

The Usefulness of Decision-Forcing Case Studies in Helping to Prepare New and
Experienced English as Foreign Language Teachers

Brent W. Crofton

Concordia University Portland

An Action Research Report Presented to
The Graduate Program in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
For the Degree of Masters in Education

Concordia University Portland
2011

Abstract

The objective of this action research project was to find the usefulness of decision-forcing case studies in helping to prepare new and experienced English as foreign language teachers (EFL) taking place in Western Chungnam province of South Korea. Nine decision-forcing cases were written for two Korean English Teachers (KETs) and two Native English Speakers (NESs) with one of each experienced or new to EFL teaching. Following the cases, participants were interviewed and, after assessing the cases, a follow-up by the participants that ranked the decision-forcing cases either “one” or “three.” An average of five cases were determined to be decision-forcing for the four participants. Answers to the decision-forcing cases revealed thoughts, feelings, and actions that participants believed they would experience in each scenario. This study concluded that decision-forcing cases are helpful to KETs and NESs because the situations may happen in any classroom or anywhere in Korea, and, thus, they provide information about cross-cultural communication issues, culture, English pragmatics, language, lessons that fail, and racism.

Dedication

I unconditionally love and thank my wife Katherine, son Owen, and daughter Edith for enduring all the struggles to complete this study. I want to thank Dr. Bianca Elliott for her patience, belief in me, and vision for what this study has evolved to become. It is a great blessing and joy to be an English teacher for elementary school children in the rural Taean peninsula area in Korea. My family feels accepted, loved, and cared for as family in 서산시. I am grateful for the support of my principals, vice principals, and school colleagues as I complete my paper and study. It is an amazing blessing to grow continuously as a teacher at the schools I passionately serve. There is never a day that I do not love teaching, the students, and Korea.

요한복음 13:13 너희가 나를 선생이라 또는 주라 하니 너희 말이 옳도다 내가
그러하다

Table of Contents

Chapter One - Introduction.....	5
Chapter Two - The Issue.....	12
Chapter Three - The Goal.....	45
Chapter Four - Action Plan.....	58
Chapter Five - Results and Next Steps.....	64
References.....	109
Appendix A - Decision-Forcing Case Studies	115
Appendix B - Native English Speaker Interview.....	128
Appendix C - Korean English Teacher Interview.....	131
Appendix D - First and Third Ranked Scenario Follow-up Sheet.....	137

Chapter One - Introduction

South Korea's foreign population is over one million. In comparison with the population of forty-eight million Koreans, this is quite small. It is no different for the province of Chungcheongnam-do. The location of this study is the Chungcheongnam province, south of Gyeonggi province where Seoul is located. In the Korean language, the names of provinces end with 'do', 도 a language identifying marker that will be removed and stated as the province name followed by the clarification. Chungcheongnam province will now be noted in the shorter form, Chungnam as it, is recognized throughout Korea.

To further clarify the location of the study, the Chungcheongbuk province is to the east with Daejeon City, also to the east. Daejeon is the metropolitan city for Chungnam province and is considered a separate district from Chungnam due to its government oversight of the province. When looking at a map of the province, Daejeon is included but noted in a different shade from the province. To the south of Chungnam province is Jeollabuk province. To the west of Chungnam province is the Yellow Sea. The setting of the research takes place in Western Chungnam province known for its rice, garlic, and beaches.

This chapter will provide the reader with pertinent information such as the population of Chungnam province in the cities and the countryside. This information is important because those who live in the countryside do not attend special English private institutes that are important in understanding this study. Because the people in the countryside do not attend

English private institutes, their abilities to read, speak, and write English are not so strong as those of students living in the cities. The program used in the countryside is *Teach and Learn in Korea* (TaLK), and it serves as Korea's rural English education program trying to close the knowledge gap regarding English for students.

Turning to the demographic information such as the number of teachers, staff, number of elementary school students and elementary schools, for the province is helpful to understanding its size. For comparison, the same information of populations from other provinces will be given as reported by the Ministry of Education, Science, and Technology (MOE). The number of native English speakers (NESs) at elementary schools, at rural schools, or at city schools all within Chungnam province is not known. There are no statistics stating the total number of NESs affected by such English knowledge difference in students based in rural or city locations.

The total population of Chungnam as of December 31, 2005, was 2,075,249. Of this total population, 1,384,206 lived within the cities in the province and 691,043 lived within the rural countryside areas (*Chungcheongnam-do. Population and household*). Chungnam province recognizes seven cities and nine counties in its territory. These cities, listed alphabetically, are Asan, Boryeong, Cheonan, Gongju, Gyeryong, Nonsan, and Seosan (*Chungcheongnam-do. Administrative districts*). The counties in the province, listed alphabetically, are Buyeo, Cheongyang, Dangjin, Geumsan, Hongseong, Seocheon, Taean,

Yeongi, and Yesan (Chungcheongnam-do. *Administrative districts*). [NOTE: When saying a city name, it ends with si (see-시); this language marker identifies it as a city and, thus, it was removed within the list. Names of counties ends with gun (gun-군); this language marker identifies any county and, therefore, has been removed within the list.]

Within each city there is a further division of neighborhoods called dong (dong-동), and the province has forty dong (Chungcheongnam-do. *Administrative districts*). Another division is a township or myeon (myeon-면); this area is in the countryside. There are 145 total myeon in the province (Chungcheongnam-do. *Administrative districts*). Finally, the province has twenty-six eup (eup-읍) or towns (Chungcheongnam-do. *Administrative districts*). The region has many small villages only marked by the closeness of houses, having (an) apartment building(s) and a convenient store with a few more stores. The province is highly agricultural with a recent shift toward industrialization.

Apartments buildings are everywhere from cities to villages to rural areas. The meaning of apartment building as used here is a Western term that does not specify unit size or number of floors to such a building. The most common form of housing is the traditional Korean house or an apartment.

South Korea is known as the most wired country. Cement poles hold many wires for the housing in the region. Tall metal T-shaped structures hold electric wires for vast distances. South Korea has internet, television, telephone, and electricity. In the countryside, rice fields

can stretch for a vast distance with each terraced so water flows to the next field. The fields push right up next to the mountains in the region.

In 2007 Korea MOE education statistics reported 5,756 primary schools serving 3,829,998 students and employing 167,182 teachers (MOE. *Introduction: Education System-Overview*). Important demographic information related to Chungnam province schools was found from the Chungnam Office of Education (CNOE) website with the numbers reflecting the 2010 year. The elementary school population in Chungnam is 138,404 (Soon, personal communication, July 21, 2011). There are 430 elementary schools in the province (Soon, personal communication, July 21, 2011). The number of elementary school staff employed is 1716, and the number of teachers employed is 8471 within Chungnam (Soon, personal communication, July 21, 2011). All elementary school students in the Chungnam province receive free lunches (Soon, personal communication, July 21, 2011). CNOE has fifteen district offices (CNOE. *Offices of education in Chungcheongnam-do*). There is an office for each of the cities and an office for each of the counties except Buyeo.

Elementary school and middle school enrollment are based on residence, so many of the schools are set in districted areas with all the nearby children attending. Schools in a city have more students, teachers, and administration than those in the country. This means rural schools have fewer students, teachers, and administrators because they serve less condensed districts. Thus, teachers in rural schools have more duties beyond teaching because there are

fewer administrators.

English is a mandatory subject from third grade to sixth grade in elementary school. There is a national curriculum for each of these grades. A noticeable difference exists in the small towns, country, and villages compared with the big cities in the amount of English knowledge because of many factors, but a main point is little opportunity to use English in daily life for those in the small towns, country, and villages. Other factors are the size of classes, uniqueness of communicative language teaching (CLT), lack of individual help, few or no private language academies, and a family's inability to afford this expense. Korea's having a national curriculum means that the words, statements, phrases, and expressions students are learning will not be easily understandable or acquired in L2.

Demographic information about the number of English assistants in the province at elementary school, middle, or high school and the total number broken down by rural or city areas does not exist (Soon, personal communication, August 9, 2011). This also means that there is no information regarding the nationalities of English assistants (Soon, personal communication, August 9, 2011).

