses. Whether taking more CBI courses or not completely depends on the students' decision. In addition, beginning the sophomore year, a strong form of CBI, which, as mentioned earlier, is content-driven, is primarily available to them. In this context, the finding that the students developed positive perception of the value of CBI in their freshman year is encouraging. Students who had positive experiences in a TETE course are likely to go for stronger forms of CBI and take advantage of them.

Regarding the group differences, the students in the high proficiency group generally showed more favorable reactions to the potential value of TETE. In particular, there were statistically significant group differences in three areas: 'enhanced interest in the English language,' 'psychologically shortened distance to English,' and 'willingness to take more CBI courses in the future.' The first two, which are related to psychological aspects of learning, will facilitate language learning. Without these, students may feel foreign language learning something remote and thus hard to get into. This finding points out that TETE may work better for high proficiency students in developing attitudes crucial to successful language learning. This positive attitude toward language learning may have contributed to their willingness to take CBI courses later.

This study also identified several instructional, interactional strategies that the students found useful. First of all, the vast majority of the students pointed out the value of pair or small group work. They had more chances to use the target language. Besides, it helped them to lower their anxiety level; to help each other; to offer and receive feedback; to get closer to each other; to take more

responsibility for their learning. This finding lends support to previous studies of group work (e.g., Long, et al., 1976; Pica, 1994; Pica & Doughty, 1985). Second, the students reported that the instructor's discursive practices, such as slow pace of speech, repetition, exemplification, elaboration, paraphrasing, and code-switching, were particularly useful. In a TETE class, teacher talk is a source of language input and also a medium of learning. To make input comprehensible to students, it is necessary for teachers to use diverse discursive practices depending on contextual factors, such as students' proficiency level, topics being discussed, and the day's lesson objectives. In this way, students will be helped to better process and, eventually, internalize the language input. Third, the students also made comments on the importance of teacher-student interaction in creating environments where they can try out English more freely. The nature of teacher-student interaction significantly determines language learning opportunities made available to individual students (Antón, 1999; Gibbons, 1998, 2003; Verplaetse, 2000). In order to help students to feel free to talk, teachers should try to shorten the distance between themselves and students by, for example, giving encouragements and compliments, and sharing personal stories, wherever necessary.

The present study has a limitation that needs to be taken into account. Some of the findings, specifically, findings about the group differences in the student perception from the t-test, cannot be generalized because of the small sample size. Interpretation must therefore be made in caution. Given this limitation, the present study suggests future studies examine the similar issue with large enough sample size. Findings from such studies will provide insights into the ways of tailoring TETE to the needs of students at different proficiency levels. Different groups of students likely have different needs, problems, and preferred learning styles. Identification of the differences will facilitate the process of designing and implementing better CBI for different groups. The success of CBI indeed relies on the details of its implementation (Stoller, 2002; Wesche & Skehan, 2002).

The present study also points out the need for a study of the relationships between students' previous TETE experiences and their performance in the TETE class. During the data analysis session, I sensed that the students with prior TETE experiences had lower anxiety level. At that time, I did not explore this

issue because it was beyond the scope of this study. Examination of the relationships would yield valuable insights into the TETE instruction. Finally, the present study calls for more research studies across instructional settings (e.g., elementary school class, high school class, and college class) using multiple data collection methods. As supported by several theoretical underpinnings, TETE has a lot of potential pedagogical values. In order to fully realize the potential, appropriate classroom techniques and activities should be devised and used. To tap into this issue, more future studies are needed. In particular, TETE classroom research studies deserve attention. These types of study will provide expansive windows through which to look at what is actually happening in TETE classes, how teachers and students are performing, what factors are influencing the instructional, interactional process, and so on. Findings of the studies from various angles collectively will work together to provide better keys to the TETE instruction.

REFERENCES

- Antón, M. M. (1999). The discourse of a learner-centered classroom: Sociocultural perspectives on teacher-learner interaction in the second-language classroom. *Modern Language Journal*, 83(3), 303-318.
- Baker, C. (1992). Description and analysis in classroom talk and interaction. *Journal of Classroom Interaction*, 27(2), 9-14.
- Bowers, C. A., & Flinders, D. (1990). *Responsive teaching: An ecological approach to classroom patterns of language, culture, and thought*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Brinton, D. M., Snow, M. A., & Wesche, M. (1989). *Content-based second language instruction*. New York: Newbury.
- Canale, M., & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics*, 1(1), 1-47.
- Cazden, C. (1988). *Classroom discourse*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Chomsky, N. (1965). *Aspects of the theory of syntax*. Cambridge, MA: Massachusetts Institute of Technology Press.

