Modern English Education, Vol. 15, No. 4, Winter, 2014

The Effect of Explicit Versus Implicit Instruction: Focusing on PAICWP

Chulwoong Bae
Daejeon Metropolitan Office of Education

Bae, Chulwoong. (2014). The effect of explicit versus implicit instruction: Focusing on PAICWP. *Modern English Education, 15*(4), 117-143.

This study compared two different teaching modes (explicit instruction and implicit instruction) and investigated the way of teaching English pronunciation for limited English proficiency (LEP) students in a middle school. The present study used Focus on Form (FonF) techniques and they were divided into two categories according to the obtrusiveness: explicit instruction vs. implicit instruction. FonF was mainly used in grammar teaching, but it is not limited to grammar teaching and can also be used in pronunciation teaching (listening and speaking) and reading. The effectiveness of explicit instruction vs. implicit instruction using phonological awareness instruction combined with phonetics (PAICWP) was compared in three language skills: listening, speaking, and reading. Forty three middle school students were divided into three groups: control group (CG) without PAICWP, implicit instruction group (IIG) with PAICWP, and explicit instruction group (EIG) with PAICWP. To find the effectiveness of new pronunciation teaching called PAICWP, ANOVA tests were employed. The findings of this research showed that EIG using PAICWP was the most effective among the three groups because of students level of English language proficiency. IIG with PAICWP was more effective than CG without PAICWP when we teach English in the EFL context.

[explicit instruction/implicit instruction/phonological awareness/phonetics
명시적지도/암시적 지도/음운인식/음성학]

I. INTRODUCTION

In Korea, English has been implanted in the curriculum beginning in the third grade of elementary school in 1997. Most students learn English as a subject at school and they usually do not have enough opportunities, chances, or time to practice and use it naturally outside of the classroom because they are in English as a Foreign Language

(EFL) environment (Y. K. Kahng, 1999). That is, unlike an English as a Second Language (ESL) environment, there is little meaningful and real interaction outside of the classroom. Most of the middle school and high school students go to *hagwon* (private academy in Korea) not to learn how to communicate in English but to prepare for English exams. Only a few students listen to educational audiotapes, watch English television programs, or surf the internet to improve their communication skills. If students with less motivation to learn English cannot understand lessons from school textbooks, vocabulary, or grammar reviewed by English teachers during school hours, they simply tend not to seek out clarification and begin to lose interest in English study. If those students who lose interest in English come to middle school, they usually have a very hard time keeping up with the textbooks. Those students are labeled low-achieving students (LAS) or limited English proficiency (LEP) students in this research. The term LEP in this research is also used to describe language learners whose first language (L1) is other than English and who seem to have limited knowledge of English and are beginners in English language proficiency.

Even though pronunciation is considered very important for its role in speaking, it has received little or no attention from many researchers, teachers, and students in Korea. That is probably because pronunciation has not been required directly to improve Korean students' test scores in the college scholastic ability test (CSAT) and it is very difficult to collect and analyze data. However, we cannot stress too much the importance of pronunciation not just to improve our speaking in this rapid changing world but also to be prepared for the speaking section of many tests (e.g. NEAT, TOEFL, TOEIC, TEPS, etc.). Although the importance of the NEAT decreased by the announcement that it is not currently going to replace the English section of CSAT, it still can be used for *Sushi* (early decision plans for college in Korea).

The present study has the following purposes. First, this study investigates the effects of Phonological Awareness Instruction Combined with Phonetics (PAICWP) on Korean middle school students' English proficiency. Second, the current study is designed to find any differences between two different teaching methods (modes) of instruction using PAICWP in terms of Focus on Form (FonF): explicit instruction and implicit instruction. Third, the current study aims to find out if any effects from the instruction of PAICWP persist after 4 weeks of instruction.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

1. Pronunciation Teaching History

There are two general approaches to the teaching of pronunciation. The first is Intuitive-Imitative Approaches (IIA) and the other is Analytic-Linguistic Approaches (ALA). In the IIA, there is no intervention of any explicit information and falls back on the learner's ability to imitate the sounds and rhythms of the target language which means student's L2. For the IIA, the availability of good models such as teachers, tape recorders, audio- and videocassettes, compact discs (CDs), digital video discs (DVDs), etc. is very necessary. On the other hand, the ALA uses information and tools like a phonetic alphabet, articulatory descriptions, charts of the vocal apparatus, contrastive information with explicit information about sounds and rhythms of the target language. The ALA was developed not to replace but to complement IIA (Celce-Murcia, Brinton, & Goodwin, 2010).

The IIA was used before the late nineteenth century and the teacher's or textbook writer's impressionistic observations about sounds which are based on orthography were added but they were often phonetically inaccurate. Pronunciation was the "Cinderella" area of foreign-language teaching, which means many linguists and teachers have studied grammar and vocabulary neglecting pronunciation (Kelly, 1969). Therefore, pronunciation began to be studied only a short time before the beginning of the twentieth century.

If we look at the various methods used in language teaching, we could understand better the history of pronunciation teaching. In the Grammar-Translation Method, teachers did not pay or paid little attention to pronunciation and they were relatively tolerant about students' pronunciation errors. If it is necessary, teachers corrected students’ pronunciation through lectures. In Direct Method, focus was placed on accuracy and students would learn how to pronounce the target language by listening to and repeating the teacher's model sounds. The teacher corrected students’ wrong pronunciation because there is a strong belief that initial errors should be corrected before they become a habit. In the Audiolingual Method, the teacher emphasized accuracy of the target language pronunciation and pronunciation was taught from the beginning. Repetition drills and practice using minimal-pairs were used. Also the teacher is not tolerant of students’ pronunciation errors. In the Silent Way, focus is placed on accuracy first then on fluency. Words and phrases are repeated until students have near native-like pronunciation. Sound-color charts and Fidel charts were used for teacher correction. In this method, the teacher is not tolerant of students’ pronunciation errors.

2. Focus on forms vs. Focus on Form

"Focus on forms" means that teachers emphasize various forms (grammatical forms, pronunciation, vocabulary, etc.) and the students' main focus is on forms. This approach can be equated with the traditional grammar teaching of discrete points in separate lessons. The "Focus on forms" approach was usually used in the grammar translation method. In the "Focus on forms" approach, activities are usually directed at one grammatical structure (Long & Robinson, 1998). Teachers using this approach pick one structure a day and make students memorize the chosen forms and practice them many times without focusing on meaning. In this approach, focus is not on fluency but on accuracy. This approach entails teaching forms in a series of separate lessons.