The following information specifically relating to the study will often use the terms "scenario(s)" or "case(s)" to refer to decision-forcing case studies. The research will be done with Korean English Teachers (KETs) and NESs. Nine decision-forcing case studies were written in a manner that would make the reader feel he or she must make a decision within

the scenario (Appendix A). Rhetorical questions caused the readers to think about the scenario, their possible reactions, and the steps they might take in the scenarios. The scenario ranking system helps to understand what the reader thought of the scenario(s)' information and the rhetorical questions. Each participant will write an explanation for the given ranking of each scenario.

Following the scenarios the participant will do an interview (Appendix B and Appendix C). This interview is to find possible common issues faced by KETs and NESs. To be employed as an English co-teaching assistant anywhere in the Korean public schools, NESs must hold a bachelor's degree. These speakers can be from Australia, the United States of America, the United Kingdom, Ireland, South Africa, New Zealand, or Canada. The government is contemplating adding other English-using nations to this list for English assistant jobs and obtaining the proper visa. These are contractual positions that provide essentials while being annually renewable for both parties upon an agreement for continuance.

Each person participating in the Korean educational program varies in how he or she knows applicable information concerning Korea and working as an English teacher. What also varies is each native speaker's experience at a school. Even the amount of helpful information and teaching materials for this teaching position varies. It is this researcher's position that a simple way to help people understand about being an English teacher in an EFL context is to write decision-forcing scenarios. This form of training and teaching NESs

helps understand culture, communication issues, co-teaching issues, and the EFL context when the training is written out as a detailed scenario for others to read and feel an important decision may be made within the context. Such scenarios would be about racism, communication issues, culture, co-teaching issues, teaching a lesson that fails, and teaching lessons without yet understanding the EFL context because these are all critical to the NESs' success. This form of education and preparation for NESs may help others present experiences and understand relevant issues in teaching, culture, and issues in relationships and communication. These same scenarios may help KETs to view what students can and cannot comprehend, the issues in co-teaching, issues in communication, issues in language meanings, and possibly racism or culture differences.

The role of the researcher in this study is an English assistant to the KET at an elementary school within Chungnam. Due to the small school population, the researcher serves at two elementary schools in a different teaching model from other schools in Chungnam province. The preferred model is to teach only fifth to sixth grade with the KET based on the Korean national curriculum. The model for both schools served is to teach all grade levels, kindergarten to sixth grade, with the largest number of hours for the higher grades and an hour for the lower grades. The research is to be done with elementary school KETs and NESs independently, absent from any elementary school students.

Chapter Two - The Issue

Introduction

The issue for the study is to try to find a method to train Korean English teachers (KETs) and native English speakers (NESs) to teach the English subject in schools. To do this, the literature review covers five sections each with subcategories. All of this information will be helpful to action research. The first section is about the Korean education system divided into two categories of the age children say they are and their true age along with the elementary school studies structure. Section two is broadly about Korean teachers with specifics regarding their education and certification, their teaching post and assessments, and the KETs training and sub content of pragmatic issues and the co-teaching relational view. The third section is about the English education program as a whole from issues, to policies, to the program's learning focus, to the curriculum Communicative language teaching (CLT), to the issues with CLT in Korea, and the thought of English speaking skills and testing possibilities. The fourth section is about culture, which encompasses the view of education, the teacher's role to students and parents, Confucianism, collective culture, and the differences in Korean and English languages. Finally, the fifth section is about the native English speakers. This addresses native English speaking teachers new to the English foreign language (EFL) context, a cross-cultural view of EFL teachers being positive and negative, decision-forcing cases that prepare teachers for the EFL context, and the NES contractual

agreement for training.

In studying about the many parts of Korea's education, Korean teachers, the English education program, culture, and NESs, this study seeks to develop a theory about how to create material that can be used for the benefit of new and current English as Foreign Language teachers to understand culture, Korea's EFL context, teaching English, Korean language or its relation to English, and relationships within the work place through the use of scenarios.

Korea's Education Structure

The South Korean school system is divided into a 6-3-3-4 configuration of with elementary school being first through sixth grade, middle school and high school. Middle school and high school levels include three years with another four years of college or university (Jo, 2008; Shiga, 2008).

Public schools in the city have gone through a vast increase in students due to migration from rural areas (Jo, 2008). An education tax was implemented in 1982 to increase the number of school buildings along with the salaries of teachers (Jo, 2008). From elementary school to middle school, the method of enrollment is based on residence (Jo, 2008). Middle school in the rural areas, from 1985, was compulsory, while, between 1992 and 1994, this was expanded to the urban areas (Jo, 2008). High school provides an advanced education continuation of middle school education (Jo, 2008). There are various types of high

schools such as general high schools, technical high schools, sports high schools, vocational high schools, and subject specific high schools (Jo, 2008). There are scholarships and subsidies used to help a students' families with financial difficulties (Jo, 2008). At all high schools there are basic subjects that are studied such as humanities, foreign language(s), music, and fine arts (Jo, 2008). There are seven categories of higher education in Korea (Jo, 2008). Due to the culture's competitive nature, an entrance exam along with an application process has been established to follow a specific procedure and set of criteria to select candidates (Jo, 2008).

The school year is divided into two semesters (Jo, 2008). The first semester is from March to mid July with mid-July thru August being summer vacation (Jo, 2008; Lee, 1997). From September to mid December is the second semester with mid-December to early February for winter vacation (Jo, 2008; Lee, 1997). For two weeks in February, schools teach leftover material(s) to help gain an understanding for the next grade and to graduate to the next grade (Lee, 1997). The other part of February is spring break.

Age in Education

The way Koreans view age is important because this has an affect with Piaget's stages of cognitive development. From birth, a baby is one year old (Ahn, 2003). In the example of a child born in December, the following month means the child is two years old (Ahn, 2003). This is the age a person would say they are. Student enrollment is based on the

year of birth with the cut-off month of February the following year. This allowance is due to the academic year system, March to December. For the 2011 academic year, sixth grade students are mainly thirteen years old, born in 1999, while a student twelve years old and born February 2000 can also enroll for sixth grade. The choice is the parents for their child born in either January or February to decide what grade they will be in. For a Westerner teacher, the age students say they are and their true development stage based on Piaget may create a gap.

Korea Ministry of Education, Science & Technology-Elementary School Studies Structure

Korea's Ministry of Education, Science, and Technology states the subject and number of hours each student is to be taught various subjects in the thirty-four weeks of an academic year (MOE. *Introduction: Education System- Primary School*). Primary school hours are based on a forty minute class periods with flexibility to be adjusted due to weather conditions, students' academic achievement level(s), and the method and plans for student learning (MOE. *Introduction: Education System- Primary School*).

“We are the 1st grade “is a specific curriculum studied only in March for 80 hours, independent activities for 60 hours, and special activities for 30 hours (MOE. *Introduction: Education System- Primary School*). Both “independent activity” and “special activity” are based on a thirty week period (MOE. *Introduction: Education System- Primary School*). First grade students will receive 830 class hours (MOE. *Introduction: Education System- Primary*

School). A person would notice that this begins from first grade without Kindergarten [You Chi Won-유치원] this is because Kindergarten education is not compulsory (Jo, 2008; Bailey & Lee, 1992). This is not to say schools do not have Kindergarten class(es) in public schools, but private Kindergartens (commonly called Eo Rin E Jeb-어린이집 literally meaning “Children’s house” or 유치원 as well) outnumber public in Korea (Kwon, 2002).

Second grade studies “independent activity” for sixty-eight hours and “special activity” for thirty-four hours (MOE. *Introduction: Education System- Primary School*).

Second grade students attend 850 hours of class (MOE. *Introduction: Education System- Primary School*). This shows that first grade and second grade children finished with school classes at different times of the day based on the schedule.

Third grade will study for the first year thirty-four hours of English along with sixty-eight hours of “independent activity” and thirty-four hours of “special activity” (MOE. *Introduction: Education System- Primary School*). Fourth grade students will study English also for thirty-four hours, “independent activity” for sixty-eight hours and “special activity” for sixty-eight hours (MOE. *Introduction: Education System- Primary School*). This means that third and fourth grades are allotted one period, forty minutes per week, of English education (Shiga, 2008). A slight change in hours for certain classes results in third and fourth grade both receiving 986 class hours (MOE. *Introduction: Education System- Primary School*). The difference in hours between third grade and fourth grade students compared

with fifth and sixth grade students means that the school day ends earlier for third and fourth grade, depending on either grade's schedule.