- Chun, Jihyeon. (2002). Learners' evaluation on English-medium lectures. *Foreign Languages Education*, 9(4), 233-251.
- Enright, D., & McCloskey, M. (1985). A cognitive process theory of writing. *College Composition and Communication*, 32, 365-387.
- Ferguson, C. (1971). Absence of copula and the notion of simplicity: A study of normal speech, baby talk, foreigner talk and pidgins. In D. Hymes (Ed.) *Pidginization and creolization of languages* (pp. 141-150). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ferguson, C. (1975). Towards a characterization of English foreigner talk. *Anthropological Linguistics*, 17, 1-14.
- Gibbons, P. (1998). Classroom talk and the learning of new registers in a second language. *Language and Education*, 12, 99-118.
- Gibbons, P. (2003). Mediating language learning: Teacher interactions with ESL students in a content-based classroom. *TESOL Quarterly*, 37(2), 247-273.
- Grabe, W., & Stoller, F. (1997). Content-based instruction: Research foundations. In M. A. Snow & D. M. Brinton (Eds.) *The content-based classroom: Perspectives on integrating language and content* (pp. 158-174). New York: Longman.
- Hall, J. K., & Verplaetse, L. S. (2000). Second and foreign language learning through classroom interaction. In J. K. Hall & L. S. Verplaetse (Eds.), *Second and foreign language learning through classroom interaction* (pp. 1-22). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1973). *Explorations in the functions of language*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1978). *Language as social semiotic: The social interpretation of language and meaning*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Hatch, E., Shapira, R., & Wagner-Gough, J. (1978). Foreigner talk discourse. *ITL Review of Applied Linguistics*, 39/40, 39-60.
- Howatt, A. P. R. (1984). *A history of English language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hwang, Jong-Bai. (2002). L2 learners' anxiety and motivation in an English-only content-based class. *English Teaching*, 57(1), 193-211.
- Hymes, D. (1967). Models of the interaction of language and social setting.

- Journal of Social Issues*, 23, 8-38.
- Hymes, D. (1972). On communicative competence. In J. B., Pride & J. Holmes (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics* (pp. 269-293). Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Kang, AeJin. (2007). How to better serve EFL college learners in CBI courses. *English Teaching*, 62(3), 69-100.
- Kang, DongHo. (2008). An exploratory study of university EFL students' participation in CBI. *English Language Teaching*, 20(1), 19-40.
- Kim, Eun-Ju. (2003). A comparative study of academic oral interaction in English-medium lectures and Korean-medium lectures. *English Teaching*, 58(3), 3-20.
- Kim, Myonghee (2009). Teacher-student interaction in a book circle activity. *English Teaching*, 64(1), 27-50.
- Kim, Sun-Ae. (2002). A critical reflection on the 'teaching English through English' classes in the Korean context. *English Teaching*, 57(4), 315-346.
- Kim, Sung-Yeon. (2002). Teachers' perceptions about teaching English through English. *English Teaching*, 57(1), 131-148.
- Kramsch, C. (1993). *Context and culture in language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Krashen, S. (1982). *Principles and practice in second language instruction*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Krashen, S. (1984). Immersion: Why it works and what it has taught us. *Language and Society*, 12, 61-64.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (2000). *Techniques and principles in language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Long, M., Adams, L., McLean, M., & Castanos, F. (1976). Doing things with words: Verbal interaction in lockstep and small group classroom situations. In R. Crymes & J. Fanselow (Eds.), *On TESOL '76*, (pp. 137-153). Washington, D.C.: TESOL.
- Long, M., & Porter, P. (1985). Group work, interlanguage talk, and second language acquisition. *TESOL Quarterly*, 19(2), 207-228.
- Met, M. (1998). Curriculum decision-making in content-based second language teaching. In J. Cenoz & F. Genesee (Eds.) *Beyond bilingualism: Multilingualism and multilingual education* (pp. 35-63). Clevedon, UK:

Multilingual Matters.

