

A Study on Military Cadets' Curricular Satisfaction, Their Needs for ESP, and the Future Use of English*

Ki-Wan Sung**

Kyung Hee University

Sung-Woo Yang

Korea Army Academy

Hanki Jung

Korea Army Academy

Sung, Ki-Wan, Yang, Sung-Woo, & Jung, Hanki. (2016). A study on military cadets' curricular satisfaction, their needs for ESP, and the future use of English. *Modern English Education*, 17(1), 89-115.

This study examines military cadets' satisfaction levels on the existing English programs, their views on the needs for general English programs, English for specific (ESP), and occupational (EOP) purposes, and expected use of English skills for specific tasks after the commission. A needs analysis survey was conducted with 903 cadets and the focus group interviews with 43 cadets. The results of ANOVA analyses showed that the junior cadets were more satisfied with the existing English programs and agreed more to the necessity for ESP or EOP programs. The cadets in the language majors showed more satisfaction with the current English curriculum at a statistically significant level. The high group in self-rated English abilities said that both written and spoken English skills would be necessary after the commission. The focus group interviews revealed that the cadets were not satisfied with leveling and rigid teaching practices in classes. Accordingly, change efforts are needed, especially, for appropriate leveling, faculty development and extracurricular English programs. In addition, offering ESP or EOP courses should be considered for cadets who need more content-specific studies in their majors.

[curricular satisfaction/ESP/military cadets/
교육과정 만족도/특수목적영어/사관생도]

* This paper was supported by Research Funds of Korea Army Academy at Yeongcheon in 2014.

** First author: Sung, Ki-Wan, Co-author: Yang, Sung-Woo, Corresponding author: Jung, Hanki

I. INTRODUCTION

It is now well-known that most English teaching practices in higher education purport to enhance learners' abilities to use English in their disciplinary fields as well as their communicative competence (CC). That is, while many people accept the view of learning English to communicate with others, there is also a call for learners' acquisition of specific English abilities to perform required tasks in their fields in future. For example, major universities implemented the policy of offering English medium instruction (EMI) for non-English subject matter courses (H. J. Oh & H. Lee, 2010; H. Lee & K. Sung, 2014). Such change reflects a call made long ago for developing learners' cognitive-academic language proficiency (CALP) in addition to improving students' basic interpersonal communication skills (BICS) (Cummins, 1979).

In the EFL context in Korea, there is, however, still an excessive emphasis on students' acquisition of BICS regardless of their major fields or future jobs. Many tertiary English programs offer general English or test-preparation courses such as TOEIC regardless of learners' disciplinary backgrounds, target language (TL) proficiency levels, or prior learning experiences (H. O. Kim, 2008). However, such practices literally betray the results of relevant studies which recommend developing more ESP or EOP or content-based instruction (CBI) programs to meet learners' needs and interests (J. E. Park, 2004; H. O. Kim, 2008; H. Lee & K. Sung, 2014). In fact, college or adult learners may not need to use fluent English for daily communication in many cases or do not have enough time to learn all language skills since they also have to learn disciplinary knowledge related to their fields. However, there are not many studies on ESP or CBI in ELT as in other fields such as international conferences (H. J. Hwang, 2001), tourism (C. K. Min, 2010), medical fields (J. S. Lee, 2012), engineering (J. B. Ha, 2013), judicial areas (M. K. Kang & E. J. Lee, 2014), nursing (E. J. Kim, 2008), navigation (S. H. Choi, 2014). Accordingly, using survey and interview methods, this study investigates military cadets' satisfaction levels of their English programs, their views on the needs of ESP or EOP, and the use of English for specific military tasks in future.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

The increasing interest in English teaching approaches and methods related to ESP began in 1960s and 1970s (Dudley-Evans & St. John, 1998) or as an immersion model of teaching both mother tongues and foreign languages (Genesee, 1994). According to Swales (2000), it was Halliday, McIntosh and Strevens (1964) who mentioned the need for ESP at first and then influenced the field of applied linguistics, which eventually made ESP as an

independent area for research. In line with the shift of researching and teaching in ELT from EGP for the basic English skills development to ESP, also promoted are CBI (Brinton, Snow, & Wesche, 1989; Met, 1999) or content and language integrated learning (CLIL: Dale & Tanner, 2012).

As a matter of fact, since the 1980s, diverse stakeholders felt the need for specific English abilities depending on their needs in their work, more English as an academic purpose (EAP) or ESP, and EOP programs and specific guidelines have been developed and offered in ELT (Hyland, 2006). Such change is to enhance learner motivation and to help learners acquire both language and content. That is, in ESP-oriented teaching, disciplinary contents are used to help students learn a TL, which is also used as a main medium of instruction. In CBI or CLIL, learning disciplinary contents is prime while language learning is incidental. Therefore, instructors should carefully select and sequence content elements according to learners' background knowledge and their learners' prior experiences and provide extra learning support and supplementary materials in order to help low-level L2 learners to engage more actively in class activities for the contents covered (DeAvila & Duncan, 1984; Larsen-Freeman, 2000).

The criterion for distinguishing EAP/ESP teaching from general English programs (EGP) is whether or not such teaching proceeds based on the understanding of learners' needs (Flowerdew & Peacock, 2001). In other words, whether or not learners' specific learning goals are reflected in the program is important in the distinction between ESP and EGP (Dudley-Evans & St. John, 1998). Therefore, ESP programs design course syllabi based on specific instructional goals and provide more learner-centered curriculum and appropriate materials and activities (Hutchinson & Waters, 1987).

H. O. Kim (2008) analyzed 958 ESP curricular course descriptions based on website materials of the 60 universities in Korea and reports that ESP programs are mostly implemented in engineering and medical fields (247), business areas (245), and hotel and leisure programs (136). Kim reports that the universities investigated offer courses such as test preparation English for TOEIC or TOEFL (98), studies of current English (88), presentation or discussion in English (87), or interview English programs (57). She concludes that there was an increasing tendency of offering more ESP-related courses for the students in some particular majors at these universities.

Among the research on ESP, there exist a number of studies on vocabulary and its learning since certain terms should be used to acquire disciplinary specific knowledge and skills in each field (M. Park & S. Kim, 2011). For example, there are studies on a corpus analysis on maritime English (S. E. Jhang & H. J. Byun, 2011), a study on building a corpus on Maritime English learners (S. C. Hong & S. E. Jhang, 2010), and research on the relationships on vocabulary and meanings specific to maritime English (M. L. Ryoo, 2013). Such interests in maritime English is probably because of the importance of (un)expected

interaction in radio, online, or face-to-face communication in this field.