Fifth and sixth grade study the same amount of hours for each class in all attending 1088 class hours (MOE. *Introduction: Education System- Primary School*). Other courses of study in fifth and sixth grade are a practical course for sixty-eight hours each grade, along with "independent activity" and "special activity," which both have sixty-eight hours of study time for each grade (MOE. *Introduction: Education System- Primary School*).

Elementary school is more than 220 days a year studying the stated subjects above with the possibility of extra-curricular activities (Jo, 2008). As shown from this structure of subjects and hours expected to study, elementary school English class totals thirty-four to sixty-eight hours a year averaging out to be an hour or two hours per week based on different grade levels (Jo, 2008). English education for fifth and sixth grade has two forty minute periods in a week (Shiga, 2008).

Table 1.

Korean Elementary Education Course and Hours

	Korean Language Arts	Mathematics	Ethics	Wise Living	Pleasant Living	Science	PE	Social Studies	Music	Arts
1 st Grade	210 hours	120 hours	60 hours	90 hours	180 hours					
2 nd Grade	238 hours	136 hours	68 hours	102 hours	204 hours					
3 rd Grade	238 hours	136 hours	34 hours			102 hours	102 hours	102 hours	68 hours	68 hours
4 th Grade	204 hours	136 hours	34 hours			120 hours	102 hours	102 hours	68 hours	68 hours
5 th Grade	204 hours	136 hours	34 hours			102 hours	102 hours	102 hours	68 hours	68 hours
6 th Grade	204 hours	136 hours	34 hours			102 hours	102 hours	102 hours	68 hours	68 hours

(MOE. *Introduction: Education System- Primary School*).

Teacher Education and Certification

Teachers graduate either from the National Teacher Education University or other universities' departments of education both require four years of study (Jo, 2008). An exam must be taken to qualify to be a teacher; however, there is an exemption process for said exam (Jo, 2008). There are eleven National Teacher Universities of Education and one

prestigious private university (Jo, 2008). Those who major in elementary education at the graduate level can obtain an elementary school teaching certificate (Jo, 2008). Since 1990, all teacher candidates must take an aptitude and personality test(s) with the purpose of raising the quality of teacher education and thus education as a whole (Jo, 2008).

Teachers Posts and Assessments

A principal noted that, within the English program at schools the vision never stays the same because teachers transfer to other schools every four years (Jung & Norton, 2002). In transferring, teachers go through a competitive process based on objective measures to city or provincial education authority every December for positions at schools under their authority (Jo, 2008). Each authority can have its own criteria and process that controls and causes competition for posts (Jo, 2008). Teachers go through teacher training and programs for professional development at the city or provincial educational office (Jo, 2008). With Chungnam Office of Education's having fifteen district offices for the province, this could mean each district office has different standards for open teaching posts due to transfers or retirements.

"Teacher performances are assessed and quantified" with scores under the framework that has a salary scale and can even grant a promotion (Jo, 2008). A teacher's first assessment is by the principal and vice principal of the school (Jo, 2008). This is mainly thought of as unfair since those that supervise and assess work could be non-objective in their assessment

(Jo, 2008). Furthermore, “only performance outcomes are assessed” as the second measure on teachers (Jo, 2008, p.379). As of the date of Jo’s paper, 2008, the Ministry of Education was establishing a new scheme of assessments that are more objective and assessed the management of the school with the purpose of having teachers desiring further training and enriching all teachers’ expertise (Jo, 2008).

English Teacher training(s)

In 1996, the year before English education became compulsory, 25,000 Korean teachers had received training in English skills and teaching methods for about 120 credit hours (Shiga, 2008). The government hoped this particular training program would cover every elementary school teacher by 2000 (Jung & Norton, 2002). For those who excelled in the 120 credit hour training program, an additional 120 credit hours of intensive English courses was to be taken (Jung & Norton, 2002). At such mandatory training programs, teachers learn English expressions to use in the classroom, those consisting mainly of commands (Butler, 2005). A long-term English teacher training program for six months has seen a steady increase in trainees from 2003 to 2007 with the expectation of 10,000 trainees by 2015 (Shiga, 2008).

Other measures implemented to increase English ability include university training courses (Shiga, 2008). Following 1997, the government increased the number of students specializing in English at nine national teacher universities (Jung & Norton, 2002). Now

“every student in the university program for elementary teachers is required to take 12 credits of English classes” and those that “specialize in English have to take 21 English credits” (Jung & Norton, 2002, pp.249-250). This caused a two person increase for a total of four native English instructors assigned to each National Universities Department of Education to enhance and increase the training programs at the universities (Shiga, 2008).

Cultural issue of pragmatics

A study by Suh (1999) on English pragmatics with ten NESs and twenty Korean English speaking learners (KESL) revealed an area of cultural difference. This is significant since an KET and NES share teaching responsibilities at schools. The significant cultural difference in the survey is an example of a close friend relationship both socially and psychologically close. NES in the survey selected the language “Can you..?” while KESL selected the imperative language (Suh, 1999, p.203). Though it was determined that the English level of the twenty KESL, intermediate 3, 4, and 5 with advanced 6 and 7 was a factor, Korean culture was the main factor in the difference. In Korean culture it is not required that friends speak politely (Suh, 1999). In a close friendship a request is often recognized in imperative form (Suh, 1999). Another factor is language since 주세요[ju-seh-yo] literally means “give to me” with please being implied in its use.

NESs consistently working with KETs likely will have an experience where the English spoken by their co-teacher does not match the situation. For native speakers new to

the EFL context this cultural misunderstanding most likely will be experienced in some form.

NESs should recognize there will be cultural differences even in the use of English and that these differences are not meant to be offensive.

Co-teaching relational view

Factors that frame quality teaching are; “teaching experience, teacher beliefs, the match between teaching beliefs and learner needs, broad understanding of learning and teaching contexts and characteristics of learners” (Han, 2005, p.201) . For those new to EFL teaching the focus is not, ‘Who is a better teacher, native English speaker or non-native?’ the focus is, ‘Who knows how to teach the content, meet learners needs, have it be interesting, and reach the goals?’ (Han, 2005, p.201). If either natives or non-natives know one point to the question, they are still a teacher. Any other point in that debate that places native above non-native in a co-teaching relation is irrelevant.

Issues in English education

From the list of hours studied per subject, it has been argued that English has too few hours only allowing for listening, reading and writing skills with little speaking competence gained (Oh, 2007). Due to the fact that L2 is used so little in society, it has led to the acceptance that students will not be able to comprehend fully speaking, reading, writing, or listening (Shiga, 2008). From third grade to sixth grade, many argue that this is too short a time-frame for all students to be able to give English output after finishing elementary school

English (Jo, 2008; Shiga, 2008; Butler, 2005). Additionally, other factors such as English exposure, class size, no individual attention, and lesson structure are attributing factors to a problem in the English program. As a result of English education importance from elementary school to high school, parents are likely to burden themselves with the expense of a private English institute (Jo, 2008; Shiga, 2008; Cho, 2004). This is quite an expense, so parents' gain unfounded expectations of their children's English ability (Cho, 2004). Many of these language institutes exist in the country due to how seriously Koreans take education. Other expenses and lengths parents may go to is for their child to study permanently or for a period abroad along with buying English material to study at home (Shiga, 2008). As more young people that had English from elementary to university come to the workforce English will have a greater role of being a gatekeeper for advancement (Howard & Millar, 2008). Shiga affirms this in stating, "It is not uncommon for the score of English tests, such as TOEIC, to play a crucial role at the time of a student entering a company" (Shiga, 2008, p.387).

English Program policy

Though English has been studied in middle school and onwards following the Korean War, it was not until 1997 that Korea established an English curriculum for elementary schools that would begin in the third grade and continues to the sixth grade (Jo, 2008; Cho, 2004; Li, 1998). Though not a national policy, it is a further extension from

making English a mandatory subject that some local governments, foundations, or the private sector have established an “English Village” as a place for students to visit and speak with native speakers (Shiga, 2008, p.391). The ‘English Village’(s) can provide weekday programs, holiday programs, or even summer and winter programs (Shiga, 2008, p.391).