"Focus on Form" refers to drawing "... students' attention to linguistic elements as they arise incidentally in lessons whose overriding focus is on meaning or communication." (Long 1991, pp. 45-46). “Focus on form instruction” is a kind of instruction that emphasizes both meaning and form. It supports the importance of communicative language teaching principles: authentic communication and student-centeredness. In addition, it holds up the value of the occasional and overt study of problematic L2 grammatical forms.

In order to teach pronunciation, several instructional techniques such as explicit explanation (Derwing, Munro, & Wieber, 1998), recasts (Lyster, 1998), metalinguistic feedback (Hardison, 2004) have been used and those techniques are known to promote learner’s attention to form-related features in second language input. The results of the research have been shown to lead to improved performance on numerous pronunciation measures. The following table compares between ‘Focus on forms’ and ‘Focus on Form’ and their primary focus and distribution.

According to Ellis (2001), “Form-focused instruction” refers to any planned or incidental instructional activity that is intended to cause language learners to pay attention to linguistic form which includes grammatical, phonological, lexical, and pragmalinguistic aspects of language. There are three types of “Form-focused instruction.”

TABLE 1

Types of Form-Focused Instruction

Type	Primary Focus	Distribution
1.Focus on forms	Form	Intensive
2.Planned focus on form	Meaning	Intensive
3.Incidental focus on form	Meaning	Extensive

Note. This table is adapted from Ellis (2001, p. 17)

Focus on Form (FonF) has many techniques: Input flood, task-essential language, input enhancement, negotiation, recast, output, enhancement, interaction enhancement, dictogloss, consciousness-raising tasks, input processing, garden path strategy, etc. For instance, the "dictogloss" is a procedure to encourage learners to reflect on their own output (Wajnryb, 1990). Learners listen to a text in normal speed and write words which they hear during the procedure. After listening, they are supposed to reconstruct it. FonF is divided into two categories according the obtrusiveness: explicit instruction vs. implicit instruction (see Appendix 1).

3. Explicit Instruction vs. Implicit Instruction

Explicit instruction refers to teaching explicitly and in the method the instructor clearly offers the learning goals of the class, clear explanations of the difficult as well as basic terms, important information. For instance, teachers draw the association between the letter (grapheme) and the sound (phoneme) in PAI. Therefore, it is teacher-centered and instruction is explicit when learners do receive information concerning rules underlying the input (Ellis, 1994).

On the other hand, implicit instruction refers to teaching implicitly and the instructor just presents some input, information, problem, etc. to the students and they are supposed to make their own conclusions. It is implied but not directly stated. For example, teachers do not draw the association between the letter (grapheme) and the sound (phoneme) in PAI (Adams, 1990; Yopp, 1992). Therefore, it is student-centered and instruction is implicit when learners do not receive information concerning rules underlying the input (Ellis, 1994; Norris & Ortega, 2000).

Many researchers have examined the effect of explicit and implicit teaching. For instance, Reber (1993) argued that what can be learned and also remembered implicitly often appears to exceed what can be learned and remembered explicitly. Based on an extensive series of experiments with artificial grammars (finite state grammars), he has also argued that participants can learn rules underlying the complex pattern of co-occurrence of forms (letter strings) without thinking about these rules and that this implicit learning may be superior to explicit induction of the rules by the subject. However, other researchers are in favor of explicit instruction and argue that learners who receive no instruction seem to be at risk of fossilizing sooner than those who receive formal instruction (Fotos, 1993; Swan, 2005).

There are a number of experiments that have shown subjects can learn very complex patterns but they were not able to verbalize them. For example, subjects could predict where a character would appear on a projection screen after they had been exposed to its complex pattern of movement many times. However, none of the subjects could describe

the pattern (Lewicki, Czyzewska, & Hoffman, 1987).

Scott (1989) compared explicit teaching with implicit teaching. Explicit teaching consisted of providing learners with explicit information about relative pronouns and the subjunctive in French followed by various form-focused practices. Implicit teaching composed of embedding the target forms in input passages (short stories). According to the result, learners from the explicit condition performed better than those from the implicit condition. However, she found no difference between the explicit group and the implicit group on oral tests.

4. PAICWP

In this present research, new pronunciation teaching called PAICWP was used. It stands for "Phonological Awareness Instruction Combined With Phonetics". Phonological awareness means the ability of a learner to manipulate phonemes (individual sounds) in words (Smith, Simmons, & Kameenui, 1998). Phonological awareness is composed of the abilities to blend (synthesize) and segment (analyze) sounds in words (Wagner, Torgesen, & Rashotte, 1994). Fitzpatrick (1997) summarizes it best by saying that phonological awareness is "the ability to listen inside a word". According to numerous studies, phonological processing variables differentiate between good and poor readers at all age levels (Stanovich, 1982; Wagner & Torgesen, 1987).

Phonetics is a branch of linguistics that comprises the study of the sounds of human speech and there are three basic areas of study: articulatory phonetics, acoustic phonetics, and auditory phonetics. Articulatory phonetics is the study of the production of speech sounds by the articulatory and vocal tract of the speaker. Acoustic phonetics is the study of the physical transmission of speech sounds from the speaker to the listener. Auditory phonetics is the study of the reception and perception of speech sounds by the listener. In particular, the present research has to do with articulatory phonetics because it provides learners with the information about how to make target sounds with regard to place of articulation and manner of articulation.

Saito (2011) investigated the effects of explicit phonetic instruction on second language pronunciation by adopting two different outcome measurements: (1) a rubric of accentedness; (2) a rubric of comprehensibility. The results showed that explicit instruction had a significant effect on comprehensibility especially in the sentence-reading task. However, a significant reduction in foreign accent was not attained in any contexts.

