

Rethinking High-Stakes Testing and Language Education Policy: From a Language Planning Perspective

Jung-Jin Kang

Michigan State University

Jae-Keun Lee*

Korea National University of Education

Kang, Jung-Jin & Lee, Jae-Keun. (2013). Rethinking high-stakes testing and language education policy: From a language planning perspective. *Modern English Education*, 14(4), 43-60.

Language has been considered to be a student's right, challenge, and resource. How to define and organize language education has influenced teachers' instruction and students' learning. Language education, which is influenced by language planning, has implemented the intentions of educational policy. However, language education has been impacted by high-stakes tests rather than by language planning which guides the directions or purposes of language education. Even though tests produce some positive results, such as changing classroom activities and supporting school reforms, current high-stakes testing limits the original purposes of educational policy and language planning. From a language planning perspective, the authors examined two educational policies in the U.S. and Korea, and how high-stakes tests, which are the important parts of the policies, influenced language education in both countries. This analysis shows that language as resource orientation or language as right perspective was changed to language as problems because of the influence of high-stakes tests in the U.S. and Korea. The authors suggest that language education needs to be free from high-stakes tests, and needs to encourage a student's language learning as a right, a challenge, and a resource.

[language planning/language education policy/high-stakes testing/
언어계획/언어교육정책/고부담시험]

* First author: Jung-Jin Kang, Corresponding author: Jae-Keun Lee

I. INTRODUCTION

In a global era, language and language education have become important because language has been used as a means of communication inside and outside of the country. Language becomes a vital point in educational, social, economic, and political issues. Many countries currently have been interested in language education in order to not only develop their own languages but also improve students' international language abilities. In order to provide effective language education, policy makers need to carefully deal with language planning. Kaplan and Baldauf (1997) define language planning as "an activity, most visibly undertaken by government, intended to promote systematic linguistic change in some community of speakers" (p. xi).

Therefore, language planning, which implies government's educational and language policies, can provide directions for language education. However, language education has been impacted by high-stakes tests rather than by language planning which guides the directions or purposes of language education. Menken (2008) pointed out that assessment policy has strongly impacted language education and educational policy. She went on to say that the trend of educational policies, such as standardized testing, has impacted language education, English as a Second Language (ESL) and English as a Foreign Language (EFL) policy in non-English speaking countries, and bilingual education or immersion programs in English speaking countries. Even though testing produces some positive results, such as changing classroom activities and supporting school reforms (Bailey, 1996), many researchers have become concerned with the negative results of tests (Li, 2009; Menken, 2008; Turner, 2009).

Researchers have reported that standardized testing or accountability systems have dramatically changed language education in schools (Diamond, 2007; Menken, 2008). For example, the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) policy in the U.S. and the College Entrance Examination System (CEES) in Korea, have strongly impacted language education in schools. Both educational policies have clear purposes: NCLB's purpose is that "states are working to close the achievement gap and make sure all students, including those who are disadvantaged, achieve academic proficiency" (Department of Education, 2002), while the purpose of CEES is that all universities should provide equal opportunities for students to receive an education according to their abilities and that high schools should focus on public education (Korean Council for University Education).

In addition, both these policies also suggested measures to improve language education. On the one hand, American policy makers expected that this NCLB policy could increase English language learners' (ELLs') (NCLB defines English language learners as students who have a limited English proficiency) abilities regarding English

use. On the other hand, the Korean government created the College Scholastic Ability Test (CSAT), which includes both the Korean and the English language. This CSAT was expected to measure “the students’ scholastic ability required for a college education” (Korea Institute for Curriculum and Evaluation) as well as improving students’ Korean and English language abilities.

However, unlike the purpose of educational policy to improve the equality of education such as encouraging ELLs’ learning and improving their practical English skills, these policies in the U.S. and Korea seem to have produced unexpected results. Diamond (2007) indicated that educational policies have been modified in various ways due to organizational features, teachers’ beliefs and knowledge, and implementers’ different interpretations. Both educational policies seem to be implemented and influenced not by language education, but by assessment policies. There are many reasons for the results, but this study focuses on the high-stakes testing that both policies implement. The core of both educational policies is standardized tests, and these have both become high-stakes tests. This trend has led to focusing on test results and has produced negative outcomes, such as increases in the marginalization of students, the collapse of public education, and a focus on teaching to the test. Many educators in both countries are concerned, as Menken (2008) argued, that these “high-stakes tests become de facto language policy in schools” (p. 182), and the marginalization and inequality of education get is getting worse.