The government had two plans for the English teacher system (Jung & Norton, 2002). One is the classroom English teacher, whom is the homeroom teacher, would be responsible for teaching English (Jung & Norton, 2002). The other is to have an English special teacher that is responsible for teaching the English lessons to various classes or grades (Jung & Norton, 2002). It was recommended by the government that schools use the classroom English teacher model for third and fourth grade, while using the English special teacher model for fifth and sixth grades (Jung & Norton, 2002). There was also a caveat that principals could choose a system that fit the needs and circumstances of the school (Jung & Norton, 2002). This could mean teaching all grades in a given school, teaching only third to sixth grades, or teaching a select grade between two or three small schools.

Policymakers were worried about the possibility of large class sizes with CLT (Jung & Norton, 2002). The government set up a frame for lessons that use multimedia systems, hands on activities, games, songs, chants, and art in developing the textbook and other materials (Jung & Norton, 2002). From what was published, the government wanted an improvement on the quality of textbooks so a competition was designed for publishers to gain

approval (Jung & Norton, 2002). Those that gained approval were put on an English curriculum list for schools to choose the materials from particular publishers (Jung & Norton, 2002).

It was a decided policy to form set parameters for elementary grades to learn. Third grade is to strictly learn “through listening and speaking activities” (Jung & Norton, 2002, p.247). In fourth grade writing is 10% of the curriculum with the alphabet being introduced also (Jung & Norton, 2002). Further, the number of words and the length of sentences were structured from 1997 to 2000 since this is the beginning of the English program in elementary school (Jung & Norton, 2002).

1997: Third grade- 100 words, 7 words in a sentence

1998: Third and fourth grades- add 100 words, still 7 words in a sentence

1999: Third, fourth, fifth grades- add 150 words, 9 words in a sentence

2000: Third, fourth, fifth, and sixth grades- add 150 words, still 9 words in a sentence.

(Jung & Norton, 2002).

The government also recognized that the English program should not be dominated by a particular English culture but to recognize English as an international language (Jung & Norton, 2002). The recently-approved Chun Jae Education books by Sohn, Ham, Bak, Lee, Kim, and Ahn (2011) has introduction content to the lesson characters on a two-page mock world map with character names in English, phonetic Korean of the English name, and the

national flag near the characters. This shows students that English is an international language with many of the characters being shown in the textbook pages and multi-media lessons.

Elementary school English program and learning focus

The aim of the elementary English program is “to motivate a student’s interest in English and to develop basic communicative competence” (Jung & Norton, 2002, p.247). The teacher should place emphasis on successful communication rather than accuracy, the acquisition of language through actual use rather than rote memorization (Jung & Norton, 2002). Oh (2007) states that elementary schools’ use of communicative language teaching is a specialized English course that avoids result-oriented evaluations to encourage students to be evaluated on participation and attitude. The evaluation of students in elementary school is to stimulate learners’ motivation, evaluate language L2 and L1 meaning usage instead of language itself [i.e. grammar], and gain interest in the spoken language (Oh, 2007). The positive aspect of this method of evaluation is how English is not intended to be a burden for the developing minds of young elementary students (Oh, 2007). This is not completely true since students are tested each semester for all classes.

Communicative Language Teaching

Communicative language teaching (CLT) is a method of developing learner’s communicative competence (Li, 1998). Nunan identifies other CLT characteristics as: “the

use of authentic materials, a focus on the learning process as well as language itself, a belief that learners' own experiences can contribute to learning; and a linkage between language learning in the classroom and real-life activities" (Butler, 2005, p.424). CLT can be identified by a majority of lesson components having a communicative intent between people (Li, 1998). With this being said it is also important to define what CLT is not. CLT does not focus on grammar and it does not focus on linguistic mastery. Students in the lesson will use the language studied in communicative activities such as games, role play, stories, and problem solving tasks (Li, 1998). A Korean English teaching guide stated that CLT was to replace the dominant audio-lingual method in middle school and grammar and translation method in high school from 1995-2010 (Li, 1998).

In CLT the goal of English teaching is to drill communicative messages in activities, games, and multi-media examples that help students create meaning in L2 (Li, 1999; Howard & Millar, 2008; Cho, 2004). CLT is learner centered and teachers are encouraged to produce materials that meet students' needs (Li, 1998). This method of studying English is contrary to Korean collective culture since it discourages speaking English (Kim, 2004). This is affirmed by Howard and Millar (2008) in an interview of a Korean English teacher that CLT and the activities have students express thoughts and opinions which is something students do not desire to do in English or Korean. Even though CLT is meant to be communicative, memorizing dialogue predominates (Ahn, 2003; Han, 2005).

This is an example of the Korea's CLT curriculum focused on expressing capability and incapability (Yoon, 2004). A lesson titled "Can you swim?" is taught in four parts. Possible replies include, "Sure, I can," "He/She can swim," "Sorry, I can't," and "No, I can't." (Yoon, 2004, p.9). These statements noted in Yoon, go without curriculum grade level notes. It can vary by the publishers' book, but a variation of this is commonly in the third grade curriculum book.

It is a policy in the Korean government for CLT to teach language through the medium of English (Butler, 2005). This policy was thought a burden for teachers not confident in their ability and also for students who could comprehend and express very little in English (Butler, 2005; Dash, 2002). This policy still predominates among education officials and some teachers.

A study done with Korean learners found what methods were preferred such as "total physical involvement in the learning situation and 'hands-on learning' such as building models or doing laboratory experiments" (Han, 2005, p.203). These Korean learners preferred a structured formal style of learning with a preference for visual learning as well. The study concluded that many types of visual materials should be used ranging from pictures, graphs, charts, computer graphics, with content written on the board from the lesson (Han, 2005). The reason for learners' having a negative preference for small group activities is the learners' unfamiliarity with this practice in Korea along with the individual competitive

nature of the Korean education system (Han, 2005).

Common issues with CLT in Korea

Studies by Li (1998), and Jung and Norton (2002), Howard and Millar (2008), show Korean English teachers as well as students reveal difficulties related to the use of CLT in the curriculum. Participating teachers in the survey stated such hardship as a lack of English competency to implement CLT, a lack of sociolinguistic knowledge from teacher training, the criticism of more fluent students', lack of time to develop CLT materials, a lack of opportunity to learn more about CLT, and CLT training being provided during vacation time without financial incentives (Li, 1998). A teacher interviewed in Jung & Norton (2002) stated that all the materials had to be made with little time to do so. He further stated that he had to guess on what students knew as well as had learned.

Teachers faced many difficulties using CLT with students. Students did not want to participate because it is not the teacher-centered model that is cultural. With little use of English outside the English classroom, students do not want to develop communicative knowledge because this also is not on school tests (Howard & Millar, 2008). A series of issues are related such as students' having a low level of proficiency, students with different abilities are within the same classroom, and the classroom may be over crowded so none have individual attention (Howard & Millar, 2008). Parents are not supportive of CLT because it is not the grammar-based method used when they were children or important to their child's

future English education at school (Howard & Millar, 2008). This is due to the importance of English knowledge for university entrance exams or high TOEIC scores for admissions abroad. Further the school has problems with insufficient funding to have authentic materials (Howard & Millar, 2008). When the school follows the homeroom English teacher model there is little time to teach English since materials need to be made to accompany a lesson and the lesson time is too short to develop student's ability (Howard & Millar, 2008). No study has been done on the issues native English speakers have with CLT.

Primary school- English speaking skills and testing possibilities

A communicative competence test is also referred to as a speaking competence test. It is a tool to evaluate students' speaking ability to deliver a message effectively to others (Oh, 2007). The challenge of speaking competency tests is that it goes against the English program views of gaining interest in L2, not being a burden to the students mind, and to develop basic L2 communication. Other challenges, such as no organized test kits, exist that match the cognitive development and recognition skills of EFL elementary school students (Oh, 2007). Also, a predominant number of English proficiency tests are designed by foreign institutions for university students (Oh, 2007).

Contrary to the table of tests provided on pages 39 and 40 of the Oh (2007) article, the article fails to prove how these tests are within the target audience listed with all tests stating "primary." The article by Oh (2007) fails by being the complete opposite of CLT. It

does not acknowledge or state how communicative competence curriculum and tests can be complimentary to the government's investment in CLT. Until something is developed for EFL elementary school students the only speaking tests (assessments) given will be those in the CLT curriculum that involve student rote memorization of the dialogue.