Pronunciation instruction has been shown to improve L2 production accuracy not only in FL contexts but also in L2 circumstances (Neufeld, 1977; Piske, MacKay, & Fledge, 2001). Some researchers believe that most adult L2 learners do not achieve native-like

pronunciation without the help of explicit instruction (Bongaerts, van Summeren, Planken, & Schils, 1997; Fullana, 2006). The central component of pronunciation instruction is usually explicit teaching of L2 phonetics and it usually emphasizes the phonetic parameters related to segmentals such as place of articulation and manner of articulation using speech organs. For example, during the PAICWP class, principal organs (lips, teeth, alveolar ridge, palate etc.) of articulation, places of articulation (bilabial, labiodentals, dental, alveolar, etc.), and manners of articulation (stop, fricative, affricate, nasal, etc.) were explained to the students using the site titled *Sounds of Speech* (http://www.uiowa.edu/~acadtech/phonetics) for 9 sessions.

III. RESEARCH RATIONALE

1. The Necessity of Pronunciation Study

Although many students and teachers realize the necessity of pronunciation teaching, most of them do not know how to teach and learn pronunciation, especially for the secondary schools. The recent tests such as NEAT, TOEFL, TOEIC, TEPS, etc. include speaking sections (e.g., NEAT speaking, TOEFL iBT speaking section, TOEIC speaking section). Therefore, students need to study English pronunciation to prepare for those tests because those tests are directly related to entering college, studying abroad, getting a promotion, improving English-language skills etc. Since Korean students live in the EFL settings and they have limited or few opportunities to speak, they have found it very difficult to improve speaking. Thus, the author was trying to find ways to help students learn how to speak English effectively and efficiently. There could be many different ways to improve students' speaking depending on different variables such as language learners' proficiency level, motivation, aptitude, gender, etc. Since there is no panacea to cure all the illnesses, the prescription should be different depending on language learners' problematic areas. The present research tried to find effective ways to improve the English pronunciation.

Phonological Awareness Instruction Combined With Phonetics (PAICWP) can be an effective and beneficial way to promote student's language proficiency. It contains the skills dealing with both phonological awareness (PA) and phonetics. Students will receive benefits of PA and phonetics and there are several reasons why this study is important.

First of all, this study is important because students with a good understanding of PA will have the underlying framework for reading when they learn letter-sound correspondences. Students who have difficulty with PA can learn "phonics", but students

have difficulty using this knowledge of letters and sound combination as they read and spell. Thus, it is important to make sure that all students have well-developed PA. Students who have difficulty with PA will struggle in figuring out the relationship between sounds and letters and will not have the underlying ability to "listen inside a word" and "play with the sounds" they hear (Fitzpatrick, 1997, p. 5). Therefore, PA is essential knowledge and students with LEP will be able to learn how to decode individual sounds within a word and read using the target language making themselves understood. It is also necessary to find out if PA instruction with phonetics works well to improve students' language proficiency. According to numerous research studies, PA skills of segmenting and blending are the most highly correlated with beginning reading acquisition and once students obtain those skills, they will be able to be successful readers.

This study is also significant in that it explores the issues of explicit vs. implicit teaching modes in the EFL situation. Through this study, we can find out the effective mode of teaching and factors that play important roles in improving listening, speaking, and reading proficiency. Those findings of this study will provide informative ways for the material designers and developers as well as teachers and students.

2. Research Questions and Hypotheses

The present study is designed to find the effects of PA instruction combined with phonetics (PAICWP) on the Korean EFL middle school student with LEP. In addition, the current study is trying to find if there are any significant differences between the control group (CG) without using PAICWP, the implicit instruction group (IIG) with PAICWP, and the explicit instruction group (EIG) using the PAICWP. General hypothesis is that PAICWP will be helpful for the development language proficiency of Korean middle school students with LEP. The null hypotheses for the purpose of this study are as follows:

H1: There is no statistically significant difference in Korean middle school students with LEP in English listening, speaking, and reading ability between the CG, IIG, and EIG.

H2: There is no statistically significant difference in Korean middle school students with LEP in listening, speaking, and reading ability after four weeks without PAICWP between the CG, IIG, and EIG.

3. Limitations of the Study

This study started at the end of August in 2012 and finished at the end of January in 2013. The Ministry of Education (MOE) and the Committee for college admissions system reform officially announced that the NEAT was not going to replace the English section of the CSAT in Korea in the beginning of September in 2013. That decision was made by the "Simpler College Admission System", a plan to simplify the current complex College Admission System. Thus, the necessity of the NEAT became very weak. However, the NEAT can still be used to for *Sushi* (early decision plans for college) because currently there are about 36 colleges using the test results of the NEAT (http://www.neat.re.kr/loginSubMain.do) and the number of colleges seems to increase with the necessity of tools to measure students' four English skills (listening, speaking, reading, and writing).

Second, there is no writing test to find the effects of this research because students are in EFL situations and there is no proven tool to measure Korean students' writing ability. In addition, it is very hard to measure students' writing proficiency because of time constraints for the research and there is no specific guideline for scoring the writing test.

IV. METHOD

1. Participants and Settings

The middle school used for the research is located on the outskirts of Daejeon Metropolitan City. All of the students in the school were divided into four groups based on the students' English scores from the regular school tests and the nationwide proficiency test in the middle of June. They were an advanced group, an upper intermediate group, a lower intermediate group, and a beginner group. The author was in charge of the three beginner classes and to ensure the equivalency of the three classes in terms of the students' English proficiency before the research, three types of pre-tests were administered: nationwide listening comprehension test (2012. 8. 27.), Level 3 NEAT speaking test (2012. 8. 29), and the Daejeon city-wide reading comprehension test (2012. 8. 31.).

Research was conducted from the end of August 2012 starting with pre-tests to the end of January 2013 ending with delayed post-tests and involved 43 Korean middle school students. The subjects had studied English as a foreign language for a period of about four years in elementary school and there were 19 male and 24 female students in their first year of middle school. According to the demographic information questionnaire,

students' ages were 14 or 15 years old.

It was also observed that none of the students possessed any substantial knowledge in phonological awareness or phonetics. All students reported no formal instruction on English pronunciation out of the classroom.

There was no PAICWP in the CG and there was implicit PAICWP in the IIG, and explicit PAICWP in the EIG during the period class which consists of 45 minutes, three times a week. The EIG received a total of 30 hours of instruction on PAICWP. The CG used only the middle school English text book without the intervention of PAICWP. Phonological awareness instruction is implied but not directly stated in the IIG.

To confirm that each group was homogeneous in the listening proficiency level, the mean scores of each group on the listening comprehension test (LCT) were calculated. To examine whether the difference in means are statistically significant, one-way ANOVA procedure was employed with the instruction type as the independent variable. The results of the ANOVA test indicated that there were no significant differences (F=0.028, p=.972) among the listening comprehension test scores of the three different groups. The results confirmed that the subjects in each group and all subjects as a whole were at the same level of listening proficiency.