This paper focuses on English education and policy in both countries because the U.S. and Korea have emphasized English learning, even though the social and educational contexts are different. Rather than finding solutions to the problems of both educational policies, this paper aims to rethink the impact of high-stakes testing and the purposes of educational policy on language education from a language planning perspective. In order to achieve this purpose, this study first examines the intended purposes of both countries’ educational policies. Second, this study examines new emerging assessment policies within the two educational policies and how the assessment policies influence language education. Third, this study discusses how to improve the original purposes of the educational policies and language education.

II. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

In this paper, language orientation is used as a theoretical framework to examine educational policy and language education within that policy. Under an educational policy, language education is planned and provided. Language planning refers to a perspective and activity on how to organize language. The language planning

perspective can also help language planners and educators look at a language's purpose and use with different perspectives. Kaplan and Baldauf (1997) stated that language planning is "an intended activity undertaken by government in order to promote systematic change" (p. xi). They meant that language planning reflects the intentions of educational policy. Tauli (1974) also shared similar opinions on language planning. He said, "Language planning is the methodical activity of regulating and improving existing languages or creating new common, regional, national or international languages" (p. 56). He argues that language is a tool and language planning is necessary for all people to achieve the tool. According to Weinstein (1980), language planning is "a government authorized, long term, sustained, and conscious effort" (p. 56). He went on to say that the purpose of language planning is to solve communication problems in societies. However, Ruiz (1984) suggests that researchers need to look at language planning in different and various ways, whereas many researchers have focused solely on the intentions of society or government in language planning.

Ruiz (1984) indicated that "language planning can benefit from a variety of approaches, and that in some circumstances some approaches are better than others" (p. 29). He suggested using language orientation for language planning: "language-as-problem, language-as-right, and language-as-resource." He defined language orientation as "a complex of dispositions toward language and its role, and toward languages and their role in society" (p. 16). He went on to say that examining orientations toward language is important for language planning because they constitute the framework of language attitudes.

First, the language-as-problem perspective assumes that language is a problem, especially "subordinate languages are problems to be solved" (Ruiz, 1984). This perspective supports a linguistic deficiency theory in which minority students have difficulty in learning because of their deficient English language ability, and this should be solved (Crawford, 1999). Second, the language-as-right perspective is that language is a basic human right. Ruiz (1984) mentioned that if people lose the right to use their language for enlightening and improving their skills and identity, they will not participate in social activity. Third, the language-as-resources perspective considers language minority groups as important sources. This approach can "alleviate some of the conflicts emerging out of the other two orientations, enhance the language status of subordinate languages, ease tensions between majority and minority communities" (Ruiz, 1984, p. 25). Because language as resource is a practical perspective, it can provide a rational and pragmatic orientation for language planning. Even though Ruiz (1984) used this language orientation as a conceptual framework in order to explain language planning and education in an American context, many researchers have used this as a theoretical framework for their language planning in other contexts (Johnson & Ricento,

2013).

Ruiz's (1984) language orientation concept, in this paper, is used to explain what language orientations, and educational and language planning intend, what causes language education to change, and how to reduce the gap between language planning and language education. The next part of this paper examines two important educational policies; NCLB in the U.S. and CEES in Korea. Finally, the paper looks at new emerging assessment policies in the two educational policies and how the assessment policies influence language education are examined.

III. EDUCATIONAL POLICY AND LANGUAGE EDUCATION IN AMERICA AND KOREA

1. Language Policy and Language Education History in America and Korea

The American government has used languages as tools to sustain its safety and profits. Tolefson (2006) said that "policies often create and sustain various forms of social inequality and that policy-makers usually promote the interests of dominant social groups" (p. 42). He meant that language policy and language education can be used as tools for social control. In the early of 20th century, language diversity was welcomed and many diverse languages were used and taught in America. The U.S. government did not announce English as its official language because it did not want to restrict other people's languages and worried about resistance from minor language groups. Nonetheless, English has functioned as and been considered to be the official language without having been declared so. However, the U.S. government had been waiting for a good day to announce English as its official language and for all people in America to learn English as their first language. The world wars had made a good excuse for the U.S. government to cry out for the unification of the American people and to justify the necessity of English as the official language to unify all powers. Even though English has implicitly become the official language, the U.S. government needs to provide language education for non-English speakers.

In the 1960s and 1970s, American language policy implemented bilingual education because of the increasing number of immigrant students. The bilingual educational policy first was suggested to solve language problems in American society. Individually, students who have limited English language abilities had difficulty studying in school, and it led to their failure in school and society. The bilingual educational policy was influenced by various contextual factors such as research on bilingualism, the civil rights

movement, social legislation, and activists and cultural pluralism (San Miguel, 2004). The bilingual educational policy seemed to be a big success because the proponents succeeded in enacting bilingual education legislation, even though it was incomplete. Their efforts also positively impacted language policy from compensatory to enrichment, silence to contestation, and voluntary to mandatory. Nonetheless, many immigrant students have struggled with their learning in schools, and educational policy makers have thought of new policies, such as no child left behind (NCLB).