In the field of aviation, P. W. Park (2013) examined on English programs and contents based on class observations, a survey which involved 39 aviation personnel (15 pilots, 24 air-traffic controllers), and the interviews with 3 instructors. The results showed that the pilots were offered 437 hours of English classes until graduation (speaking: 120 hours, listening: 108 hours, writing: 102 hours, reading: 96 hours, evaluation: 11 hours). In the case of the air-traffic controllers, they studied 457 hours (speaking: 177 hours, writing: 99 hours, reading: 60 hours, listening: 60 hours, preparation for English Proficiency Test for Aviation (EPTA): 50 hours). The class observations showed that both foreign and Korean instructors conducted their classes in a teacher-centered manner and mostly focused on test preparation. The survey also showed that both pilots and controllers preferred classes on English speaking while the former expected most improvement in listening and the latter in speaking. They viewed that both instructor quality and learning environment were most important in their learning and wanted the extension of class hours and change in evaluation. Park also noted that the program was helpful in preparing the pilots and controllers to pass EPTA but was short of helping them acquire real English skills for their specific jobs due to the heavy focus on grammar, reading in general, writing, and basic conversational English. Accordingly, Park suggests that in order to decrease learner demotivation in the program, a needs analysis should be done to offer various courses based on learner interests, to develop appropriate lesson contents and materials, and to cover the lack of instructors' experiences and knowledge through collaboration with experts in the field of aviation.

D. Shin and H. Kim (2005) noted the serious lack of ESP programs in Korea and conducted a research study of a needs analysis to prepare learners for the proficiency exam required by the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) since 2008. According to the results of the survey based on 530 pilots, 240 controllers, and 22 switchboard operators, Shin and Kim reported that, even though experienced workers in the field of aviation responded did not feel the need of daily English, such a view was worrisome since it is against the ICAO's concern over the aviation safety. The study also shows that Korean workers in this field would have most difficulties in the sections of fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension. The respondents in the survey also said that English for aviation should be evaluated based on face-to-face interviews and favored native English speakers as instructors, interviewers, evaluators and test reviewers. Accordingly, D. Shin and H. Kim (2005) claim that these voices from the actual workers should be considered in preparing them for the English proficiency exam. They also call for the cooperation between a diverse group of experts and relevant organizations in the field to motivate these workers rather than focusing on failing them.

J. Y. Lee (2014) surveyed 248 college students and reported that, though they said they

needed speaking skills or ESP/EAP, they also preferred general English classes rather than English mediated instruction. She concluded that such a result shows that, though a number of ESP programs are offered at the university level in Korea, these programs are implemented without the close examination of possible relationships or linkage with GEPs offered or without a systematic study on a needs analysis of a particular group of learners.

In conclusion, as seen above, most of the suggestions and research studies on ESP are from non-English majors such as maritime and aviation fields but no existing research on military cadets in Korea could be found. Therefore, given the increasing interests in and necessity of researching on needs of EAP/ESP or EOP to meet diverse needs of tertiary and adult English learners instead of offering typical general English programs without considering learner needs and future use of their learning, this study is to examine the needs of a specific group of military cadets given that their instructional and career goals and future roles are unique and that such a study has rarely been done before.

III. METHOD

1. Research Questions

This study examines military cadets' levels of satisfaction on the existing curriculum and their opinions on needs and interests for the different types of curricular programs. That is, in order to find problems in the existing programs and improve them, the following research questions were posed;

- 1) To what extent are military cadets satisfied with the curricular and instructional elements according to years of study, majors, and self-rated English levels?
- 2) What are the differences in military cadets' views on the needs for different types of English programs according to years of study, majors and self-rated English levels?
- 3) What are the differences in military cadets' views on expected use of English skills after commission according to years of study, majors and self-rated English levels?

2. Context of Research

The military academy at the time of this research in 2014 offered *Military General English Conversation* for about 500 juniors and *Military English* class for some 500 seniors. Both courses were offered as 2 credit and four hour courses for a year, respectively. The former was similar to English for general purposes in that it focused on basic English conversation skills. As for this course, a commercially developed textbook, *Interchange*

(Cambridge University Press), was used and either foreign or Korean instructors taught the courses according to English levels of the cadets. *Military English* was to teach English for specific purposes focusing on vocabulary, expressions, and related contents necessary in military service work. The textbook for this course was developed by three faculty members at the Academy and there were different sections taught by military faculty or instructors at the time of this study.

3. Participants

A total of 903 cadets at a military academy located in the southeastern part of the country participated in this study. Table 1 shows the majors of the participating cadets:

TABLE 1

Participants by Majors

Majors	<i>n</i>	Majors	<i>n</i>
Chinese Studies	27	Japanese Studies	27
English Studies	55	French Studies	33
Administration	102	Military Management	81
International Relations	97	Studies of Military History	54
Leadership	82	Electronics Engineering	31
Mechanical Engineering	57	Civil Engineering	42
Information Engineering	62	Chemical & Environmental Engineering	31
Weapons System	122	Total	903

Table 2 shows the demographics of the cadets classified by the year (466 juniors and 437 seniors) and their self-rated English abilities. It was reasoned that self-rated proficiency levels are highly correlated with official proficiency tests according to previous studies (Leblanc & Painchaud, 1985), especially given that it was unrealistic to administer these tests to all the cadets for logistical and technical reasons such as time and financial issues.

TABLE 2

Participants by Year and Self-rated Proficiency Levels

Variables	Category	<i>n</i>	%
Years	Junior	466	51.6
	Senior	437	48.4
	Total	903	100.0
English Levels	High	46	5.1
	Intermediate	422	46.7
	Low	435	48.2
	Total	903	100.0

4. Instruments

1) Survey

The questionnaire for this study¹ was developed based on theories and previous research on general or ESP teaching and learning (e.g., H. O. Kim, 2008; J. S. Lee, 2012; J. B. Ha, 2013; P. W. Park, 2013; H. Lee & K. Sung, 2014). The survey draft was piloted with a group of college students to ensure its reliability through multiple revisions and (re)organizations of some questions by the researchers and panel of experts in curricular and instructional areas in ELT. More specifically, the survey was composed of the three parts: 1) the 15 demographic information items included the participants' year of study, major, age, their English study experiences such as study-abroad, taking official English proficiency exams, self-rated English abilities, etc., 2) the second part consisted of 21 questions examining the participants' opinions on the existing curricular elements (10 items) and on their needs for general, ESP/EAP, and EOP English (11 items), and 3) the last part was composed of the 22 questions which investigated the participants' needs for English skills after the commission (12 items) and English skills related to military occupation specialties (MOS, 10 items). In the survey, the following definitions of the terms were provided in Korean to facilitate the participants' understanding of the questions:

- (1) General English Programs (GEP): Courses or subjects offered as basic English skills learning or part of general education (e.g., English Conversation, English Reading, English Listening, etc.)
- (2) English as Academic/Specific Purposes (EAP/ESP): Disciplinary content courses or English subjects in a major field usually taught in English as a main medium of instruction (e.g., Introduction to Economics, Foundation of Physics, Military Science, Regional Language Studies, Understanding Culture, etc.)
- (3) English as Occupational Purposes (EOP): English courses of which the contents are more used on a daily basis and are also directly related to specific tasks after the commission (e.g., English Translation & Interpretation Practice, General Military English, Business English, English for Tourism, etc.)