To confirm that each group was homogeneous in speaking proficiency level, the mean scores of each group on the Level 3 NEAT speaking test were calculated. To examine whether the difference in means are statistically significant, one-way ANOVA procedure was employed with the instruction type as the independent variable. The results of the ANOVA test indicated that there were no significant differences (F=0.094, p=.910) among the Level 3 NEAT speaking test scores of the three different groups. The results confirmed that the subjects in each group and all subjects as a whole were at the same level of speaking proficiency.

To confirm that each group was homogeneous in reading proficiency level, the mean scores of each group on the reading comprehension test (RCT) were calculated. To examine whether the difference in means are statistically significant, one-way ANOVA procedure was employed with the instruction type as the independent variable. The results of the ANOVA test indicated that there were no significant differences (F=0.101, p=.904) among the reading comprehension test scores of the three different groups. The results confirmed that the subjects in each group and all subjects as a whole were at the same level of reading proficiency.

2. Instrumentation

The instrument employed in this study consisted of 3 sets of nationwide English Listening Comprehension Tests, 3 sets of the Level-3 NEAT speaking test, and 3 sets of

city-wide Proficiency Tests for middle school students. Each instrument will be described in the following paragraph.

The study began by administering three pre-tests (listening, speaking, and reading pre-tests) in the fourth week of August and three immediate post-tests (listening, speaking, and reading post-tests) were conducted at the end of the PAICWP in the last week of December 2012. The delayed post-tests were administered at the end of January 2013. For measuring listening ability, 2010 nationwide listening comprehension tests for middle school students were used for the pre-test and immediate post-test and 2011 nationwide listening comprehension test for middle school students was used for the delayed post-test . There were 20 questions for each listening comprehension pre-test, immediate post-test, and delayed post-test. Students' correct answers for each question counted towards the scores of each student: 20 was the perfect score.

The Level-3 NEAT speaking test was conducted in a computer room and students responses were audio-recorded using either Microsoft Sound Recorder installed as a basic tool of Windows or the Audio Dropbox 2.0, a Rich Internet Application for Language Learning. The Microsoft Sound Recorder program is located under "entertainment: start-programs-accessories-entertainment-Sound Recorder." The audio dropbox is an audio collection tool that can be put on any web page. After students record themselves using the audio dropbox their recordings are placed in the instructor's dropbox automatically. One can access the Audio Dropbox after logging in to the Rich Internet Application (RIA) which can be accessed from the following website (http://clear.msu.edu/clear). In the research, the perfect score for the speaking test was 5.

Students recorded their voice and responded to the 9 questions of Level-3 NEAT pre-test, the immediate post-test, and delayed post-test. When students were using the Microsoft Sound Recorder, they were required to save their recorded files on the desktop and later the files were collected using a USB after the recording job was done.

The reading comprehension test was originally composed of 10 listening questions and 20 reading questions. Since the author was only concerned with the reading portion of the test and students already took the listening comprehension tests, the 10 listening questions in the original city-wide English proficiency tests were eliminated to measure only the students' reading ability. Each question was worth 5 points in the reading comprehension test and the total score for reading comprehension questions was 100.

3. Procedures

During each class session, the participants in the control group (CG) did not receive any PAICWP. The implicit instruction group (IIG) was provided PAICWP instruction implicitly and the explicit instruction group (EIG) was provided PAICWP instruction

explicitly (see Appendix 2). The author taught three groups: CG, IIG and EIG using the same text book "Middle School English 1" from Doosandonga (S. K. Kim et al., 2011). The EIG received explicit teaching in the PAICWP through a variety of activities. For example, when students learn the pronunciation of the English vowels, listen and repeat, sound maze, vowel discrimination activities, cued dialogues, bingo, information gap activities, chain drills, role plays, dictogloss and student generated limericks were used (Celce-Murcia et al., 2010; Y. Oh & C. K. Min, 2011). On the other hand, students in the implicit instruction group (IIG) were taught the English pronunciation implicitly through the use of indirect ways such as recast, which means the reformulation of the learner's immediately preceeding erroneous utterance while maintaining the speaker's intended meaning.

Each class session was forty five minutes and the participants in the EIG learned how to segment, synthesize, and manipulate phonemes using the words in the textbook. They also learned the organs of articulation, places of articulation and manners of articulation using audio-visual materials. For the control group, each lesson consisted of participation in classroom activities that did not contain any explanation about PA and phonetics. The IIG received the implicit instruction on PAICWP and students did not receive any explicit corrective feedback on pronunciation or PA. When there is a part in the textbook that is necessary to explain, the author gave simple and implicit instruction without providing teacher-centered feedback. The author provided students with the organized, systematic, and ongoing instruction for the EIG. When students seemed not to understand the teacher's comments or explanation, the author tried to make sure students had a clear understanding by giving explicit instruction. For instance, after students in the EIG learned that the rhyme is any sound from the vowel to the end of the word, they were asked if the two words they heard were rhymes: e.g., "Do these words rhyme: shell, bell?" In addition, participants did rhyme detection or rhyme oddity tasks: e.g., "Which word does not rhyme: fish, dish, hook?"

4. Data Collection and Analysis

The data for this study is based on three kinds of tests: listening, speaking, and reading. First of all, listening tests consist of nationwide listening comprehension tests. In the pre-test, immediate post-test, and delayed post-test of listening comprehension, a score of 1 was given for the right answer. The test format was a multiple-choice test and the total score of the listening comprehension test was 20.

Speaking tests for the pre-test, immediate post-test and delayed post-test consisted of 4 parts containing 9 questions. The first part of the speaking test was to answer 3 questions based on pictures. In this part, students saw three pictures and each picture had

one question. Students were required to answer the question based on the given picture with one or two complete sentences. The given time to recording this question was 15 seconds. The second part of the speaking test was to answer the 4 related questions. Students were given 20 seconds to orally answer each question. The third part of the speaking test was a picture description. Students were asked to tell a story based on six pictures and they were given 1 minute to prepare their answer and 1 minute to record their answer. The fourth part of speaking test was problem solving. Students were given a word and asked to provide a solution within 1 minute and had an additional 1 minute to record their responses.