English status in Korea is different than that in America. Since Korea contracted free trade associations with many countries and the world changed moved into a global era, Korea has been facing the challenges of language policy and language education. This change first influenced the relationship between individuals. To Korean people, learning a foreign language is considered to provide more opportunities to get better jobs. Foreign language ability is being used as the main factor in deciding an individual's ability or socio-economic status. Learning a foreign language is possible in the public school, but many students go to a private academy to get a better education, spending a lot of money in the process. Learning English is considered to be a natural step in getting good jobs. This thought is consistent with the opinion of the UCLA Steering Committee (2002), which said that "most researchers see the major reasons as related to the power and international status of English in the media and the economy." This perspective has been implicitly rooted in language education in Korean society.

Regarding this perspective, power issues have existed relative to language use. A power struggle between individuals could change from learning a language to the economical ability to learn it. Unlike prevention of using a foreign language in the late of 19th century, the Korean government is now implementing language policy more assertively. K-12 educational institutions are required to teach English as a foreign language, and junior high school students must learn another language besides English. Watzke (2003) asserts that "The 'world language' term reflects an advantage to the study of a second language beyond college preparation or professional and vocational purposes to participate in local communities, contribute to and benefit from society, and address the realities and responsibilities of citizenship" (p. 129). In the next section, the history of language in both countries and its influence on language policy and language education are discussed.

2. No Child Left Behind (NCLB) and Language Policy in America

1) NCLB policy implementations and expectations

After the NCLB Act was passed by the federal government in 2001, many educators

and other Americans expressed both expectations and concerns. The NCLB Act, which tries to improve the quality of education and reduce the achievement gap between students from different backgrounds, is considered to be a major effort for school reform. Some people welcomed this act because it could improve American education's quality, not only by developing content standards for reading, math, and science but also by providing qualified teachers, scientifically based studies, and accountability for students' achievements. Other people, however, wondered if it could be implemented. Others were also concerned about the lack of qualified teachers, the lack of empirically based studies, and the lack of criteria for assessing students. Most of all, the big issue was whether teachers and parents could understand this unprecedented policy.

U.S. Secretary of Education Margaret Spellings commented on the NCLB policy of the last few years: "We can be proud of this record of bipartisan accomplishment. Expectations were raised for what our students can achieve and what our government can get done" (Department of Education, 2008). She went on to express her satisfaction with the success of the NCLB policy in its use of empirical data. The data showed that NCLB has had effects on improving test scores in math, reading, writing, and history; reducing the achievement gap (African-American and Hispanic students' reading, math, and history achievements, compared to white students); helping children once 'left behind' improve their reading scores, especially for students with disabilities or who are English language learners; and achieving remarkable progress in test scores compared to other nations. Irrespective of continuing challenges on the NCLB Act, this policy seems to be generally a successful reform.

2) Standardized tests and language education in schools

Many studies have reported the effectiveness of NCLB on students' achievements (Hanushek & Raymond, 2005; Haycock, 2006), but NCLB policy and language education are different issues. The NCLB policy provided measures to improve ELLs' language learning, such as providing professional development for teachers who have ELLs or supporting effective leadership and instruction. However, many researchers found that ELLs were still being left behind and their performance was far less than native speakers on the tests (Gandara & Baca, 2008; Menken, 2008, 2009; Solorzano, 2008). There are many reasons for these problems, such as a scarcity of high quality teachers, insufficient resources and school support, limits in federal and district government funding, and disconnection of collaboration between community and schools. The most prominent reason is that "NCLB mandates two types of assessments for ELLs: English language proficiency and academic content which includes English language arts and math" (Menken, 2008, p. 31). Menken (2008) argued that high-stakes

testing is the core of NCLB and this test has been used to limit language education in schools. She went on to say that ELLs must take the same test as native English speakers to meet states' demands of proving their progress in English proficiency. There are two factors regarding proving students' progress in English proficiency in NCLB mandated tests.

The first factor is a standardized test (ST). Under NCLB, the federal government asked states and districts to develop content standards for their students. These content standards define the purposes toward which teachers should teach and what students should learn. The federal government also asks states and districts to develop the ST based on these criteria. Teachers usually make various tests for their students, and these tests are used to improve teachers' teaching skills, find students' problems, and develop effective teaching methods. The ST, which requires the same conditions as the content standards, can be used to compare the achievement results of individuals, students, or schools. The serious problem is that the ST focuses on assessing English language proficiency. Without having mastered English abilities, ELLs were apt to fail the tests and be unfairly "labeled as deficient and low-performing and barred from advancement" (Menken, 2008, p. 35).