Accordingly, the three terms above will be used to distinguish each type of English class or program in this paper. In addition, among these questions, there were five choice or opinion questions on the necessities of different types of English programs and one opened

¹ The survey could not be included in the appendix due to the page limit and please contact the authors if needed.

questions on the urgent area to be improved in the existing curriculum. Last, the reliability of the questionnaire was reported in the result section according to the grouping of the items based on the research questions above.

2) Focus Group Interviews

Focus group interviews were conducted one and a half months after the survey to complement the results of the survey. The interview participants were randomly selected from each department. That is, one or two cadets from each major participated in the interviews according to the number of enrollment in the departments or availabilities at the time of the interviews. Accordingly, the lead researcher interviewed a total of 18 juniors and 25 seniors as a group of four. Each focus group interview lasted for 20-30 minutes using semi-structured questions on their experience of learning English, the extent of helpfulness and difficulties of the courses taken, and the expected use and necessities of English skills related to MOS after the commission. During the interview, the interviewees were given frequent opportunities to express their opinions through confirmatory and expanded questions by the researcher, who also wrote a field note. All the interview sessions were also tape-recorded for further analysis.

3) Data Collection and Analysis

The survey questionnaire was collected at the beginning of the second semester in 2014 while the focus group interviews were done in the mid-October. The participants were first informed that their names would remain anonymously and their responses would also be used confidentially. Then, they were asked to either fill out some demographic information or open-ended questions while also checking either the choice items or a five-point likert scale items. The data were arranged in SPSS 20.0 or excel sheets for further analyses using both descriptive and inferential statistics based on the quantitative data. More specifically, one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to examine the difference of the three dependent variables, which are 1) the satisfaction level for the existing curriculum, 2) views on the needs of different types of English (i.e., GEP, ESP/EAP, EOP), and 3) views of future use of English after the commission, according to the three independent variables (i.e., the cadets' years of study, their major fields, and self-rated English abilities). The significant level was set at $p \leq 0.05$. Last but not least, the focus group interviews were also analyzed through multiple listenings to find out recurring comments or issues expressed by the interviewees. In other words, the participants' responses during the focus group interviews were reviewed by the researchers several times and the similar responses were categorized and coded into the identified categories or grouped using key terms or themes

in a qualitative manner (Saldaña, 2013).

IV. RESULTS

1. Participant Satisfaction on Existing English Curriculum

The four items (II-4, 6, 7, and 8) in the survey measured the satisfaction levels of the participating cadets. These questions were given to examine their levels of satisfaction on the existing English curriculum and content (Q. 4), adequacy of course evaluation (Q. 6), consistency of tests and own language abilities (Q. 7), and relevance of courses for future MOS (Q. 8). The reliability of these four items was Cronbach's $\alpha=0.708$. The following shows the descriptive statistics of these four items;

TABLE 3
Descriptive Statistics on Cadet Satisfaction on Existing Curriculum ($n=903$)

	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>MIN</i>	<i>MAX</i>
Overall Satisfaction	2.87	.67	1	5
Satisfaction on Curriculum & Content	2.87	.94	1	4
Adequacy of Evaluation	2.87	.81	1	4
Consistency of Exams	2.85	.81	1	5
Relevance to Future MOS	2.89	1.03	1	4

As shown in Table 3, the mean score of overall satisfaction on the existing curriculum was 2.87 on a 5-point likert scale. This shows the cadets' views were on a little negative side given that it was below the theoretical midpoint (3.0) and, as a matter of fact, all four items were below the midpoint.

1) Descriptive Statistics on Curricular Satisfaction by Year, Majors, and English Levels

The following shows the descriptive statistics and the results of a one-way ANOVA regarding the differences in the cadets' satisfaction on the existing English curriculum according to years of study, majors, and English proficiency level.

TABLE 4
Descriptive Statistics on Curricular Satisfaction by Years, Majors, and English Levels

	Variables	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Years	Juniors	466	2.98	.65
	Seniors	437	2.75	.66
	Total	903	2.87	.71
Majors	Language	142	3.01	.66
	Social Science	416	2.80	.66
	Engineering	130	2.81	.63
	Science	215	2.94	.66
	Total	903	2.87	.67
English Levels	High	46	3.01	.92
	Intermediate	422	2.93	.59
	Low	435	2.79	.69
	Total	903	2.87	.66

2) Participants' Curricular Satisfaction by Year, Majors, and English Levels

According to Table 4 and 5, there was a statistically significant difference between the juniors and seniors regarding the satisfaction level of the current curriculum. It shows that the juniors ($M=2.98$) were more satisfied than the seniors ($M=2.75$). This results may be due to the fact that the juniors was mandated to take *Military English Conversation* course, which was similar to general English courses they had taken in previous colleges or universities. On the other hand, the seniors took a required course titled *Military English*, which was similar to an ESP subject covering disciplinary specific vocabularies and expressions related to military operations or tasks.

TABLE 5
Result of One-way ANOVA on Curricular Satisfaction
by Years, Majors, and English Levels

		<i>ss</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>ms</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	Scheffé
Years	between groups	12.414	1	12.414	28.714***	.000	Junior*
	within groups	389.529	901	.432			Senior
Majors	between groups	6.254	3	2.085	4.736**	.003	language*
	within groups	395.689	899	.440			social science
English Levels	between groups	4.831	2	2.415	5.474**	.004	low*
	within groups	397.112	900	.441			IM

Note. *** $p \leq .00$, ** $p \leq .011$; IM=Intermediate

In order to examine curricular satisfaction according to cadets' majors, all majors were categorized as 4 major groups (language, social science, engineering, science) by

collapsing 15 different majors based on the similarities of the fields and also by considering the number of the cadets in similar majors, simultaneously. The mean score for language majors ($M=3.01$) was the highest while that of social science was the lowest ($M=2.80$). The result of one-way ANOVA in Table 5 revealed that there was a statistically significant difference between these two major groups. No difference was observed between other majors. The cadets took the same courses each year and this difference may result from their differences in the difficulties of the courses or language abilities. That is, language majors, especially English majoring students, may have felt easier in taking English courses offered in the academy.