- Mohan, B. A. (1986). *Language and content*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Moon, Young-in, & Lee, Kyu-seon (2002). Perceptions of middle school English teachers on teaching English through English. *English Language Teaching, 14*(2), 299-324.
- Park, Hye-Sook. (2006). The effectiveness of English mediated courses with engineering students. *English Language Education, 33*, 86-119.
- Pica, T. (1994). Research on negotiation: What does it reveal about second-language learning conditions, processes, and outcomes? *Language Learning, 44*(3), 493-527.
- Pica, T., & Doughty, C. (1985). Input and interaction in communicative classroom: A comparison of teacher-fronted and group activities. In S. Gass & C. Madden (Eds.), *Input in second language acquisition* (pp. 115-132). Rowley, MA: Newbury.
- Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (2001). *Approaches and methods in language teaching*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Rodgers, D. M. (2006). Developing content and form: Encouraging evidence from Italian content-based instruction. *Modern Language Journal, 90*(3), 373-386.
- Shim, Young-Sook (2006). Voices of students from English-medium courses in Korean universities. *KATE Forum, 30*(2), 6-8.
- Snow, M. A. (2005). A model of academic literacy for integrated language and content instruction. In E. Henkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 693-712). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Snow, M. A., Met, M., & Genesee, F. (1989). A conceptual framework for the integration of language and content in second/foreign language instruction. *TESOL Quarterly, 23*(2), 201-217.
- Stoller, F. L. (2002). Promoting the acquisition of knowledge in a content-based course. In J. A. Crandall & D. Kaufman (Eds.), *Content-based instruction in higher education settings* (pp. 109-123). Alexandria, VA: TESOL.
- Verplaetse, L. S. (2000). Mr. Wonderful. In J. K. Hall & L. S. Verplaetse (Eds.) *Second and foreign language learning through classroom interaction* (pp.

- 221-242). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Wells, G. (1993). Reevaluating the IRF sequence: A proposal for the articulation of theories of activity and discourse for the analysis of teaching and learning in the classroom. *Linguistics and Education*, 5(1), 1-17.
- Wells, G. (1996). Using the tool-kit of discourse in the activity of learning and teaching. *Mind, Culture, and Activity*, 3(2), 1-22.
- Wesche, M. B., & Skehan, P. (2002). Communicative, task-based, and content-based language instruction. In R. Kaplan (Ed.), *The Oxford handbook of applied linguistics* (pp. 207-228). NY: Oxford University Press.
- Wilkins, D. (1976). *Notional syllabuses*. London: Oxford University Press.

APPENDIX 1

Questionnaire

This questionnaire is to see how you think of the teaching English through English (TETE) instruction. Your answers will be helpful to a better planning and implementation of future TETE. Thank you very much.

1. Did you take any TETE courses before?
2. Did you have any overseas living or learning experiences? If so, how long?

Read the following statements (#3~#17) and put a mark on an appropriate number.

- 1: strongly disagree 2: disagree 3: neither disagree nor agree
4: agree 5: strongly agree

3. I felt anxious in a TETE course, compared with regular courses.
4. As time went by, anxiety gradually decreased.
5. Speaking in small group caused less anxiety than speaking in a whole class setting.
6. TETE provides more opportunities to get exposed to English.
7. TETE contributes to the development of overall English proficiency.
8. TETE contributes to the development of speaking skills.
9. TETE contributes to the development of listening skills
10. TETE contributes to the development of vocabulary knowledge.
11. TETE contributes to learning English naturally

12. TETE contributes to enhancing interest in English.
13. TETE contributes to enhancing interest in the culture of English-speaking countries.
14. TETE increases motivation for studying English.
15. TETE increases the level of concentration on the lesson.
16. TETE contributes to shortening the psychological distance to English.
17. I would like to take more TETE courses in the future.
18. What kinds of difficulties/problems did you have in the TETE course?
19. What kinds of class activities most contribute to lessening anxiety or discomfort?
Why?
20. What instructional strategies/activities used by the instructor helped you most to understand the lesson content?
21. What instructional strategies/activities used by the instructor helped you most to lessen your anxiety?

APPENDIX 2

Interview Questions

1. Did you understand the lecture well?
2. If you had any problems in understanding the lecture, what do you think the reason was?
3. What did you do when you couldn't understand the lecture well?
4. What do you perceive TETE?
5. What was most helpful to you in the TETE class?
6. What do you think is necessary for better TETE?

Myonghee Kim
Division of English Language and Literature
Sookmyung Women's University
53-12, Chongpa-2, Yongsan-ku, Seoul
Tel: (02) 2077-7377
Email: kimm@sookmyung.ac.kr

Received 30 September 2009
Reviewed 25 October 2009
Revised version received 7 December 2009