The second factor is the accountability system (AS). NCLB provides four important AS factors for using the ST effectively: all schools must take annual tests; schools and districts should report their schools' achievements including subgroups' scores; all schools should design an adequate yearly progress (AYP) process and report the results of AYP to show improvement in management, and schools' reorganization should be decided upon according to the fulfillment of the AYP. Some agree that schools, teachers, and students have the responsibility for improving students' achievements (Hanushek & Raymond, 2005). However, this AS forces districts and schools to focus not on teaching but on tests. ELLs or minority students are sometimes excluded from the tests, which results in higher dropout rates, teaching to the test, destruction of the schools' roles, and the discouragement of the ELLs.

As a result of this, teachers and schools transform testing policy into language policy. The most common phenomenon is 'teaching to the test,' which affects language policy in classrooms. Menken (2008) mentioned that "language policies changed in schools after it was decided that ELLs would be included in the state's high-stakes tests" (p. 121). For example, because the high-stakes tests consist of English, teachers and schools provided more opportunities for ELLs to experience English rather than their native languages. The funding that supported the bilingual educational policy was transferred to instruction in the English-only policy. In her report, Menken (2008) found that all ten schools aligned the curriculum for ELLs to the test, and "teachers employ a wide range of strategies in the classroom to prepare their students for the tests" (p. 129). This data

showed that language policy in schools was mostly transformed by high-stakes tests.

The NCLB policy makers consider language as a problem for ELLs; thus, they wanted to shift language planning from language-as-problem to language-as-resource in which ELLs can use English for their school achievements. However, the standardized test and the high-stakes test changed language education in schools, and the testing made ELLs consider English not as a resource but as a problem for their learning in schools.

3. College Entrance Examination System (CEES) and Language Education in Korea

1) College Entrance Examination System (CEES) in Korea

Korean education has evolved and developed from the theories of John Dewey and progressivism. Since the Korean War, Korean education needs to eradicate the remnants of Japan's education system and improve educational quality. In order to achieve these aims, Korean education has focused on developing K-12 curriculum and college education. Government-controlled educational systems influenced the CEES, but with the movement of democracy in the 1980s and the demands of society and students, Korean education had to change the CEES. Korean education has a national curriculum and it is revised about every seven year (Korea Institute for Curriculum and Evaluation). With the increase of trade with other countries and the development of technology, the national curriculum has recently changed more often than before. When the national curriculum is changed, the CEES policy is also changed partly or wholly.

In Korean society, it is very symbolic for students to go to a university. Many parents have assumed that finishing a university degree is the basic demand for a normal life in Korea. Every year, the Ministry of Education (ME) gives CEES guidance, and each university uses it. The university entrance policy is based on the purpose of the ME, which promotes the stability of public schools and protects students' rights by giving freedom to choose universities. In the past, there were limitations on choosing schools, and the university had the complete right to choose students. Now, however, the ME suggests guidelines that universities should follow and adapt to their schools' own situations.

With the national curriculum, the ME's suggestions had some positive results as well as negative ones. First, they prevented certain universities from monopolizing certain students. In Korean society, only a few universities have been respected and favored by students, parents, and companies. This odd structure within the university system made the university entrance system unequal because only upper class students or good test-takers could go to those schools. However, the ME's guidance required university

committees to consider students' aptitude and extra-curriculum activities as well as test scores. It also suggested quotas of students so that minority students can have equal opportunities.

Second, the ME's guidance contributed to reducing the expense of private schooling. In order for their child to apply to good universities, parents have spent a large sum of money to hire good private teachers. But the guidance asks high school students to focus on their learning in schools, not in private academies or cram schools. The purpose of the university entrance policy provided by the ME is to provide equal opportunities to students, parents, and schools, and, thus, it tries to eliminate the high cost of private education such that public education will survive. However, this university entrance policy has also produced side effects not because of the purpose of it, but because of the assessment of it. The next section talks about the College Scholastic Ability Test (CSAT).

2) College Scholastic Ability Test (CSAT) and language education in schools

The Korea Institute for Curriculum and Evaluation (KICE) has invented the CSAT based on the national curriculum. Lee et al. (2004) argued that the CSAT improved on the former university-based tests: 1) it focused on evaluating high-order thinking skills, 2) it led to a higher quality of high school education, and 3) it alleviated students' and parents' burden from tests (p. 14). However, Lee et al. (2004) also argued that the CSAT has produced other problems, and it has influenced language education in schools, such as standardization of content, instruction, and tests. Even though the CSAT policy did not expect some negative outcomes, it has impacted language education because of the features of the test.