In terms of the results according to cadets' English proficiency level, the 7 likert scale items in the survey asked the participating cadets to assess their English abilities regarding speaking, listening, reading, writing, vocabulary, grammar, and pronunciation. The reliability for these items was Cronbach $\alpha=0.87$. Based on these data, a correlation between their self-rated English abilities and satisfaction level on the existing curriculum was examined. Then, a group difference was also examined after dividing their self-rated English abilities into three levels, high, intermediate, and low.

TABLE 6
Result of a Correlation Analysis between English Levels
and Curricular Satisfaction ($n=903$)

		Curricular Satisfaction	Self-rated English Abilities
Curricular Satisfaction	<i>r</i>	1	.101
	<i>p</i>		.002**

Note: ** $p \leq .001$

According to Table 6, the correlation between the cadets' self-rated English abilities and their curricular satisfaction degree has a very low relationship ($r=0.101$). As revealed in Tables 4 and 5, the cadets' curricular satisfaction levels did not necessarily increase though their self-rated English abilities were higher. This is why the correlation presented in Table 6 was also low. As a matter of fact, there was a statistically significant difference only between intermediate and low groups in terms of their self-rated English abilities. As a result, it can be concluded that the cadets' curricular satisfaction are not decisively affected by their English abilities though measured through self-rating.

2. Participants' Views on Needs of Different English Curriculums

1) Descriptive Statistics on Needs of Different English Programs by Years, Majors, and English Levels

Table 7 shows descriptive statistics on the cadets' views on needs for EGP, EAP/ESP, and EOP programs (III-1, 2, 3), respectively, measured with the three 5-point likert type items. It shows that the mean score of GEP English was the highest ($M=3.77$) while that of EAP/ESP was the lowest ($M=3.38$).

TABLE 7
Descriptive Statistics on Cadets' Views of Different English Programs ($n=903$)

Type	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>MIN</i>	<i>MAX</i>
EGP	3.77	.90	1	4
EAP/ESP	3.38	.96	1	4
EOP	3.70	.91	1	4

Table 8 presents descriptive statistics on needs of different types of English programs (i.e., GEP, EAP/ESP, and EOP) according to the cadets' years, majors, and English abilities.

TABLE 8
Descriptive Statistics on Needs of Different English Programs
by Years, Majors, and English Levels

Variables	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i> ¹	<i>SD</i> ¹	<i>M</i> ²	<i>SD</i> ²	<i>M</i> ³	<i>SD</i> ³
Years	Juniors	466	3.86	.89	3.48	.94	3.91 .84
	Seniors	437	3.66	.90	3.28	.99	3.47 .92
	Total	903	3.77	.90	3.38	.97	3.70 .91
Majors English Levels	Language	142	3.75	.92	3.46	.97	3.68 .98
	Social Science	416	3.78	.89	3.36	.99	3.71 .90
	Engineering	130	3.80	.90	3.28	1.06	3.68 .83
	Science	215	3.72	.92	3.43	.84	3.70 .85
	Total	903	3.77	.90	3.38	.97	3.70 .91
	High	46	4.04	.82	3.80	.98	3.85 .87
Intermediate	422	3.80	.85	3.42	.96	3.78 .87	
Low	435	3.70	.96	3.30	.83	3.60 .93	
Total	903	3.77	.90	3.38	.97	3.70 .91	

Note. *M*¹: EGP, *M*²: EAP/ESP, *M*³: EOP

2) Participants' Views on Needs of Different English Curriculum by Years, Majors, and English Levels

Table 9 shows that there were statistical differences in the cadets' views on the needs of different English programs depending on their years of study, majors, and English

proficiency level. The juniors thought that different English programs were more needed in the curriculum or in their future jobs than the seniors ($F=11.839$, $p=0.001$). As for EGP English, there was a difference between the high group ($M=4.04$) and the low group ($M=3.70$) at a statistically significant level ($F=3.886$, $p<0.01$).

TABLE 9

Results of One-way ANOVA on Needs for EGP by Years, Majors, and English Levels

		<i>ss</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>ms</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	Scheffé
Years	between groups	9.548	1	9.548	11.839**	.001	Junior* Senior
	within groups	726.680	901	.807			
Majors	between groups	.833	3	.278	.339	.797	
	within groups	735.395	899	.818			
English Levels	between groups	3.604	2	3.152	3.886*	.021	high*low
	within groups	729.924	900	.811			

Note: ** $p \leq .001$, * $p \leq .01$

Table 10 presents the results of one-way ANOVA analysis of the needs of EAP/ESP programs according to the cadets' college years, majors, and English levels.

TABLE 10

Results of One-way ANOVA on Needs for EAP/ESP by Years, Majors, and English Levels

		<i>ss</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>ms</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	Scheffé
Years	between groups	9.170	1	9.170	9.910**	.002	Junior* Senior
	within groups	833.782	901	.925			
Majors	between groups	2.990	3	.997	1.067	.362	
	within groups	839.963	899	.934			
English Levels	between groups	11.567	2	5.783	6.261**	.002	high*IM high*low
	within groups	831.386	900	.924			

Note: ** $p \leq .001$; IM=Intermediate

As in Table 10, when cadets' majors were considered, there were no statistical differences in the cadets' views on the needs of EGP ($F=0.339$, $p=0.797$), ESP/EAP ($F=1.067$, $p=0.362$), and EOP according to their majors ($F=0.054$, $p=0.983$). As for EAP/ESP, the high ($M=3.80$) and intermediate groups ($M=3.42$), and the high and low groups ($M=3.30$) showed statistical differences at a significant level ($F=6.261$, $p<0.01$).

Lastly, when EOP English was considered as in Table 11, there was a statistically significant difference ($F=5.266$, $p \leq 0.01$) between the intermediate group ($M=3.78$) and low group ($M=3.60$). It shows that the higher the cadets' self-rated English levels were, the

higher their mean scores regarding the needs of different types of English were. Accordingly, there were statistically significant differences in their views for all three types of English according to their self-rated English levels.

TABLE 11

Results of One-way ANOVA on Needs for EOP by Years, Majors, and English Levels

		<i>ss</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>ms</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	Scheffé
Years	between groups	44.347	1	44.347	57.286***	.000	Junior* Senior
	within groups	695.935	901	.774			
Majors	between groups	.134	3	.045	.054	.983	
	within groups	740.148	899	.825			
English Levels	between groups	8.581	2	4.291	5.266**	.005	IM*low
	within groups	731.700	900	.815			

Note: *** $p \leq .000$, ** $p \leq .001$; IM=Intermediate

3. Cadets' Views on the Use of English Skills after Commission

In Section III in the survey, there were 10 five-point likert type questions regarding the cadets' views on their future use of English skills after the commission. More specifically, there was one question regarding the use of vocabulary and expressions for specific military work (Q. 2). As for reading, both understanding of a field manual (Q. 4) and translation (Q. 6) were included while there was one question on using writing for military reports (Q. 1) in the survey. These four items were categorized into "Use of Written English." In addition, there were also six items examining the cadets' views on future work which may include speaking and/or listening skills (Q. 3), military information exchange on a radio or other communication tools (Q. 5), regular job-related conversations or interpretation (Q. 7), participating in meetings (Q. 8) or presentations (Q. 9), and negotiation and discussion for specific tasks (Q. 10). These six items were categorized into "Use of Spoken English."