Reading comprehension tests for the pre-test, immediate post-test and delayed post-test have 20 multiple questions. Scores of 5 were given according to the numbers of correct answers and the perfect score of the reading comprehension test was 100 for each experimental session.

Data collected from subjects who completed all three kinds of tests were included in the analysis. For measuring students listening comprehension, nationwide listening comprehension tests for the first year in middle school students as pre-test, immediate and delayed post-tests were administered, and the ANOVA was conducted to find out if there were any statistical differences between the CG and the IIG and EIG. For the Speaking ability, the Level 3 NEAT test was conducted and the scores were analyzed using the ANOVA and Scheffe' test. For the analysis of reading ability growth, the ANOVA and Scheffe' test were used.

SPSS 18.0 for Windows with alpha level .05 was used for the statistical analyses. In case there were statistically significant differences between CG, IIG, and EIG, the Scheffe' test was conducted as a post-hoc follow-up procedure.

V. RESULTS

To investigate the effect of implicit and explicit PAICWP, the collected data from three different tests were analyzed using a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA). There are three groups; the control group (CG), the implicit instruction group (IIG), and the explicit instruction group (EIG). The result from the immediate post-test of listening comprehension is shown in Table 2. As indicated in the table, the EIG obtained the highest score (M=6.71), whereas the CG noted the lowest result (M=5.07).

TABLE 2

Descriptive Statistics for the Immediate Post-test of LC

Group	N	M	SD	Min	Max
CG	14	5.07	.730	4	6
IIG	15	5.40	.986	4	7
EIG	14	6.71	1.139	4	9

To examine whether the difference in the scores is significant, a one-way ANOVA was conducted with the instruction type as the independent variable and the scores as the dependent variable. The result presented in Table 3 showed there were significant differences among the three groups (F=11.376, p=.000)

TABLE 3

ANOVA Summary for the Immediate Post-test of LC

Group	SS	Df	MS	F	p
Between-Groups	21.265	2	10.633	11.376	.000*
Within-Groups	37.286	40	.935		
Total	58.651	42			

*p<.05

To find the difference among the instructions, the Scheffe's test as a post hoc follow-up procedure was applied to the immediate post-test scores of LCT. According to the result shown in Table 4, a comparative analysis noted that the CG performed worse than any other group and the EIG performed significantly better than any other group. There was no significant difference between CG and IIG (p=.661), but there was significant difference between CG and EIG (p=.000). In addition, there was a significant difference between IIG and EIG (p=.003).

TABLE 4

Result of Scheffe's Test for the Immediate Post-test of LC

Source	MD	SE	p
CG vs. IIG	-.329	.359	.661
CG vs. EIG	-1.643	.365	.000*
IIG vs. EIG	-1.314	.359	.003*

*p<.05

The result from the post-test of Speaking Test (ST) is shown in Table 5. As indicated below, the EIG obtained the highest score (M=2.21), whereas the CG obtained the lowest score (M=1.43).

TABLE 5

Descriptive Statistics for the Immediate Post-test of Speaking

Group	N	M	SD	Min	Max.
CG	14	1.43	.514	1	2
IIG	15	1.53	.516	1	2
EIG	14	2.2	.699	1	3

The result of one-way ANOVA (Table 6) showed there was a significant difference among the three groups (F=7.592, p=.002*). To find the difference between each instruction group, the Scheffe's test was conducted. According to the result (Table 7), there was no significant difference between CG and IIG (p=.889), but there was a significant difference between CG and EIG (p=.004). In addition, there was significant difference between IIG and EIG (p=.012).

TABLE 6

ANOVA Summary for the Immediate Post-test of Speaking

Group	SS	Df	MS	F	p
Between-Groups	5.132	2	2.566	7.592	.002*
Within-Groups	13.519	40	.338		
Total	18.651	42			

*p<.05

TABLE 7

Result of Scheffe's Test for the Immediate Post-test of Speaking

Source	MD	SE	p
CG vs. IIG	-.105	.216	.889
CG vs. EIG	-.786	.220	.004*
IIG vs. EIG	-.681	.216	.012*

*p<.05

The result from the reading comprehension (RC) is shown in Table 8. As indicated in the table, the EIG obtained the highest score (M=51.43), whereas the CG noted the lowest result (M=42.14).

TABLE 8

Descriptive Statistics for the Immediate Post-test of RC

Group	N	M	SD	Min	Max.
CG	14	42.14	9.139	25	55
IIG	15	43.80	6.338	30	50
EIG	14	51.43	7.187	40	60

To examine whether the difference in the scores is significant, a one-way ANOVA was conducted with the instruction type as the independent variable and the scores as the dependent variable. The result presented in Table 9 showed there were significant differences among three groups (F=5.955, p=.005)

TABLE 9

ANOVA Summary for the Immediate Post-test of RC

Group	SS	Df	MS	F	p
Between-Groups	690.643	2	345.322	5.955	.005*
Within-Groups	2319.543	40	57.989		
Total	3010.186	42			

*p<.05

To find the difference among the instructions, the Scheffe's test as a post hoc follow-up procedure was applied to the post-test scores of LC. According to the result shown in Table 10, a comparative analysis noted that there was no significant difference between CG and IIG (p=.843), but there was a significant difference between CG and EIG (p=.010). In addition, there was a significant difference between IIG and EIG (p=.035).

TABLE 10

Result of Scheffe's Test for the Immediate Post-test of RC

Source	MD	SE	p
CG vs. IIG	-1.657	2.830	.843
CG vs. EIG	-9.286	2.878	.010*
IIG vs. EIG	-7.629	2.830	.035*

*p<.05

A delayed post-test of LC was administered about four weeks after the immediate post-test to examine the retention effect of the PAICWP. As shown in Table 11, the EIG scored the highest (M=5.86), whereas the CG was the lowest (M=4.93).

TABLE 11

Descriptive Statistics for the Delayed Post-test of LC

Group	N	M	SD	Min	Max.
CG	14	4.93	.730	4	6
IIG	15	5	.655	4	6
EIG	14	5.86	.864	4	7

The result of a one-way ANOVA (Table 12) showed there were also significant differences among the three groups (F=6.663, p=.003). According to the Scheffe' test indicated in Table 13, the EIG performed significantly better than the CG and IIG. Specifically, there was no significant difference between CG and IIG (p=.968), but there was a significant difference between CG and EIG (p=.009). In addition, there was a significant difference between IIG and EIG (p=.015). Therefore, the fourth hypothesis is rejected, and it can be claimed that the effects of PAICWP on listening ability improvement are sustained after four weeks without PAICWP.