First, the CSAT is a standardized test. Volante (2004) stated that a standardized test aims to measure students' learning outcomes under the same administered and controlled conditions. McMillan (2000) stated that a standardized test could be used effectively for identifying students' strengths and improving teachers' instruction. However, a standardized test in Korea, has been used to compare students' knowledge, to enter college, and to gauge teachers' and schools' effectiveness. With the standardization of the CSAT, teachers need to prepare their students for the test. Because of this feature, the CSAT still asks students about knowledge and memorization rather than high-order thinking. Lee et al. (2004) explained that the CSAT limited content and methods because of test reliability and convenient uses. Even though Korean education has a national curriculum and the CSAT was based on that curriculum, a proportion of the CSAT is an important part of the CEES procedures. That is why many Korean parents and students spend a lot of money to prepare for this CSAT outside of school.

Second, making English a high-stakes subject, regarding standardized testing, is

problematic within the CSAT. English is not an official language, and it is difficult to deal with English like other subjects. Korean education, since it started English education, has emphasized English as a subject more than others. In 2008, because of another catch phrase, ‘training of native-like English speakers,’ many districts and schools have invested money to improve students’ speaking abilities. The government asked teachers and students to shift from grammar-translation to communicative learning.

Thus, many districts and schools constructed and provided English-Zone, English village, English native speakers, and English speaking curriculum. KICE presented the National English Ability Test (NEAT) in the name of changing previous English education’s weak points. The purpose of the NEAT is “to develop and implement a national standardized English proficiency test to improve practical English communication skills required in the era of globalization” (Korea Institute for Curriculum and Evaluation). This policy ultimately intends to give students a waiver for the English test in the CSAT. The testing policy is in crisis because ME decided not to use NEAT for a waiver of the CSAT. Many educators, parents, and students have been concerned about the practicality of the test, and educational policy makers admit to the negative sides and unpreparedness of the policy. However, if an English test plays a role as a high-stakes test, new types of NEAT will be developed and provided.

4. High-Stakes Tests and Language Planning

So far, two main educational policies (America’s NCLB and Korea’s CEES) and two types of high-stakes testing in both policies were examined. Both educational policies reflect the demands of current society. For example, globalization and the development of technology have influenced many countries’ educational policies (Rizvi & Lingard, 2010). Rizvi and Lingard (2010) indicated that educational policy has shifted to prepare students for 21st century society, which is represented as competitive and cooperative environments. In order to achieve this goal, both policies have stressed global language education. However, there seem to be some gaps between educational policy and practice because of various reasons, such as the lack of understanding of implementers (Davies, 2000). This study paid attention to high-stakes testing which was intended to produce positive change of instructional methods and school reforms. The NCLB policy has initiated a drive for improving the quality of education. NCLB has a clear purpose, “all children will have a fair, equal, and significant opportunity to receive a high quality education and reach, at a minimum, proficiency on challenging state academic achievement standards and state assessments” (Department of Education). The CEES in Korea also intends to provide equal opportunity for students to study and seek their interest. As this study shows, even though both policies had educational purposes the

overemphasis on testing produced unexpected results.

First, tests in both educational policies became high-stakes testing as the indicator of the success of the policies. Many researchers have suggested that evaluation can produce positive effects in teachers' instruction and students' learning (Bailey, 1996; J. H. Lee, 2001; J. S. Park & M. B. Lee, 2012). Bailey (1996) noted that teachers' teaching methods, educational materials, or school curriculum could be changed positively because of the washback effect. J. H. Lee (2002) argued that the CSAT encouraged listening and speaking tests in schools and improved teachers' instruction. When the NEAT plan was announced as a waiver of the English test, many researchers also expected that the NEAT could change current English education, such as focusing on communicative skills (J. S. Park & M. B. Lee, 2012). However, high-stakes testing in both policies became the important scale of deciding school closings or school funding in America and deciding college entrance or not in Korea. Because of this importance, schools and teachers cannot help focusing on the tests. H. S. Choi and S. M. Cheon (2013) also point out that tests possibly control all school activities and instruction methods when people consider tests as the most important factor in their school life.

Second, the next problem is teaching to the test. Many researchers over the world have reported how high-stakes testing influenced instruction in schools (Li, 2009; Menken, 2008, 2009; Turner, 2009; Wright & Choi, 2006). Li (2009) examined college English testing in China and found that the high-stakes testing influenced writing instruction in schools. He noted that Chinese teachers did not change their teaching methods, but rather focused on preparing for the test. Turner (2009) defines washback as "the phenomenon of the influence of tests on classroom activity" (p. 104). He concluded that the high-stakes testing did not influence EFL pre-teachers' language proficiencies, but rather it influenced their classroom practices and activities. D. J. Kim and B. W. Lee (1998) examined how Korea's CEES influenced high school curriculum implementation and instruction in the classroom. They noted that the purposes of school reform and education were decided not by the school curriculum, but by standardized tests. They went on to say that this measurement-driven instruction encourages students' creativity and high order thinking skills, but also forces teachers to prepare for the CEES by limiting the school curriculum. Even though testing has the purposes of evaluating students' achievement and of encouraging new instruction and reforms, high-stakes testing limits teachers' instruction and leads to teaching to the test.