1) Descriptive Statistics on Future Use of Written and Spoken English by Years, Majors, and English Levels

Table 12 presents the descriptive statistics on the 10 items on the expected use of English in work after the commission.

TABLE 12

Descriptive Statistics on Future Use of English in Work ($n=903$)

Category	Variables	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>MIN</i>	<i>MAX</i>
Written	Written Reports	3.57	1.00	1	5
	Technical Military Terms	3.73	.99	1	5
	Understanding Manuals	3.79	.88	1	5
	Job-related Translation	3.73	.99	1	5
Spoken	Military Communication	3.79	.93	1	5
	Job-related Conversation	3.97	.93	1	5
	Interpretations	3.71	1.02	1	5
	Presentations	3.65	1.03	1	5
	Participating in Meetings	3.68	1.00	1	5
	Negotiation and Discussion	3.72	1.05	1	5
Total		3.74	.77	1	5

Table 13 shows the descriptive statistics on the cadets' views on the use of written and spoken English in their work in future.

TABLE 13

Descriptive Statistics on Future Use of Spoken and Written English in Work ($n=903$)

Type of Use	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>MIN</i>	<i>MAX</i>
Written English	3.72	.80	1	5
Spoken English	3.75	.82	1	5

Table 14 shows the descriptive statistics on the cadets' views on the use of written and spoken English related to their future work according to years of study, majors, and English proficiency levels.

TABLE 14

Descriptive Statistics on Future Use of Spoken and Written English

	Variables	<i>n</i>	<i>M¹</i>	<i>SD¹</i>	<i>M²</i>	<i>SD²</i>
Years	Juniors	466	3.91	.72	3.84	.73
	Seniors	437	3.58	.89	3.60	.85
	Total	903	3.75	.82	3.72	.80
Majors	Language	142	3.84	.85	3.80	.81
	Social Science	416	3.76	.82	3.74	.81
	Engineering	130	3.54	.82	3.55	.81
	Science	215	3.79	.78	3.74	.76
Total		903	3.75	.82	3.72	.80
English Levels	High	46	4.03	.67	3.96	.62
	Intermediate	422	3.81	.74	3.77	.71
	Low	435	3.66	.90	3.65	.88
	Total	903	3.75	.82	3.72	.80

Note. *M¹*: Written English use, *M²*: Spoken English use

2) Participants' Views on the Future Use of Spoken and Written English by Years, Majors, and English Levels

Table 15 presents the results of one-way ANOVA based on the cadets' views of expected use of written English according to years of study, majors, and English proficiency levels.

TABLE 15
Results of One-way ANOVA on Written English by Years, Majors, and English Levels

		<i>ss</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>ms</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	Scheffé
Years	between groups	14.070	1	3.518	5.632***	.000	Junior* Senior
	within groups	560.854	901	.625			
Majors	between groups	4.960	3	1.653	2.608	.051	
	within groups	569.964	899	.634			
English Levels	between groups	5.933	2	2.966	4.692**	.009	high*low
	within groups	568.992	900	.632			

Note. *** $p \leq .001$, ** $p \leq .01$

In Table 15, there were statistically significant differences between the juniors and seniors in the expected use of written English ($F=5.632, p=0.000$). There was, however, no statistically significant difference between majors ($F=2.608, p=0.051$). There was, however, a statistical difference between the high and low group regarding written English at a significant level ($F=4.692, p=0.009$). That is, the cadets in the high group ($M=4.03$) in terms of the self-rated English abilities thought they would use written English skills more compared to those in the low group ($M=3.66$).

Table 16 presents the results of one-way ANOVA based on the cadets' views of expected use of spoken English according to years of study, majors, and English proficiency levels.

In Table 16, there were statistically significant differences in their views of using spoken English in their future work between the juniors and seniors ($F=9.719, p=0.000$). That is, the juniors thought both spoken English would be used more in their future work as they also thought the same for written English in Table 15. There were also statistical differences in the expected use of spoken English according to the cadets' majors ($F=3.754, p=0.011$). More specifically, language major cadets ($M=3.84$) thought spoken English to be more important than engineering majors ($M=3.54$), who also thought spoken English to be less important than those in social science majors ($M=3.76$) and science majors ($M=3.79$). As for the spoken English, there were statistically significant difference between the high ($M=3.99$) and low groups ($M=3.65$), and between the intermediate ($M=3.77$) and low groups ($M=3.65$) in terms of the use of the spoken English in their work after the commission ($F=6.440, p=0.002$).

TABLE 16

Results of One-way ANOVA on Spoken English by Year, Major, and English Levels

		<i>ss</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>ms</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	Scheffé
Years	between groups	25.299	1	6.325	9.719***	.000	
	within groups	584.415	901	.651			
Majors	between groups	7.543	3	2.514	3.754*	.011	Lang*Engin Engin*SS
	within groups	602.172	899	.670			Engin*Sci
English Levels	between groups	8.602	2	4.301	6.440**	.002	high*low IM*low
	within groups	601.112	90	.668			

Note. *** $p \leq .000$, ** $p \leq .001$, * $p \leq .05$; IM=Intermediate

4. Results of Focus Group Interviews

The interview data with the 18 junior and 25 senior cadets were analyzed separately given that they took different English courses: an EGP course for the juniors and an EAP/ESP course named *Military English* for the seniors. The data were coded in terms of three overarching themes: problems in current English programs, suggestions for improvements, and views of different English programs. The following Tables 17 and 18 show the results of the interview data analyses.

1) Junior Cadets' Views on Current and Different Types of English Programs

Table 18 shows the results of the analyses of the interview data collected from the juniors. The most frequent response regarding the problems on the current curriculum was uniformity ($n=10$). They expressed that many classes were similar since they relied on designated materials, test-solving practices, mere memorization and simple repetition. In addition, they said that there were too many assignments and that teaching was old-fashioned and boring. Next frequent was the problem with leveling and lesson content ($n=7$). That is, the cadets' levels at one class varied so widely due to inappropriate leveling and placement, which made it difficult for them to engage in meaningful learning. For example, in one class, there were some students who lived and studied abroad while the level of some classes was actually lower than those in colleges they graduated. The other problems mentioned were the lack of drawing learner interest ($n=4$) and the lack of helpfulness of the content ($n=3$), grade-oriented teaching and learning ($n=3$), the disparity between lesson content and evaluation ($n=3$), and the lack of individual studying time due to many school events ($n=3$).