View of Education

In reading about Korea and education it is common to have this characterization “educational zealots,” “educational enthusiasts,” “education maniacs,” and “taking education very seriously” (Robertson, 2002; Cho, 2004, p.31). Education is believed to be achievable for anyone regardless of ability (Han, 2005). This “belief puts enormous emphasis on effort and will power to succeed in academic achievement and life” (Han, 2005). Students who succeed are viewed as having put forth effort, have willpower and good study methods while those that do not succeed do not put forth effort and lack willpower (Han, 2005). Because these are foundational beliefs of the educational system, it leads extremely dedicated, highly motivated, highly literate, and hardworking students to obtain a good education (Han, 2005; Ahn, 2003). Succeeding in education is the means to a higher socioeconomic status (SES) (Han, 2005). This is why families stress educational achievements with their children so strongly (Robertson, 2002). Such an emphasis is placed on the hard work they must put into their education, that mom, grandmother, or older sister will do the cooking, cleaning and attend to other matters so studying can be the exclusive focus of the student (Sorenson, 1994).

Any hardship in learning should be endured to reach an important social status (Han, 2005).

As a whole, the education system rewards students' ability to memorize rather than be creative. This is a product of Confucianism (Robertson, 2002).

Teacher's role as to students and to parents

It is an expectation that students will be obedient, humble, respectful, and hardworking (Han, 2005). Korean Confucianism, based on hierarchy, gives teachers unquestionable authority since the matching model is teacher-centered (O'Donnell, 2006; Reed, 2002.). Within the classroom this gives the teacher immense power. To Western teachers those students that have come from Confucian culture are passive and silent learners, spoon-fed recipients that follow their cultural role of teachers delivering knowledge while students receive it (Han, 2005).

This is part of Confucianism in having set roles: "The teacher delivers knowledge and the students receive" (Han, 2005, p.203). Thus, learning and understanding is a process of memorization and repetition (Han, 2005). Teachers follow a method of 'teaching to test' so students succeed while giving relevant knowledge for exams (Han, 2005; Sorenson, 1994). In some schools, classrooms are overcrowded meaning that teacher's ability to maintain a disciplined atmosphere is important (Robinson, 1994). Teachers will use methods to control, modify, and change student behavior in the forms of giving a verbal scolding; pinching an ear, calling a student's name, giving stern looks, and corporal punishment (Robinson, 1994). A

point of discipline parents expect is for the teacher to forcefully push students on in studying when they do not desire to do so all for the hopes of passing each exam (Sorenson, 1994).

Common student behavior toward the teacher is to avoid eye contact as a sign of respect and to act embarrassed when praise is given since humility and self-criticism are culturally valued (Cho, 2004). In society's view, "a quiet student learns more and is more respectful than one who speaks up, singling himself out from the group and taking time away from the teacher's lesson" (Kim, 2004). This clearly shows that students are teacher-centered.

Many teachers reveal the importance of home background in determining academic achievement for students, while having a good home or bad home is a euphemism for SES (Robinson, 1993). Some parents set-up a meeting with the teacher and give various gifts possibly including money (Robinson, 1993 & 1994). Though a Westerner would think of this as bribery, gifts and or money are not buying grades. The intent is to be called on more in class, be student leader more often, and receive extra attention in a crowded classroom (Robinson, 1994). Culture dictates that a gift should be brought to a visit with a teacher thus meaning the family has a comfortable SES (Robinson 1993 & 1994). In the classroom some teachers knew of other teachers that did favor the student(s) whose parents gave a gift while some teachers believe subconsciously it has affected their teaching (Robinson, 1994).

Confucianism

In Korea, Confucianism is the foundation for Korea's values (Lee, 1995). These

Confucian “traditional values stressed virtue, righteousness, good manners, intelligence, and trust” (Lee, 1995, p.5). Particular emphasis is on filial piety as the means to attaining virtue and good manners (Lee, 1995). Lee also states (1995) in his article that good manners are part of traditional values. A further examination would show from ethics comes properness and the good manners needed to match social and life situations. Observing the chart (see Table 1) of courses for students in elementary school a person can notice the importance of ethics because it begins in the second grade. Confucianism considers ethics “the most important concept of education” (Lee, 1995, pg.5). This is because society has “clearly defined ethical standards” (Lee, 1995, p.5). Not much further is stated specifically in this section since Confucianism views, philosophy, and even behavior blend into the topic of each section.

Collective culture

Kim Sung Jin (2004) makes quite a few points on collective culture that is representative of Asian culture. Collectivism fosters interdependence and group success. In the school system students are to listen to teachers respectfully so that they will succeed (Kim, 2004). Loyalty and obedience to parents and teachers are important in Confucianism (Han, 2005). This includes the view that their knowledge and authority is unquestionable (Han, 2005). Two pieces of collective culture that are not separate are that norms are expected to be adhered to; respect for elders, and a group consensus with hierarchical roles dependent on gender, family background, and age (Kim, 2004). A person is not often called or known by

their name but rather their relationship as being 'June's teacher' or family role as being 'Anne's father' (Cho, 2004, p.34). This is represented in social interactions being defined by age and gender (Kim, 2004).

Quite opposite to individualism being dominant in U.S. culture, collectivism thinks of shared property and group ownership (Kim, 2004). This is a noted part of Korean language since students will say "our teacher" even when the listener does not have the same teacher, "our father" when the listener is not a member of the family, and "our house" when the listener is a stranger (Cho, 2004, p.34). Even the name of people is a claim to a family group since the last name is first followed by the given name (Cho, 2004). Further, this collective orientation extends to the truth. That is to say that something is true when a majority or those older hold it to be a fact, while for Westerner's fact can vary to individual experiences and be seen as both right and wrong.

General invitations to respond sometimes work, while many will not answer until the teacher calls upon the student. Students are taught to be sensitive to the thoughts, perceptions, and expectations of others to the point that they indirectly express themselves (Cho, 2004). Not only do students do this towards elders, but it should also be observed for those in situations where age, status, and relation require due respect. Thus, to freely volunteer information can be interpreted as a form of showing off and thus inappropriate (Cho, 2004). No response, though, has the cultural view "silence is gold" (Kim, 2004).

Collectively, in the classroom the relationship between the teacher and students is that neither will be made to lose face (Reed, 2002). Koreans would refrain from openly criticizing someone's work (Kim, 2004). Additionally, students would not want to give a correct answer after a student incorrectly answered so as not to embarrass the person in front of the rest of the class (Kim, 2004).

Differences in Korean and English languages

English and Korean are different in phonetic system, syntactic structure, and semantics. Thus, learners require much effort to make the same expressions between the languages (Cho, 2004). Korean students have trouble pronouncing English phonetic sound *f* and *v* because they do not exist in Korean (Cho, 2004). In Korean, students know the *l* and *r* sound while for English they sometimes cannot distinguish the *l* and *r* in pronouncing or listening (Cho, 2004). Things that are in English, such as articles and plurals, are hard since they do not exist in Korean (Ahn, 2003). They are often skipped over in reading due to L1 interference. “Korean syllabic form normally follows’ consonant-vowel-consonant (CVC) where in English it can be three consecutive consonants at the initial position causing confusion for students” (Cho, 2004, p.33). The pattern for a simple sentence in Korean is subject-object-verb (SOV) while English is subject-verb-object (SVO) (Cho, 2004). Thus, for students to make an English sentence they have to consciously think about the word order from Korean to English (Cho, 2004). “Modifiers generally come before modified elements”

as in the English phrase “hit strongly” while this is switched in Korean to “strongly hit” (Cho, 2004, p.33).

Native speaking English teachers- New to EFL

Korean English teacher assistant programs recruit any bachelor degree-holding English speakers from the United States, Canada, Ireland, Australia, the United Kingdom, South Africa, and New Zealand (Shiga, 2008). There is no requirement of a specific degree while certain degrees such as English, Education, or Linguistics can give a benefit of quickly being accepted as a teaching assistant to the Korean teacher. This is not much of a requirement because some teaching experience is obviously a benefit for such positions. Living in a context of constantly being surrounded by English language it is a common misconception that English will be a student’s second language (ESL). There are few chances for Koreans to speak English in daily life (Jo, 2008). Those with a bit of teaching experience in ‘communicative pedagogy’ would realize the challenges in transferring pedagogy between different contexts (Butler, 2005, p.425). This misconception with trying to transfer pedagogy likely leads to frustration and failure not yet realizing the EFL context.