Third, high-stakes testing often comes first over educational or language policy. M. S. Han (2010) argues that English education policy was developed and provided appropriately, but the implementation problems, such as high-stakes testing, made a negative impression on the public and English education. Language education and tests need to be separated from high-stakes testing. It is true that English has been considered

to be an important tool for social mobility, college entrance, or free trade, not only in America, but also in many countries (J. H. Jeon & J. Y. Paek, 2008). English ability has been evaluated to be an important scale for students' success in schools and society (Li, 2009; J. H. Jeon & J. Y. Paek, 2008). Within the NCLB policy, many ELLs failed their reading or math tests because of their English ability (Abedi, 2004; Menken, 2008, 2009). In Korea, English ability has played an important role for college entrance, the job market, and promotions. When language is used as a gatekeeper for success, language education could disregard language orientation, such as a student's right, a challenge, and a resource.

IV. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

According to Ruiz (1984), language planning is constructed on one of three language orientations: language-as problems, language-as-right, and language-as-resources. He mentioned that "orientations determine what is thinkable about language in society" (p. 16). Language education cannot help being influenced by educational policy and language planning. The NCLB policy and the CEES policy are different educational policies, but they have some things in common, such as focusing on standardized tests, high-stakes tests, and an accountability system. In terms of language orientation, this paper examined the two policies and found some emerging issues related to language planning and language education.

First, language education is influenced by a high-stakes test rather than by the language orientation. The NCLB policy had the purpose of providing equal opportunities and reducing achievement gaps between minority and white students. However, much research has shown that the NCLB policy reproduced inequality and increased achievement gaps (Gandara & Baca, 2008; Menken, 2008, 2009). The NCLB policy makers approached the language as problems perspective in that they saw that ELLs had difficulty in studying in classrooms. They thought that if ELLs improve their English abilities, the students could improve their learning outcomes. However, the standardized test, which was devised for measuring students' learning, became a high stakes test for deciding schools' effectiveness. The high-stakes test items and forms that assess English proficiency force teachers and schools to focus on English-only instruction. To ELLs, English was not considered as resources, but as problems. ELLs also thought of their native language as problems, not as their rights. At the expense of their native languages, ELLs seemed to learn English and prepare for the English test.

The English test in the CEES of Korea is similar to the NCLB policy. The CSAT started with the belief that language is the important resource of the global era, and

students need both to learn English and to improve their Korean. The CSAT policy makers seemed to think of English as resources, and Korean students must use English as the tool to communicate with others and pursue their academic advancement. However, the CSAT policy produced language as problems, not language as resources. The high-stakes tests make teachers and schools focus on preparing for the CSAT. It began with language-as-resources, but it produced language as problems in the Korean educational context.

Second, the high-stakes test made students give up their rights to sustain and learn various languages. In terms of language as a right, the NCLB policy took out the right to preserve minority students' own languages. Ruiz (1984) suggests two kinds of language rights, "the right to freedom from discrimination on the basis of language" and "the right to use your language(s) in the activities of communal life" (p. 22). In terms of human rights, the right to use language, and the protection of minority groups, the NCLB policy removed the function of language-as-right. ELLs had to give up their right to use their own languages in order not to be excluded from majority groups. This was similar to the CSAT policy in Korea. The college entrance exam demanded English and a few foreign languages such as French, German, Japanese, and Chinese. Students did not have any rights to choose foreign languages and had to learn major foreign languages without considering their interests. The high-stakes testing, such as CSAT, keeps limiting language education such that language is no longer a student's right, a challenge, and a resource, but is changed to language as problems.

In conclusion, this paper has explained how high-stakes tests influenced language policy and language education, changing the curriculum schools provide, the content teachers focus on, the instructions of teachers, and so on (Menken, 2008). From the literature, many researchers were concerned that high-stakes tests influence language education in schools and change the policy of schools and teachers to fit to the tests. Menken (2008) was concerned that top-down educational policies would limit language education in schools. She argued that "top-down policies overpower local practices and it can become difficult for schools to provide quality educational programming for their language learners; such policies directly disadvantage these students" (p. 184). Many teachers seem to provide English-only instruction for the test, and adjust their curriculum and teaching methods to high-stakes tests. Many students had to learn English proficiency to take English-based tests at the expense of their own languages.