TABLE 17
Results of Focus Group Interviews with Juniors

Category	Responses (<i>n</i>)	
Problems in Current English Programs	-Monotonous teaching (10)	
	-Inappropriate leveling (7)	
	-Lack of drawing interests (4)	
	-Lack of usefulness of contents (3)	
	-Studying for grade or ranking (3)	
	-Inconsistency between content & evaluation (3)	
Suggestions for Improvements	-Insufficient individual studying time (3)	
	Level-specific Instruction	-Level appropriate & goal-specific teaching (2)
	Course Contents	-More prep courses for official English tests (4)
		-More classes by native English teacher (4)
		-More conversation or interactive classes (4)
		-Foundational courses for low-level learners (2)
Teaching Methods & Learning Situations	-Providing EOP contents (2)	
	-Diverse teaching methods (5)	
	-Change in evaluation methods (2)	
Needs of Different English Programs	-Better environment for individual study (2)	
	-Efficient management of off-class and self-study time (2)	
	-Need for EAP/ESP (6)	
	-Conversation classes (4)	
	-Priority of basic skills (3)	
	-Writing (2)	
	-Basic grammar (2)	
	-Reading comprehension (2)	

The cadets interviewed clearly knew the importance of acquiring a cutoff score of 500 in TOEIC for their commission and the possible benefits of scoring more than 740 points for promotion or assignments for better jobs. So some suggested the complete change of the classes to prepare them for the official English tests ($n=4$) by inviting expert TOEIC lecturers, allowing them to take more official tests outside the Academy, or offering extra classes for TOEIC. They also suggested more focuses on conversation ($n=4$), teaching by native English instructors ($n=4$), offering of basic courses for low-level learners to catch up ($n=2$), and provision of more EOP lesson contents ($n=2$) to help them apply for, for example, a position at ROK-US Combined Forces Command or to become a translation officer. As for teaching methods and learning environment, they said more diverse teaching approaches were necessary ($n=5$). More specifically, they said there should be changes to use more situation-based, participatory, and interactive activities in class while a discussion class was also necessary. There were also two responses on the improvement in evaluation ($n=2$) in order to diversify evaluation methods and secure the fair evaluation for all.

When their prior experiences in taking the courses in English or other diverse programs such as EAP or ESP were considered, the junior interviewees had no such experiences

other than one interviewee who took a Korean class in English. At the Academy, there were very few courses taught in English except for the English Studies Department. Accordingly, there were some opinions on the need of offering EAP/ESP programs ($n=6$) for the English Studies department or for those who would work in the area of international relationships in future, and so on. A few said the cadets' various learning experiences in previous colleges should be considered in case of offering some ESP/EAP programs. Next, they said English conversation ($n=4$) would be most necessary after the commission for the work with the U.S. army or as a military specialist to engage in communication. However, there were also the views that some priorities existed before taking EAP/ESP such as building enough basic skills ($n=3$), writing ability to compose a report ($n=2$), basic grammar ($n=2$), reading comprehension ability ($n=2$), and English presentation ability for specific tasks ($n=1$).

2) Senior Cadets' Views on Current and Different Types of English Programs

Table 18 shows the results of the analyses of the interview data collected from the seniors. In Table 18, similar to the juniors interviewed, the seniors' most frequent responses on the problems of the current curriculum were the ambiguity of instructional goals and methods in *Military English* ($n=9$) and inappropriate leveling ($n=6$). Given that the course, *Military English*, was a required subject, the interviewees frequently mentioned this subject, especially its lack of specific goals or teaching based on rote learning and drills. Some said that it was a subject unnecessary before being commissioned as an officer and felt the burden of memorizing the text, the lack of time, and exhaustion of studying it. They also suggested that this course should not be offered right before the commission and that some consideration for low-level students was needed.

The seniors also responded that there were too many classes relying on rote learning ($n=4$) and grammar-focused lessons ($n=4$). Two cadets mentioned the difficulty of communicating with the Japanese cadets in English who visited their academy two weeks prior to the interviews. They also views problematic to compel them to join in after-school or weekend classes ($n=3$) or to take the tests with inappropriate contents and formats ($n=3$). For example, they thought that there were many ineffective classes such as self-managing reading, listening, or grammar classes or night TOEIC classes offered after-school hours. Three responses were concerned with the evaluation methods which were inconsistent with lesson contents or the excessive use of fill-in-the-blank type questions. Other opinions included "too elementary lesson contents" ($n=2$), the lack of studying time due to the class assignments, lesson contents and styles without considering learner interests ($n=2$), reliance on nonnative English teachers for conversation classes ($n=2$), and lecture-oriented teaching ($n=2$).

TABLE 18

Results of Focus Group Interviews with Seniors

Category	Responses (<i>n</i>)	
Problems in Current English Programs	-Unclear goals of <i>Military English</i> classes (9)	
	-Inappropriate leveling (6)	
	-Rote learning (4)	
	-Grammar-focused teaching (4)	
	-Compulsory after-class or weekend classes (3)	
	-Exam contents & question types (3)	
	-Teaching of basic contents (2)	
	-Classes focusing on giving assignments (2)	
	-Lack of drawing interests (2)	
	-Lack of courses by native English instructors (2)	
Suggestions for Improvements	-Lecture-based classes (2)	
	Level-specific Instruction	-Improving leveling methods & maintaining instructional consistency (5)
	Courses & Contents	-More conversation class (6) -Focus more on communication (2) -TOEIC (2) -More choices in regular courses (2)
	Teaching Methods & Learning Situations	-More native English instructors (3) -Teaching English for more daily use (2) -Classes based on learner interests (2) -Small class size (2) -Diverse teaching methods (2)
	Instructional Aims	-Sharing institutional goals of English programs (1) -Providing learning goals for courses offered (1)
	Needs of Different English Programs	-Conversation (8) -Need for EAP/ESP programs (7) -Disciplinary vocabulary & expressions (7) -Reading comprehension (2)

The unique response from the seniors was that the Academy needed to share specific goals for English programs offered. That is, the courses should be based on the cadets' interests, guarantee the continuity of learning, offer conversation or more job-related classes, and support them with more studying time. While there was one cadet who emphasized an individual effort due to the initial difference in abilities, another cadet said that English is a must in competing with those who graduate from the Korea Academy Military or with R.O.T.C. and that more EOP English classes with concrete objectives were necessary. He said that there should be diverse classes to develop the cadets' communicative abilities through communicative grammar, songs, movies or opportunities to interact with native English speakers outside the classroom.