TABLE 12

ANOVA Summary for the Delayed Post-test of LC

Group	SS	Df	MS	F	p
Between-Groups	7.543	2	3.772	6.663	.003*
Within-Groups	22.643	40	.566		
Total	30.186	42			

*p<.05

TABLE 13

Results of Scheffe Post Hoc Test for the Delayed Post-test of LC

Source	MD	SE	p
CG vs. IIG	-.071	.280	.968
CG vs. EIG	-.929	.284	.009*
IIG vs. EIG	-.857	.280	.015*

*p<.05

A delayed post-test of speaking was administered about four weeks after the immediate post-test to examine the retention effect of the PAICWP. As shown in Table 14, the EIG scored the highest (M=1.57), whereas the CG was the lowest (M=1.36).

TABLE 14

Descriptive Statistics for the Delayed Post-test of Speaking

Group	N	M	SD	Min	Max.
CG	14	1.36	.497	1	2
IIG	15	1.40	.507	1	2
EIG	14	1.57	.514	1	2

The result of the one-way ANOVA (Table 15) shows there are no significant differences among the three groups (F=.706, p=.499). According to the Scheffe Post Hoc test indicated in Table 16, the EIG performed better than the CG and IIG, but the difference was not significant. Therefore, the fifth hypothesis is retained and it can be claimed that the effects of PAICWP on speaking ability improvement were not sustained and faded away after four weeks without PAICWP.

TABLE 15

ANOVA Summary for the Delayed Post-test of Speaking

Group	SS	Df	MS	*F*	*p*
Between-Groups	.362	2	.181	.706	.499
Within-Groups	10.243	40	.256		
Total	10.605	42			

TABLE 16

Results of Scheffe Post Hoc Test for the Delayed Post-test of ST

Source	MD	SE	*p*
CG vs. IIG	-.043	.188	.974
CG vs. EIG	-.214	.191	.539
IIG vs. EIG	-.171	.188	.663

A delayed post-test of RC was administered about four weeks after the immediate post-test to examine the retention effect of the PAICWP. As shown in Table 17, the EIG scored the highest (M=49.29), whereas the CG was the lowest (M=42.86).

TABLE 17

Descriptive Statistics for the Delayed Post-test of RC

Group	N	M	SD	Min	Max.
CG	14	42.86	6.993	30	55
IIG	15	42.67	5.627	30	50
EIG	14	49.29	6.462	40	60

The result of the one-way ANOVA (Table 18) shows there are significant differences among the three groups (F=4.963, p=.012). According to the Scheffe' test indicated in Table 25, the EIG performed significantly better than the CG and IIG. Specifically, there was no significant difference between CG and IIG (p=.997), but there was significant difference between CG and EIG (p=.028). In addition, there was significant difference between IIG and EIG (p=.038). Therefore, the sixth hypothesis is rejected and it can be claimed that the effects of PAICWP on reading ability improvement were sustained after four weeks without PAICWP.

TABLE 18

ANOVA Summary for the Delayed Post-test of RC

Group	SS	Df	MS	*F*	*p*
Between-Groups	402.514	2	201.257	4.963	.012*
Within-Groups	1621.905	40	40.548		
Total	2024.419	42			

*p<.05

TABLE 19

Results of Scheffe Post Hoc Test for the Delayed Post-test of RC

Source	MD	SE	*p*
CG vs. IIG	-.190	2.366	.997
CG vs. EIG	-6.619	2.336	.028*
IIG vs. EIG	-6.429	2.407	.038*

*p<.05

VI. DISCUSSIONS

From the current research, several important things were found. To test the first hypothesis, a descriptive analysis on the scores of immediate post-tests taken by one control group (CG) and two experimental groups (IIG and EIG) was done. It showed that the mean of the CG, IIG, and EIG from the immediate post-test of LC was different (CG=5.07, IIG=5.40, EIG=6.71). The two experimental groups performed differently from each other and from the control group. Furthermore, the result of the ANOVA test (F=11.376, p=.000) followed by the Scheffe Post hoc test, which supported the fact that PAICWP has an effect on improving listening ability and that implicit and explicit instructions have statistically significant different effects on Korean EFL learners.

According to the descriptive analysis on the scores of immediate post-tests of speaking taken by one control group (CG) and two experimental groups (IIG and EIG), the mean of the CG, IIG, and EIG was different (CG=1.43, IIG=1.53, EIG=2.21). The result of the ANOVA test (F=7.592, p=.002) followed by the Scheffe Post hoc test supports the fact that PAICWP has effects on improving speaking ability and the implicit and explicit instructions have statistically significant different effects on Korean EFL learners.

According to the descriptive analysis on the scores of immediate post-tests of reading taken by one control group (CG) and two experimental groups (IIG and EIG), the mean of the CG, IIG, and EIG was different (CG=42.14, IIG=43.80, EIG=51.43). According to the result of the ANOVA test (F=5.955, p=.005) followed by the Scheffe Post hoc test, it supports the fact that PAICWP has effects on improving reading ability and the implicit

and explicit instructions have statistically significant different effects on Korean EFL learners. Consequently, the first hypothesis is rejected.

According to the descriptive analysis on the scores of delayed post-tests of listening taken by one control group (CG) and two experimental groups (IIG and EIG), the mean of the CG, IIG, and EIG was different (CG=4.93, IIG=5, EIG=5.86). The result of the ANOVA test (F=6.663, p=.003) followed by the Scheffe Post hoc test supports the fact that PAICWP has effects on improving listening ability after four weeks

According to the descriptive analysis on the scores of delayed post-tests taken by one control group (CG) and two experimental groups (IIG and EIG), the mean of the CG, IIG, and EIG was not that different (CG=1.36, IIG=1.40, EIG=1.57). The result of the ANOVA test (F=.706, p=.499) followed by the Scheffe Post hoc test supports the fact that PAICWP had no effects on improving students speaking ability after four weeks.

According to the descriptive analysis on the scores of delayed post-tests taken by one control group (CG) and two experimental groups (IIG and EIG), the mean of the CG, IIG, and EIG was different (CG=42.86, IIG=42.67, EIG=49.29). The result of the ANOVA test (F=4.963, p=.012) followed by the Scheffe Post hoc test supports the fact that PAICWP had an effect on improving reading ability after four weeks. Therefore, the second hypothesis is partly rejected.