Educational policy, in both the U.S. and Korea, has similar purposes to improve equal opportunity in education and to reduce the achievement gaps between lower- and higher-class students. The U.S. government approaches language planning as language-as-problems because the NCLB policy and its high-stakes tests regard minority languages as problems and force the use of English-only. By contrast, the Korean government

began language planning as language-as-resources, and the university entrance policy considered English and foreign languages as resources. However, the policy produced problems in their language education. The role and status of English and foreign languages in America and Korea are different, and, thus, it is difficult to compare two countries with the same framework ‘orientation.’ However, the common thing in both countries was that language education was influenced by educational policy, especially when high-stakes tests are emphasized, so that language education in schools changed to fit to the tests.

It is not easy for districts and schools to resist top-down policy without changing the paradigm in educational policy. Trujillo (1998) argued that “the imposition of national and state educational policies from the top-down are more powerful forces than are any counter forces from the bottom-up, despite the exceptions during particular historical moments” (p. 17). This paper examined three important factors that influenced language education in schools under certain educational policies; language education is evaluated by a standardized test, language education requires accountability to teachers and students, and language education becomes a high-stakes test.

Menken (2008) made some suggestions for policymakers, schools, and teachers in order for language education to play a role in schools. She argued that if schools have strong, clear, and cohesive school-based language education programs, it is possible “to protect programming and negotiate top-down reforms and policies in ways that make sense for ELL students” (p. 185). Another suggestion is that the English language should not be included in a high-stakes test. If students could consider English as one of the language resources or language rights, language education would not be influenced by educational policy. The paradigm shift from high-stakes tests for English proficiency to school/classroom based tests as well as the collaboration between educational policymakers, schools, and teachers are necessary to prevent the negative effects of top-down policy and high-stakes tests.

REFERENCES

- Abedi, J. (2004). The no child left behind act and English language learners: Assessment and accountability issues. *Educational Researcher*, 33(1), 4-14.
- Bailey, K, M. (1996). Working for washback: A review of the washback concept in language testing. *Language Testing*, 13(3), 257-279.
- Choi, Hyung-Sim., & Cheon, Seung-Mi. (2013). Introductory high school English writing class for NEAT preparation. *The Journal of Human Studies*, 31, 57-84.
- Crawford, J. (1999). *Bilingual education: History, politics, theory, and practice* (4th ed.).

- Los Angeles: Bilingual Education Services.
- Davies, P. (2000). The relevance of systematic reviews to educational policy and practice. *Oxford Review of Education*, 26(3&4), 365-378.
- Department of Education. (2002). No child left behind: A new era in education presentation. Retrieved August 29, 2013, from the World Wide Web: <http://www2.ed.gov/nclb/overview/intro/presentation/index.html>.
- Department of Education. (2008). Progress by our schools and the U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved August 29, 2013, from the World Wide Web: <http://www2.ed.gov/nclb/overview/intro/presentation/index.html>.
- Diamond, J. B. (2007). Where the rubber meets the road: Rethinking the connection between high-stakes testing policy and classroom instruction. *Sociology of Education*, 80(4), 285-313.
- Gandara, P., & Baca. G. (2008). NCLB and California's English language teachers: The perfect storm. *Language policy*, 7, 201-216.
- Han, Moon-Sub. (2010). Principal in-service training on native English-speaking assistant teachers. Retrieved September 2, 2013, from the World Wide Web: http://www.epik.go.kr/board/download.epik?bid=9&num=446&bf_id=566.
- Hanushek, E. A., & Raymond, M. E. (2005). Does school accountability lead to improved student performance? *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 24(2), 297-327.
- Haycock, K. (2006). No more invisible kids. *Educational Leadership*, 64(3), 38-42.
- Jeon, Ji-Hyeon., & Paek, Jee-Yon. (2008). A study on the performance management of English education policy. Retrieved September 2, 2013, from the World Wide Web: http://library.mest.go.kr/edu/components/searchir/detail/detail.aspx?cid=271506&m_var=64.
- Johnson, D. C., & Ricento, T. (2013). Conceptual and theoretical perspectives in language planning and policy: Situating the ethnography of language policy. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 219, 7-21.
- Kaplan, R., & Baldauf, R. (1997). *Language planning from practice to theory*. Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters.
- Kim, Doo-Jung., & Lee, Byung-Wook. (1998). The impacts of college entrance examination on the curriculum implementation and classroom teaching-learning activities in Korea's high schools. *The Journal of Curriculum and Evaluation*, 1(1), 1-15.
- Korean Council for University Education. (2013). The purpose of college entrance examination system. Retrieved August 29, 2013, from the World Wide Web: <http://univ.kcue.or.kr>.
- Korea Institute for Curriculum and Evaluation. (2013a). *College scholastic ability test*. Retrieved August 29, 2013a, from the World Wide Web: <http://kice.re.kr/>.