Concerning the questions on the need for EAP/ESP or EOP English, the most frequent response was the speaking ability ($n=8$) for public relations work, communication with American G.I.s, and working overseas. There were also several responses on the necessity of EAP/ESP classes to learn, for example, military terms, English words or expressions for

Korean history. In addition, they also mentioned the reading ability to understand military documents ($n=2$). Other minor views included the need for special English classes according to each major, providing an option for EAP/ESP for majors such as international relations, business management, the field of aviation, developing good programs for teaching disciplinary vocabulary or conversation. The cadets from the departments such as civil, mechanical, and information engineering also said they needed EAP/ESP classes while others said it would be possible to teach some general education courses such as Korean history or War history could be taught in English, too. However, the cadet majoring in electronic engineering said they only needed some translation ability to read English texts while the one from the Military History department said they needed a class on Chinese characters rather than English. However, as one cadet critically expressed, many cadets actually thought that, compared to their junior year, "most would never use English after the commission." He said that is why many focused on acquiring a passing score for the commission by focusing on and preparing for the official English test like TOEIC.

V. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

This study utilized a survey questionnaire and a focus group interview to examine the military cadets' satisfaction of the existing curriculum, their views on the needs of the three different types of English (EGP, ESP/EAP, and EOP), and their expectation of using specific TL skills after the commission. First, as for their satisfaction levels of the current curriculum, one-way ANOVA analysis revealed that the juniors were more satisfied than the seniors while language majors showed more satisfaction than those in social science at a statistically significant level. When the cadets' self-rated English levels measured by seven skills on a 5-point likert-type scale were considered, a statistically significant difference was shown only between intermediate and low groups. In fact, there was a low correlation between the cadets' satisfaction level and self-rated their English levels, which also means that their satisfaction did not increase according to their self-rating. In sum, the juniors, language majors, and the intermediate group in self-rated English levels seemed more satisfied with the existing English programs.

Second, the juniors in this study were more in favor of different English programs but there were no differences in their views according to their majors though the mean of EGP was higher. The analysis based on their self-rated English levels, the high group thought that EGP was more needed than those in the low group. As for EAP/ESP, the high group also viewed that such a program was more necessary than those in the intermediate and low groups. Then, the intermediate group thought EOP was more needed than the low group at a statistically significant level. These results are in line with J. B. Ha's study

(2013) in which the students with low scores in the TOIEC preferred EGP compared with those who with high scores who wanted more specialized courses.

In sum, this study showed that there was a general tendency of the juniors who viewed the existing curriculum more favorably while agreeing with the necessity of different types of English programs. Such a result may result from the different emphasis of the courses offered for the junior and senior cadets; the former took general and practical military English classes while the seniors took a more disciplinary subject, *Military English*, for a year. It also appears that the cadets whose programs emphasized English learning more (i.e., English Studies) showed more satisfaction for the current curriculum than those in other majors (i.e., engineering majors) who viewed spoken English to be less important than any other major.

Third, regarding the cadets' views on the use of English skills after the commission measured by the ten 5-point likert type questions, the juniors thought both written and spoken English would be used more in their work than the seniors. The language majors thought spoken English would be used more in their future work than those in engineering majors at a statistically significant level. In fact, the engineering majors viewed that spoken English is less important than those in social science majors and science majors. The cadets in the high group in terms of the self-rated English levels also viewed written English skills to be more important than those in the low group at a statistically significant level. The high and intermediate groups also thought spoken English would be more important in their future than those in the low group. In sum, the high and intermediate groups in their self-rated English levels thought spoken skills for specific tasks in future would be more needed at a statistically significant level compared to low group whose responses showed less agreement for all the skills areas.

Fourth, in the focus group interviews after the post-survey, both junior and senior cadets wanted changes in level-specific classes for which they were often inadequately assigned based on a mock-TOEIC score without considering cadets' proficiency levels or prior learning experiences. The juniors also strongly expressed that the classes they had taken or had been taking were uniform and the teaching styles were monotonous and uninteresting while they wanted more communicative and EOP classes. They confessed that, in some courses, there were too many rote learning activities. The senior cadets expressed their dissatisfaction with *Military English* for which they had to memorize the text all the time. Furthermore, there were a few comments on the disjuncture between what they learned in class and what they actually did after regular class hours.

As noted in H. O. Kim (2008), like most college students, the cadets were also very keen on TOEIC since they had to pass this test as a graduation requirement. They frequently mentioned the benefit of good job assignment after their commission with a high score on this test. They wanted a more systematic and helpful after-school or weekend programs or

more chances to take tests. In addition, they said that English conversation classes with foreigners were effective and were more needed. However, these views seem a bit contradictory in that while their utmost concern was to score high for a TOEIC test, they said they wanted more practical English classes.

During the interviews that many cadets were keener on the use of English for their military tasks after the commission. As a matter of fact, these cadets considered the necessity of EOP in their future work and thought of it separate from ESP/EAP. Such tendency may result from the fact that most of these cadets knew that their future MOS would be different from their majors. In addition, few would continue to study or use English immediately after the commission for advanced degrees.

The juniors also mentioned the discontinuity in studying due to many school events and the lack of studying materials or time. Some cadets also expressed that even though they knew that English was indispensable after being commissioned but the current curriculum did not meet such needs for them. From the interviews, it was clear that the cadets could not fully engage in self-directed learning based on their own goals such as improving speaking skills or using English more meaningfully due to the institutional mandates on curricular and extracurricular activities. As a matter of fact, there were only several students who said they studied speaking ($n=5$) or writing ($n=1$) on their own. Therefore, it was obvious that the cadets lacked time to practice productive language skills or did not make much effort in doing so. Accordingly, in order to address such problems, the institutional mandates on both curricular and non-curricular programs and activities should be reconsidered to serve cadets' diverse needs and interests.

It was also clear that there were some ineffective teaching styles such as memorization or word tests in their English classes. The seniors attested that they were not really clear about the course goals or objectives. Therefore, more efforts should be made to change rather a uniform teaching style across English classes despite the cadets' differing language levels. In fact, the results of the survey and interview data strongly indicate that there are urgent needs for adequate level assignments for EGP English classes, materials development or revision for some content-based courses, especially for *Military English*, and improvement in teaching approaches and adequate administrative supports as suggested by in case of Aviation English (D. Shin & H. Kim, 2005). It is also necessary as expressed by a senior cadet that the Academy should make a concerted and steady effort to share specific objectives of English programs with the instructors and cadets more clearly. It may also be necessary to develop more practical EOP and EAP/ESP courses according to the unique characteristics of each major. In addition, there should be some efforts to offer appropriate general and practical English courses to juniors, and *Military English*, to seniors. The cadets did not see clear curricular relevance in terms of its contents and the time periods each course was offered and such a disjuncture is one of the causes of learner

dissatisfaction on the ESP programs (J. Y. Lee, 2014).