Cross cultural views of EFL teachers- Positive and Negative

Kontra (1993) published a study set in Hungary and examined 116 students and 58 teachers. This study intrigued Barratt to repeat it in 1996 in China with 100 students and 54 teachers (Barratt & Kontra, 2000). Both results prove that it is not unique to any one country

that helping native speakers (NS) fit into the host culture is a challenge (Barratt & Kontra, 2000). Both surveys had participants' free write about their positive and negative experiences with a NS teacher (Barratt & Kontra, 2000). These sentences were then analyzed to go into categories (Barratt & Kontra, 2000). Again the sentences were analyzed to fit within the writer's intent of being positive, negative, and nonspecific positive (Barratt & Kontra, 2000). Commonalities existed between the way Hungarians and Chinese wrote about positive and negative aspects (Barratt & Kontra, 2000).

Positive points between both cultures were NS teachers have authentic pronunciation, wide knowledge of vocabulary, and information about usage (Barratt & Kontra, 2000). NS teachers are a resource about their and other cultures (Barratt & Kontra, 2000). Personal character traits such as being sociable, friendly, and other positive characteristics are noted (Barratt & Kontra, 2000). A positive was the way a teacher provided a different way to relate to students, gave new methodological views, was relaxed with errors and grading, and had students get involved (Barratt & Kontra, 2000).

Negative comments were such views as the NS teacher showing a lack of professionalism in preparation was written by students and teachers (Barratt & Kontra, 2000). A key point is that the NS teacher did not have a sense for common errors by EFL learners as well as efficient ways to teach (Barratt & Kontra, 2000). A problem was that NS teachers did not match the instruction with the school's expectations, the students' needs, or followed the

school's syllabus (Barratt & Kontra, 2000, p.21). A comment was made that points out NS culture likely makes them view the existing system of the host as having problems, being something that needs to be changed, altered, or modified (Barratt & Kontra, 2000). To this point, NS lacked basic cultural knowledge of the host country, acted with a prejudice against the host country, acted superior to the host culture, and ignored situations of culture difference (Barratt & Kontra, 2000). Lastly, there is the perception that most NS do this mainly as a means of traveling overseas as well as not being able to get a proper job in one's country (Barratt & Kontra, 2000).

Again some of the same views are presented in interviews done with Korean adult learners in a study by Han (2005). The context of the Korean culture though adds that teaching is "an honorable mission rather than simply a job" (Han, 2005, p.207). Culture notes this in that a person is not remembered by their name, but by their title, "teacher," or family role (Cho, 2004, p.34). This also hints at the Eastern culture view that people are their job and never leave until retirement.

The conclusion gives important advise for administrators of NS to examine applicants carefully, give an orientation for teachers, and make host language lessons available (Barratt & Kontra, 2000). Points for educators are to not recommend unqualified NS EFL teachers, teach candidates about world Englishes, help them identify how to teach about cultural diversity and acceptance, and lastly teach them about the EFL context (Barratt

& Kontra, 2000). Barratt and Kontra article (2000) leads to a conclusion for NS teachers to study the language and culture of the host, understand they are hired to teach within a structure and that they may have problems while not forcefully solving the problems and become familiar with the educational context for the sake of all those they work with as a teacher.

Decision-forcing cases that prepare teachers for the EFL context

The expectation of EFL NS teachers is to “help raise English language standards by providing an authentic environment for students to learn and use English as a means of communication” (Jackson, 2000, p.5). In EFL teaching, NS will encounter situations that are uncontrollable and confusing (Jackson, 2000). It is because of these unfamiliar situations that having open ended account cases of teaching events is important for EFL teacher education and development (Jackson, 2000). These cases should be teaching tools “designed to focus on curricular, pedagogical, administrative, cultural, or personal issues” important to EFL teachers (Jackson, 2000, p.6).

- To be a good teaching tool, cases should be based on real scenarios and if they are fictional they should be based on field research (Jackson, 2000, p.6).
- Having an understandable dialogue of interactions between characters and being able to visualize the contextual situation would help to draw the reader in the situation (Jackson, 2000, p.6).

- The case should commonly arise in teaching situations (Jackson, 2000, p.7).
- A case should not be restricted to time, but be relevant to future and current EFL teachers (Jackson, 2000, p.7).
- Cases should, as best as possible, display the multi-layers that are within a classroom situation to give life and complexity to the multiple cases going on at the same time (Jackson, 2000, p.7).
- Cases should have a development for the case(s) by being broad, specific, and probing questions (Jackson, 1998, p.156)
- To finish writing a case it would be best to leave the reader asking a nagging question that causes them to want to find a solution (Jackson, 2000, p.7).

Cases are to provide “opportunities for teachers to examine their own perceptions, attitudes, and values, and to reflect on different ways of teaching that might better motivate and engage their EFL students” (Jackson, 2000, p.6). The point of teachers analyzing the cases is to gain insight between theory and practice, thus becoming socialized to the real situation of EFL teaching (Jackson, 2000).

Such cases can be designed to put the reader in the teacher’s real-life situation about issues that are routinely confronted (Jackson, 1997). These issues could be

- Having to prepare curriculum lessons for a multilevel class (p.6).
- “Teaching a listening-speaking class to students who are reluctant to speak”

(p.6).

- “Teaching a language lesson that falls flat” (p.6)
- “Dealing with an incident of cross-cultural communication or racism in the classroom” (p.7).
- “Dealing with the pressure of being an itinerant ESL teacher in four elementary schools” (p.7).

For those that begin the adventure of living and teaching in an EFL context there is little help in published casebooks that are targeted for ESOL teachers (Jackson, 1997). As of the date of Jackson’s article (1998) there was, *ESOL case studies: The real world of L2 teaching and administration* by Plaister (1993) and *Teaching in action: Case studies from second language classrooms*, edited by Richards (1997).

Jackson gives a great outline of how experiences can be used as a decision-forcing case to allow other teachers to gain an insight into the EFL classroom setting. This is very important especially for NES teachers that lack knowledge in culture, Korean language, and experience teaching. For KET such decision-forcing cases will allow them to read and experience cross cultural communication issues, lessons that fail, possible racism, and student discipline to name a few.

NES contractual agreement for training

There are various contracts for being an English assistant at public schools in Korea.

The main programs for the teaching positions are *English Program in Korea* (EPIK), *Gyeonggi English Program in Korea* (GEPIK), Seoul Metropolitan Office of Education (SMOE), and *Talk and Learn in Korea* (TaLK). Some of the programs have their own websites while many use recruiting services to fill teaching positions. Many of the education provincial contracts are similar. For some of the contracts it is article 18 and others it is article 19, but it is titled, *Completion of Mandatory Orientation and Training* (KORVIA). In this section the intent is to give NESs information about the teaching position either before beginning teaching or during the term of the contract (KORVIA). The issue for the study is how to best have a method for training not only NESs but also KETs since both will teach together.

Conclusion

The literature review presents information that is helpful to do an action research project. The literature review covers five sections each with subcategories. These five sections are the Korean education system, section two is broadly about Korean teachers, the third section is about the English education program, fourth is culture, and lastly native English speakers. Each subsection has further information. The first section is divided into two categories of the age children say they are and their true age along with the elementary school studies structure. Second have specifics on, teacher education and certification, their teaching post and assessments, and the Korean English teacher's training and sub content of

pragmatic issues and the co-teaching relational view. The third section has information about the policies, the programs learning focus, curriculum Communicative language teaching (CLT), the issues with CLT in Korea, and the thought of English speaking skills and testing possibilities. Next, the fourth section, about culture, encompasses the view of education, the teacher's role to students and parents, Confucianism, collective culture, and the differences in Korean and English languages. Finally, the fifth section contains information that addresses native English speaking teachers new to the English foreign language (EFL) context, a cross-cultural view of EFL teachers being positive and negative, decision-forcing cases that prepare teachers for the EFL context, and the NES contractual agreement for training.