Questionnaires for students, Korean English teachers (KET), and native English speaking teachers (NEST), were distributed to find their current beliefs about the present study-related items: amount of study time, pronunciation teaching, feedback, etc.

According to the survey for students (n=43), most of the students studied English about one hour a day and they thought speaking was the most difficult part to learn. They also thought the most important skill to learning English was reading for test preparation. In addition, they thought teachers did not seem to give enough feedback about pronunciation and they did not want too much feedback about pronunciation. The survey showed that students believed that reading was the most important part because most of the questions in the middle school tests were related to reading. It also showed that most of the students were not able to read pronunciation symbols very well. When students made mistakes, they wanted to have explicit feedback after the class. It seems that students want to avoid the situation of losing face when teachers talk about some pronunciation problems.

The survey for KETs (n=15) shows that they did not allot time for English pronunciation. That was because they did not have time for pronunciation teaching and it was not an important part of the test preparation. They thought the most important thing for speaking is suprasegmental training. They also believed *Suneung* (Korean Students' College Entrance Exam) should be changed to measure students' English proficiency levels on all four skills (listening, reading, speaking, and writing), and assess test takers'

achievements in English. Most of KETs were familiar with phonetics because they learned it in college but not with phonological awareness. They allotted on average less than 30% time for English pronunciation and they thought surprasegmental training such as rhythm, intonation, and stress is more important than segmental training such as consonants and vowels. They also thought that they were not giving enough pronunciation feedback to the students and gave implicit feedback such as recast which means indirectly correcting students' mistakes by rephrasing their responses.

According to the survey for NESTs (n=7), they did not give a lot of time for pronunciation teaching and thought suprasegmental training is more important than segmental training to improve students' pronunciation. They thought that teaching materials for pronunciation is the most important and necessary thing. According to the survey for NEST, most NESTs were familiar with phonetics but not with phonological awareness. They allotted on average less than 30% time for English pronunciation, and to improve students' pronunciation, they believed surprasegmental training such as rhythm, intonation, and stress is more important than segmental training such as consonants and vowels. They also thought the Korean evaluation system should be changed to reflect the importance of speaking and pronunciation teaching materials should be provided. Most of the NESTs also did not think they were giving enough pronunciation feedback to the students and tend to give implicit feedback such as recast because they do not want to embarrass the student in front of his/ her classmates.

VII. CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

This study found that both the explicit and implicit PAICWP is helpful to improve Korean middle school students' listening, speaking, and reading abilities. It is also found that there is a statistical difference between the CG without using PAICWP and the IIG using PAICWP and the EIG using PAICWP. From the findings, we can say that the explicit mode of teaching is the most beneficial in the EFL environment. The Implicit teaching mode is helpful but not so efficient as explicit instruction at least to the LEP students in Korean middle schools.

The success of implicit instruction in the ESL setting seems to depend on abundant communicative opportunities in class and much exposure outside of class. This kind of exposure helps maintain awareness of the target structure of L2. Thus, it appears that implicit instruction would be more successful in the ESL classroom than in the EFL classroom. However, explicit instruction seems to be more successful in EFL than in ESL because students in the EFL setting usually do not have enough time and opportunities for using the L2 and explicit instruction might better help students notice

the gap between what the learners want to do and what the learners can do. In addition, it appears that there is no statistically significant difference between the CG without using PAICWP and the IIG using PAICWP because students level of English language proficiency were so low and they could not get help from the implicit way.

This study also shows that classroom teaching that involves special training in the perception and production of L2 sounds is beneficial to students in the EFL setting to increase fluency and accuracy of L2.

The results also reveal that the explicit teaching of PAICWP is more effective and efficient in improving Korean EFL middle school LEP students' listening, speaking, and reading ability than the implicit teaching. Specifically, explicit instruction using planned Focus on Form such as metalinguistic explanation, pronunciation rule statement, dictogloss, consciousness-raising tasks, etc. might be more helpful than implicit instruction such as recast, input flood, input enhancement, etc. Teachers also need to plan useful tasks related to the target form in pronunciation meticulously. That is because students do not always pay attention when teachers offer to help them notice the gap between what they say and what the native speakers say. It appears that those kinds of phenomenon happen partly because of the students' ability to be aware of the discrepancy is not enough.

Based on the results of the study, it is suggested that especially in EFL settings where natural target language input is scarce, PAICWP had an ameliorative effect on listening, speaking, and reading abilities of Korean EFL middle school LEP students.

There are several things to consider for future research. First of all, there was only one grade (first year in middle school) in the present study. It is necessary to include more grades (i.e., second year, third year) in middle school and high school to find if there is any difference between grades.

Second, there was only one level of English proficiency (beginner or LEP). For future research, it is necessary to include more levels of English proficiency (i.e., intermediate and advanced) to determine if there is any difference between different levels of English proficiency.

Third, there was no writing ability measurement task after PAICWP because of the time constraint and the author did not want to give too many tests to young students. In addition, there was no single written test that can measure Korean middle school students' writing ability in the EFL context. In the future, a proper written test for Korean middle school students can be employed to decide the effects of PAICWP on their writing ability.

Fourth, the importance of NEAT became very weak because of the announcement of the "Simpler College Admission System", but the new test will be necessary to change the way the English proficiency of the students is evaluated. It also enhances the

balanced way of improving students' communicative competence and performance by strengthening students' speaking abilities.

Fifth, the current study was done in Korea and it is necessary to find out if the results of the PAICWP are consistently the same in different EFL environments such as China and Japan. In addition, it is worth investigating the effects of PAICWP in ESL circumstances.

Sixth, it is necessary to incorporate pronunciation into English classes because pronunciation is a key to gaining full communicative competence.

Lastly, the effects of PAICWP were measured only after one month of PAICWP for the delayed post-test in this research. It would be valuable to investigate how long the effects of PAICWP are sustained after the end of the PAICWP.

REFERENCES

Adams, M. (1990). *Beginning to read: Thinking and learning about print*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Bongaerts, T., van Summeren, C., Planken, B., & Schils, E. (1997). Age and ultimate attainment in the pronunciation of a foreign language, *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *19(*4), 447-465.