This study is unique in that there was no study on the military cadets' different curricular needs and their expected use of English after the commission. As a matter of fact, there is a serious lack of research on EAP/ESP in the military context compared to other disciplinary areas as mentioned earlier. As these cadets' needs may be different and unique compared to typical college students learning English as part of liberal education or disciplinary specific requirements, this study made an effort to show the importance of providing more appropriate types of English programs suitable to the cadets' needs and future military works. Furthermore, given the lack of research on military cadets' needs on English learning, this study can help army, navy, and aviation academies develop more learner-centered curriculums and instructions along with more effective management of their cadets' levels by organically linking courses and utilizing better teaching methods based on their career needs. There are, however, some limitations in this study such as a need for presenting a concrete curricular and instructional model or doing a longitudinal study to show its effectiveness as well as suggesting a concrete materials development and evaluation framework for such a model. Furthermore, if the participants' actual language proficiency levels are measured, the results may be different. A more selective sampling and increasing number of interviewees may also yield more specific needs on different types of English programs for each major. It is, however, hoped that this study functioned as a seminal work to promote a more context-specific and disciplinary-based research to develop EAP/ESP and/or EOP programs to support learners' current and future needs in learning English.

REFERENCES

- Brinton, D. M., Snow, M. A., & Wesche, M. (1989). *Content-based second language instruction*. Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan Press.
- Choi, Seung-Hee. (2014). Designing ESP curriculum for EFL learners at college of navigation. *Journal of Navigation & Port Research*, 38(2), 127-134.
- Cummins, J. (1979). Cognitive/academic language proficiency, linguistic interdependence, the optimum age question and some other matters. *Working Papers on Bilingualism*, 19, 121-129.
- Dale, L., & Tanner, R. (2012). *CLIL activities*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- DeAvila, E., & Duncan, S. (1984). *Finding out and descubrimiento: Teachers guide*. San Rafael, CA: Linguametrics Group.
- Dudley-Evans, T., & St. John, M. (1998). *Developments in English for specific purposes*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Flowerdew, J., & Peacock, M. (2001). *Research perspective on English for academic purpose*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Genesee, F. (1994). Integrating language and content: Lessons from immersion (Educational Practice Report 11). McGill University: National Centre of Cultural Diversity and Second Language Learning.
- Ha, Jong-Bum. (2013). Needs analyses for designing ESP curricula at a provincial university: Focus on engineering major. *Modern English Education*, 14(4), 185-205.
- Halliday, M. A. K., McIntosh, A., & Strevens, P. (1964). *The linguistic sciences and language teaching*. London: Longman.
- Hong, Shin Chul, & Jhang, Se-Eun. (2010). The compilation of a maritime English corpus for ESP learners. *Korean Journal of English Language and Linguistics*, 10(4), 963-985.
- Hutchinson, T., & Waters, A. (1987). *English for specific purposes: A learning centered approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hwang, Hae-Jin. (2001). ESP course development for international conference communications. *Foreign Languages Education*, 8(1), 319-340.
- Hyland, K. (2006). *English for academic purposes: An advanced resource book*. London: Routledge.
- Jhang, Se-Eun., & Byun, Hyun-Jung. (2011). A corpus-based lexical analysis of maritime English. *The New Korean Journal of English Language & Literature*, 53(4), 247-268.
- Kang, Min-Kyung, & Lee, Eun-Joo. (2014). ESP needs analysis for Korean law school students. *Foreign Languages Education*, 21(2), 205-229.
- Kim, Eun-Jung. (2008). An ESP course for nursing college students: Needs analysis. *Korea Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 24(3), 349-372.
- Kim, Hyeon-Okh. (2008). The practices, problems, and prospects of university ESP courses in Korea. *English Language Teaching*, 20(3), 143-168.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (2000). *Techniques and principles in language teaching*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Leblanc, R., & Painchaud, G. (1985). Self-assessment as a second language placement instrument. *TESOL Quarterly*, 19, 673-687.
- Lee, Hyeran, & Sung, Kiwan. (2014). WTC in EMI: Correlational factors and college learners' perceptions. *Foreign Languages Education*, 21(2), 75-106.
- Lee, Jai-Seon. (2012). Doctors' needs analysis for developing ESP course for medical students. *Studies in English Language & Literature*, 54(1), 273-297.
- Lee, Ji Young. (2014). EGP English or ESP/EAP? Rethinking college students' needs for GE and ESP/EAP. *English Language & Literature Teaching*, 20(1), 133-156.
- Met, M. (1999). Content-based instruction: Defining terms, making decisions (NFLC

- Reports). Washington D. C.: The National Language Center.
- Min, Chang-Kee. (2010). A study on the ways to enhance intercultural communication competence through tourism English education. *Journal of Tourism Sciences*, 34(6), 397-415.
- Oh, Hee Jeong, & Lee, Heewon. (2010). Characteristics of effective English medium instruction and support measures. *Modern English Education*, 11(1), 191-212.
- Park, Jun-Eon. (2004). Issues of university English education in Korea. *Korean Journal of English Language & Linguistics*, 4(4), 593-613.
- Park, Myongsu, & Kim, Seokhwan. (2011). How to extract domain-specific vocabulary in ESP. *English Language Teaching*, 23(1), 183-201.
- Park, Phil-Whan. (2013). A study on the current situation of English education for military aviation personnel. *Korean Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 29(1), 101-126.
- Ryoo, Mi-Lim. (2013). Lexico-semantic associations in maritime English as ESP: A corpus-based study. *English Language Teaching*, 25(4), 107-128.
- Saldaña, J. (2013). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Shin, Dongil, & Kim, Hyejeong. (2005). English for aviation specific purposes: Needs analysis for English proficiency requirements. *Korean Journal of the Applied Linguistics*, 21(2), 193-217.
- Swales, J. M. (2000). Language for specific purposes. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 20, 59-76.

Examples in: English
Applicable Language: English
Applicable Levels: Tertiary

Kiwan Sung
British-American Language & Literature
Kyung Hee University
1732, Deogyong-daero, Giheung-gu, Yongin-si, Gyeonggi-do 17104
Tel: 031-201-2274
E-mail: kiwansung@khu.ac.kr

Sung-Woo Yang
English Studies
Korea Army Academy at Yeongcheon
495 Hoguk-ro, Gogyong-myeon, Yeongcheon-si, Gyeongsangbuk-do, 38900
Tel: 054-330-4645

A Study on Military Cadets' Curricular Satisfaction, Their Needs for ESP, and ... 115

E-mail: yang0388@gmail.com

Hanki Jung

English Studies

Korea Army Academy at Yeongcheon

495 Hoguk-ro, Gogyeong-myeon, Yeongcheon-si, Gyeongsangbuk-do, 38900

Tel: 054-330-4640

E-mail: hxj5@hotmail.com

Received 15 December 2015

Revised 27 January 2016

Accepted 12 February 2016