In studying about the many parts of Korea's education, Korean teachers, English education program, culture, and NESs a view has been formed. Using Jackson (1997, 1998, & 2000) decision-forcing cases will be made to understand the usefulness of decision-forcing case studies for experienced and new EFL teachers.

Chapter Three - The goal of the Action Research Project

The focus of the action research project will be to survey, interview, and later survey again both Korean English teachers (KETs) and native English speakers (NESs). The goal of the action research project will be to understand the usefulness of decision-forcing case studies for experienced and new English as foreign language (EFL) teachers. This method, if successful, will be used for NES contractual agreement for training.

The first step will be to survey the KETs and NESs with nine decision-forcing case studies (see Appendix A). The case studies will be developed from parts of the literature review such as differences in English and Korean languages, English pragmatics and Korean culture, while others will be from the researcher's personal experiences. Each scenario will follow Jackson's criteria (1997, 1998, & 2000) for decision-forcing cases. KETs and NESs will read each scenario and respond to questions that are meant to guide and evoke a decision a person would make when facing such a scenario. These questions will cause the KETs and NESs to think about the scenario, their possible reactions, and/or the steps they might take. Participants will rank each scenario with a number representing set criteria indicating what a person thinks of the scenario and the questions used to evoke such a decision. Participants, if they choose to, will give an alternative question(s), and/or change or extend existing questions stated in the directions. The goal of each scenario will range from (1) experiencing cultural student behavior in the classroom, (2) the co-teaching relationship and making

requests to one another, (3) student discipline for language, (4) understanding previous NES issues, (5) a situation that could be viewed as having racism, (6) differences in English and Korean language, (7) English pragmatic phrases, (8) understanding what can understandably be taught and not be taught in the EFL classroom, and (9) cultural difference(s). The KETs and NESs participants will be at two extremes of experience, i.e., someone that is quite new to the EFL context or teaching and another with some years of experience. The difference of experience might be discovered in the ranking of scenarios.

Scenario one is based on the researcher's frequent experiences in the classroom.

The scenario follows:

You are to ask questions about a dialogue clip just watched by 30 sixth grade students. The teacher guide book has you ask, "What did you hear?" This is a general question asked to the whole class while no one is openly answering. So you ask one student the question. As you chose a student to answer for the class immediately the student chosen has their head angled so you can only see the mouth move. You approach the student since you cannot make out exactly what the student says. You crouch a little and ask them to speak again. You hear that their answer is, "Hi."

From Cho (2004) the student's head being down, soft tone and short statement are a blend of culture and a lack of confidence. The two questions are, "What are the factors that caused the student to respond as they did?" and "From the view of the student what are their possible

thoughts or reasons?”

Scenario two states:

Due to the school budget your co-teacher and you share the teacher guide book. You have known your Korean co-teacher for about eight months and they are close in age to you. Before the lesson you were asked to lead some specific sections of the lesson. Your class is ten minutes into the lesson when your Korean co-teacher states, “Give it to me.” while you are using it (the teacher guide book) to teach through a section of the lesson you were asked to lead. Quickly afterwards he or she takes it from your hands.

This is based on the researcher’s experience with a KET in the 2010 academic year. The details of the scenario were changed to match Suh (1999) so the teacher’s within the scenario are both socially close in age and psychologically close in terms of time spent working together. From the scenario there is a clear misunderstanding of pragmatic English. As Suh’s (1999) study reflects an imperative is common in Korean relationships of closeness socially and psychologically than NES strategy of using a polite request. The rhetorical questions for the scenario are, “Other than having to share a teacher guide book why is it likely they stated this?”; “How do you think you would react to this?” “Thinking about the students in the classroom do you think they will perceive your thoughts or feelings towards this situation and how?”

The third case in the study states:

When a student comes into the room, they say in Korean, “안녕.”(An nyung– Hello).

Your Korean co-teacher has the student hold a chair above their head until they allow the student to put it down.

Though this and other discipline is against the reforms of the Ministry of Education, Science, and Technology (MOE) it does happen. The scenario is built from Robinson (1994) and a personal understanding of methods used to control the class and knowledge of Korean language. This is an English class and the child uses Korean. The Korean stated towards the teacher is not honorific for the teacher’s status or age. The child should have said, “안녕하세 요(An nyung ha seh yo- Hello).” The 요 (yo) is the honorific ending. Two rhetorical questions state, “What are your reactions and thoughts?” and “What is likely being taught?”

The fourth case study states:

You are two months into working at the school and are told by teachers and your co-teacher about problems that occurred from the previous native speaker employed at a school dinner. In telling about the problem they are vague. You inquire for further understanding while the teachers just move on to something else to discuss.

Again this is an experience of the authors. This scenario was not built with any part of the literature review, but the question, “What are your thoughts on common problems with native speakers?” this intends on getting the reader to think about common international issues with

NESs in character, actions, and work stated in Barratt and Kontra (2000). Along with this question are, “What are your reactions or thoughts?” and “How do you get more information?” and “What do you likely do to find out the problem without asking again?”

From Jackson’s article the fifth scenario is built from the researcher’s experience that can be viewed as racism (1997) and has an understandable interaction of dialogue that could take place within the classroom (2000).

Your class has nine middle school students with two tables set down in the middle that are parallel to a whiteboard. You have finished your lesson five minutes early so with the remaining time you want to have a discussion. You ask the students to tell you about their country, Korea.

Female student - “You know Dokdo?”

You - “No.”

Female student 1 - “It is ours. Japan wants it.”

Female student 2 - “What do you call the sea between Japan and Korea?”

You - “It is the Sea of Japan.”

Female student 2 - Firmly stating, “No! It is the East Sea,” as she gives you an angry glare.

Female student 3 - “They are so evil. Their eyes are like this,” as the student slants her eyes to near closed. “They know only hair as jet black and straight style. Not like my

hair,” as she shows her hair is dyed and styled.

Male student 1 - “You know the greeting, Ohayoogozaimasu? What does it sound? A train is coming.” As all the students laugh at the joke.

Female student 4 - “They stole our things. Put in museum. They don’t give it back. It is so beautiful.”

For a Westerner, this is shocking as it was for the researcher at the moment; however, a study of Korean history will allow a person to gain insight into the sentiments of the people as well as increase understanding of the above comments. Lee’s (1995) article gives a short historical view of issues between Korea and Japan. For this scenario the rhetorical questions are, “What are your feelings and beliefs after such a conversation?” and “What is your reaction?” These are followed by “What is the subject you were told about with Korea?”

Sixth in the case studies features a blend of English and Korean languages that is called Konglish. The meaning to this is that Korean will follow the phonetics of English words. It is not an exact match phonetically, but is close. This scenario states:

You are teaching a lesson about places to fourth grade students. On a piece of paper is the English paired with the Korean. You read the words with students listening first and then they follow what you are reading while pointing to the word. You notice every time you read and say supermarket students have a similar pronunciation. In speaking the students sound like, supeomaket.

Here the Korean word is 슈퍼마켓 and phonetically su-peo-ma-ket. The issue here is that in words phonetically close to English yet not exact to L1, would a person leave this alone or continually try to get the exact English pronunciation. A series of questions after the scenario include, “What is your assumption with students speaking?” “Do you continue to practice the pronunciation of this word? Why?” and “For Korean words that phonetically are similar to English is it important to force English pronunciation repeatedly?”

For the seventh scenario another English pragmatic scenario is built from the author’s experience with an exaggeration of what the author would do or say.

Elementary school students are in your room and it is only minutes before the lesson is to start. You can finish reading an internet article before class is to begin. In finishing the article that you find to be ridiculous so you firmly say, “Come on!” A student comes over and says, “Yes, teacher.” Now the lesson is to begin and for likely a quick lesson you decide to teach what you meant.

“Come on!” meant that the people in the news article were ridiculously not thinking.

While if I call on you and am waiting I would say, ‘Come on’ I am expecting you to hurry.” Your Korean co-teacher translates.

The issues in this scenario are that many phrases and words are teachable under EFL, some points are understandable for students, while anything else but literal meanings cannot be acquired by elementary school students in EFL. The researcher’s view of the scenario is that

it follows Jackson's (1997) point on a lesson that fails. Questions to the scenario are, "Did your students gain an understanding of 'Come on!' other than literal?" "If this possibly happened again would you do the same thing again? Why? What would you change and how if it happens again?"