Celce-Murcia, M., Brinton, D. M., & Goodwin, J. M. (2010). *Teaching pronunciation: A coursebook and reference guide (2nd ed.).* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Derwing, T. M., Munro, M. J., & Wieber, G. E. (1998). Evidence in favor of a broad framework for pronunciation instruction. *Language Learning*, *48*(3), 393-410.

Ellis, R. (1994). *The study of second language acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ellis, R. (2001). Investigating form-focused instruction. In R. Ellis (Ed.), *Form-focused instruction and second language learning* (pp. 1-46). Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Fitzpatrick, J. (1997). *Phonemic awareness*: *Playing with sounds to strengthen beginning reading skills*. New York: Creative Teaching Press.

Fotos, S. (1993). Consciousness raising and noticing through focus on form: Grammar task performance versus formal instruction. *Applied Linguistics, 14*(4), 385-407.

Fullana, N. (2006). The development of English (FL) perception and production skills: Starting age and exposure effects. In C. Muñoz (Ed.), *Age and the rate of foreign language learning* (pp. 41–64). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Hardison, D. M. (2004). Generalization of computer assisted prosody training: Quantitative and qualitative findings. *Language Learning & Technology, 8*, 34-52.

Kahng, Yong-Koo (1999). Immersion education in Southeast Asia. *English Language and Literature Teaching, 5*, 79-101.

Kelly, L. G. (1969). *25 centuries of language teaching*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Kim Seong Kon, Song Mi Jeong, Yun Jeong Mi, Kang Eun Kyeong, Mun Do Shick, Ryu Yae Hyun, Yeom Mi Seon, & Haas, J. L. (2011). *Middle School English 3*. Seoul: Doosandonga.

Lewicki, E., Czyzewska. M., & Hoffman, H. (1987). Unconscious acquisition of complex procedural knowledge. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition, 13*(4), 523-530.

Long, M. H. (1991). Focus on form: A design feature in language teaching methodology. In K. de Bot, R. B. Ginsberg, & C. Kramsch (Eds.), *Foreign language research in cross-cultural perspective* (pp. 39-52). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Long, M., & Robinson, P. (1998). Theory, research and practice. In Doughty, C. & Williams, J. (Eds.), *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition* (pp. 15–41). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lyster, R. (1998). Negotiation of form, recasts, and explicit correction in relation to error types and learner repair in immersion classrooms. *Language Learning*, *48*(2), 183-218.

Neufeld, G. (1977). Language learning ability in adults: A study on the acquisition of prosodic and articulatory features. *Working Papers in Bilingualism, 12*(1), 45–60.

Norris, J., & Ortega, L. (2000). Effectiveness of L2 instruction: A research synthesis and quantitative meta-analysis. *Language Learning*, *50*(3), 417–528.

Oh, Yeong-ho, & Min, Chan Kyoo. (2011). The effects of dictogloss using cooperative learning on the improvement of English writing abilities. *Modern English Education*, *12*(4), 237-257.

Piske, T., MacKay, I., & Flege, J. (2001). Factors affecting degree of foreign accents in an L2: A review. *Journal of Phonetics, 29*(1), 191–215.

Reber, A. S. (1993). *Implicit learning and tacit knowledge: An essay on the cognitive unconscious*. NY: Oxford.

Satio, K. (2011). Examining the role of explicit phonetic instruction in native-like and comprehensible pronunciation development: an instructed SLA approach to L2 phonology. *Language awareness, 20*(1), 45-59.

Scott. V. (1989). An empirical study of explicit and implicit teaching strategies in French. *The Modern Language Journal, 73(*1*)*, 14-22.

Smith, S. B., Simmons, D. C., & Kameenui, E. J. (1998). Phonological awareness: Research bases. In D. C. Simmons & E. J. Kameenui (Eds.), *What reading research tells us about children with diverse learning needs: Bases and basics* (pp. 19-50). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Stanovich, K. E. (1982). Individual differences in the cognitive processes of reading: Word decoding. *Journal of Learning Disabilities, 15*(8*)*, 485-493.

Swan, M. (2005). *Grammar*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wagner, R. K., & Torgesen, J. K. (1987). The nature of phonological processing and its causal role in the acquisition of reading skills. *Psychological Bulletin*, *101*, 192-212.

Wagner, R. K., Torgesen, J. K., & Rashotte, C. A. (1994). The development of reading-related phonological processing abilities: New evidence of a bi-directional causality from a latent variable longitudinal study. *Developmental Psychology, 30*, 73-87.

Wajnryb, R. (1990). *Grammar dictation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Yopp, H. K. (1992). Developing phonemic awareness in young children. *The Reading Teacher, 45*(9), 696-703.

APPENDIX 1

Degree of obtrusiveness of Focus on Form

(Doughty & Williams, 1998, p. 258)

Task	Unobtrusive						Obtrusive
Input flood	×						
Task essential language	×						
Input enhancement		×					
Negotiation		×					
Recast			×				
Output enhancement			×				
Interaction enhancement				×			
Dictogloss					×		
Consciousness-raising tasks					×		
Input processing						×	
Garden path							×

APPENDIX 2

Teaching Comparison of CG, IIG, and EIG

Situation	CG	IIG	EIG
When students learn /s/, /th/sound	No feedback	Teacher shows how to pronounce /s/, /th/ sound without clear explanation	Teacher shows how to pronounce /s/, /th/ sound with clear explanation
Example	Please listen and repeat Sink, think	Please listen and repeat Sink, think /s/, /th/ Do they begin with the same sound ? No. (Ss answer) Good job! Listen one more time and repeat.	Please listen and repeat Sink, think /s/, /th/ Do they begin with the same sound ? No.(Ss answer) Good job! Let's say just the beginning of the words: /s/ /th/ /s/ is alveolar fricative voiceless /th/ is interdental (sound between teeth) fricative voiceless. When you pronounce /th/sound, you need to protrude your tongue between your upper teeth and lower teeth Please take a look at the animation and notice the place of articulation and manner of articulation.

Examples in: English
Applicable Languages: English
Applicable Levels: Secondary

Chulwoong Bae
Daejeon Metropolitan Office of Education
302-703, 89 Dunsanro Seogu, Daejeon
Tel: 010-7963-1582
Email:msucbcw@gmail.com

Received 14 September 2014
Revised 15 November 2014
Accepted 21 November 2014