- Korea Institute for Curriculum and Evaluation. (2013b). National English assessment test. Retrieved August 29, 2013b, from the World Wide Web: <http://kice.re.kr/en/contents.do?contentsNo=150&menuNo=406>.
- Li, H. (2009). Are teachers teaching to the test? A case study of the college English test (CET) in China. *International Journal of Pedagogies and Learning*, 5, 25-36.
- Lee, Jai, Hee. (2001). Some comprehensive suggestions for the improvement of the college scholastic abilities test (CSAT). *English Teaching*, 56(2), 333-364.
- Lee, Jong-Seung, Park, Do-Soon, Lee, Jong-Jae, Nam, Myung-Ho, Kim, Heung-Won, Kim, Jeong-Kyoum, Baek, Sun-Geun, Kim, Byoung-Jin, & Choi, Won-Hye. (2004). A study for the improvement of the college scholastic abilities test. (Research report: RRE 2004-9). Retrieved August 1, 2013, from the World Wide Web: <http://kice.re.kr/board.do?boardConfigNo=69&menuNo=255&boardNo=30954&action=view>.
- McMillan, J. H. (2000). Fundamental assessment principles for teachers and school administrators. *Practical Assessment, Research & Evaluation*, 7(8). Retrieved August 29, 2013, from the World Wide Web: <http://PAREonline.net/getvn.asp?v=7&n=8>.
- Menken, K. (2008). *English learners left behind: Standardized testing as language policy*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Menken, K. (2009). No child left behind its effects on language policy. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 29, 103-117.
- Park, Ji-Seon., & Lee, Moon-Bok. (2012). A report on the teaching and learning of speaking and writing in high school English classrooms: Transiting to NEAT. *Modern English Education*, 13(2), 121-149.
- Rizvi, F., & Lingard, B. (2010). *Globalization education policy*. London: Routledge.
- Ruiz, R. (1984). Orientations in language planning. *NABE Journal*, 8, 15-34.
- San Miguel, M. (2004). *Contested policy: The rise and fall of federal bilingual education in the United States, 1960-2001*. Denton, TX: University of North Texas Press.
- Solorzano, R. W. (2008). High stakes testing: Issues, implications, and remedies for English language learners. *Review of Educational Research*, 78(2), 260-329.
- Tauli, V. (1974). The theory of language planning. In J. A. Fishman (Ed.), *Advances in Language Planning* (pp. 49-67). Paris: Mouton & Co. N. V., The Hague.
- Tollefson, J. W. (2006). *Planning language, planning inequality: Language policy in the community*. London: Longman.
- Trujillo, A. L. (1998). *Chicano empowerment and bilingual education: Movimiento politics in Crystal City, Texas*. New York: Garland Publishing.
- Turner, C. (2009). Examining washback in second language education context: A high stakes provincial exam and the teacher factor in classroom practice in Quebec secondary schools. *International Journal of Pedagogies and Learning*, 5, 103-

123.

- UCLA Steering Committee. (2002). The importance of English in a global era. Retrieved August 29, 2013, from the World Wide Web: <http://www.lightcalls.com/article/5967>.
- Volante, L. (2004). Teaching to the test: What every educator and policy-maker should know. *Canadian Journal of Educational Administration and Policy*, 35. Retrieved August 29, 2013, from the World Wide Web: <http://umanitoba.ca/publications/cjeap/articles/volante.html>.
- Watzke, J. L. (2003). *Lasting change in foreign language education: A historical case for change in national policy*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Publishing.
- Weinstein, B. (1980). Language planning in francophone Africa. *Language Problems & Language Planning*, 4(1), 55-77.
- Wright, W., & Choi, D. (2006). The impact of language and high-stakes testing policies on elementary school English language learners in Arizona. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 14(13), 1-75.

Examples in: English

Applicable Language: English

Applicable levels: Elementary/Secondary/Tertiary

Jung-Jin Kang

Department of Curriculum, Instruction, and Teacher Education

Michigan State University

Erickson Hall 620 Farm Lane

East Lansing, MI 48823, U.S.

Tel: (070)-8803-9100

Email: justin217k@gmail.com

Jae-Keun Lee

Department of Elementary Education

Korean National University of Education

San 7 Darakri Gangnaemyeon CheongWonGun

ChungBuk 363-791, Republic of Korea

Tel: (043) – 230-3545

Email: jkeun@knue.ac.kr

Received 9 September 2013

Revised 5 November 2013

Accepted 16 November 2013