The eighth scenario is built from experience with the KETs qualifications exaggerated to make the person less identifiable by other KETs that will do the study.

You are a teacher at two rural schools because both have a small amount of students.

At one of these schools the biggest class is the fifth grade with 15 students. The school is an old building set near a mountain with a view of a small village a quarter of a kilometer to the left and many rows of rice fields until the main road to the village is seen. The policy the school has in English teaching is for the native speaker to work with homeroom teachers that are comfortable in speaking English. For third and fourth grade a teacher has volunteered to assist the native speaker in teaching English.

The fifth grade teacher at the school is the head of the English department, the second senior teacher at the school, has over five years of elementary education experience, has been trained by the province education department in English, and is ten years older. Your schedule at the school has two periods of forty minute lessons in English being taught to fifth grade students in one day. The fifth grade homeroom teacher

leads the classroom for anywhere from both periods to seventy minutes.

Together you are teaching a lesson about asking where a place is and giving direction.

Fifth grade students understand the opening dialogue to the lesson as well as two important phrases to a lesson about asking where a place is and giving directions.

Now the class is working on writing these words in their notebook with the Korean

meaning to the word. When the word “straight” is to be written the Korean

homeroom teacher has accompanied this by speaking sentences or questions using the

word while students write. After writing the word straight three times your Korean

teacher proceeds to call specific students and ask each, “Are you straight?” doing this

three times. The students look confused at their homeroom teacher. The homeroom

teacher then states the meaning to this question in Korean.”

Again, the point is to show a failed lesson (Jackson, 1997). For both teachers the knowledge

level of students in English must be thought of above what knowledge a person has that they

believe to be related. For this scenario the questions are, “How would you assist the teacher

in the use of specific words that help students grasp the meaning knowing your relation at the

school?” and “How do you draw the line as an adult with knowledge you know to be

connected to the level of your students since such things are not connected in their minds?”

Lastly, scenario nine is an experience in teaching at a private language academy. In

that sense it is fictitious in taking place in a public school setting of high level students. The

point of the scenario is to gain insight into cultural views that are different than Western views. This view is about age that is stated in many of the resources used and is important in Confucianism (Cho, 2004; Kim, 2004; Lee, 1995).

This scenario states:

You are the teacher to a class of second and third grade students totaling twelve. It is mixed due to the higher language ability of the students. They understand quite well what is spoken while having hints of good and poor output construction. One boy has made another boy in the class cry after speaking Korean to him. Other students tell you who caused this reaction. They further tell you that he has remarked to the other boy about, "How stupid he is losing." These boys are on the same team in a game that just lost one round in a game of many rounds with many turns for each student. You now tell this boy to say, "I'm sorry." The boy just looks at you for a minute with nothing being said. You further pry at him saying, "Why did you do this when he is your friend?" The boy replies back, "I am not his friend I am older."

Rhetorical questions to the scenario are, "What does this statement cause you to think?

Realize? React?"

Following this, NES participants will participate in an interview to gain further insight (see Appendix B). Participants in the interview will be asked to assess how a person prepared for teaching in Korea or their first country. The interview will include questions

about their knowledge of national English education policies as well as for them to identify if any resources to help teach English or resources at the school helped them to understand culture and being an English teacher, where they felt they lacked knowledge, any useful material(s) when they came to the school, the ratio of teaching time to preparation time in teaching, and lastly their thoughts on the effectiveness of decision-forcing case studies. The intent of the interview will be to raise issues in areas NESs likely lack in insight regarding national English policies, authentic materials, tools for teaching English, preparation for the EFL context, struggles with communicative language teaching (CLT), and teaching to preparation ratio. It is likely that with the questions the two extremes of experience in the EFL context may be shown as well.

The interview for KETs will be absent of the cultural questions asked to NESs. This interview will focus on known English policies, helpful information, resources at the school to study about policies, teaching English or co-teaching, where the teacher lacks knowledge, struggles with CLT, has knowledge of teaching materials already at the school, knows the ratio of teaching to preparation, and the teacher's thoughts on the effectiveness of decision-forcing case studies (see Appendix C). The intent here will be to see if there is any similarity to NES in knowledge of national English policies, a school having tools for teaching English, struggles with CLT, and teaching to preparation ratio. Especially in the literature review the topic of CLT issues with KET will be covered extensively by previous authors, Li (1998) plus

Howard and Millar (2008).

For the survey, the difference of the participants' experiences possibly could be seen in the scenario where culture shock, the ways another culture thinks of concepts such as relationships, is the issue (9). Other points will be statements made by students that could be construed as racism (5). A person with a few years' experience might understand more to the current thoughts and feelings from historic events related to the Japanese. A scenario in the survey shows a possible problem related to English pragmatics between the KET and the NES (2). Here it is likely that a person with a few years experience would understand what is further embedded in the situation between people of two different cultures.

From the interview it must be acknowledged that all schools are different along with a school's KET. When it comes to a question about having knowledge of national English education policies, for a new NES the policies are likely not viewed as policies. For a new NES to the EFL context, policies are more viewed as the way things are done according to information received from their KET. Meaning they are not directly told policies, but an informative statement the KET states in order to help the new NES. Another difference of experience might be in stating what struggles each participant has with CLT.

Following the collection of data from the decision-forcing case studies and the interview, another meeting with the participants will take place. This meeting is where participants will have a sheet of paper showing their ranking of the scenarios. Each

participant will be given a copy of the scenarios ranked “one” or “three.” This is the ranking that the participant put for a scenario that they feel or think an important decision must be made. They will have a copy of the scenario(s) with the comments they previously made. After reading the scenario again and their comments from before, they will answer two questions on a single sheet of paper (see Appendix D). The first question will be, “What is it about the scenario that makes you feel or think a decision must be made?” The second question will be, “Which question(s) helped you feel or think a decision must be made?” The intent of this will be to find out what information was particularly in the scenario that made the participants feel or think a decision must be made. Since the purpose of the questions was to be a guide along with the intent of evoking the participant to make a decision, the participants will state which question(s) made them feel or think an important decision must be made.

Chapter Four - Action Plan

The purpose of this action research study will be to gain an insight into the usefulness of decision-forcing case studies for experienced and new English foreign language teachers (EFL). The issue of the study will be to understand if decision forcing case studies can be useful in training experienced and new EFL teachers. NES have a contractual requirement to be available for and receive training. The researcher's belief is that decision-forcing cases will be a means to train experienced and new EFL teachers no matter the cultural difference of Korean and NESs since they both teach English together.

The participants in the study will be two KETs and two NESs. One participant from each group; KET and NES, will be at two extremes of experience, i.e., someone that is quite new to the EFL context and another with some years of experience.

Each decision-forcing case study or scenario will be written to follow the criteria by Jackson (1997, 1998, & 2000) in order to be a decision-forcing case. Nine decision-forcing scenarios will be written with questions (see Appendix A). Some scenarios will feature an issue from the literature review such as difference in English and Korean languages, English pragmatics, and Korean culture while others will be based on personal experiences. The questions will help compel the reader to make a decision within the scenario. The participants, after reading the scenarios and questions, will then rank their feelings and thoughts of the scenario to these set criteria.

- A “one” indicates any well set-up and useful scenario(s) with helpful questions that make you sense an important decision must be made.
- A “two” indicates a useful scenario with questions that do not make you sense any decision needs to be made.
- A “three” indicates a scenario that needs more information with questions that make you sense an important decision must be made.
- A “four” indicates a scenario that needs more information and has questions that do not make sense for any decision needing to be made.
- A “five” indicates no answer can be given with the available information.

The adaptation of this ranking system for the scenarios will be to understand the participant’s thoughts if the scenario is a decision-forcing case. To be a decision-forcing case, the participant will sense (feel or think) that an important decision must be made. These rankings will be “one” and “three.” This ranking system will be able to tell which scenarios an experienced and new EFL teacher thinks are useful. For each participant, tables will be made on the ranking of each scenario. The categories of the tables will include: all participants, KET participants, NES participants, new KET and NES teacher, experienced KET and NES teacher, new KET and experienced NES teacher, and new NES and experienced KET teacher. Key notes on differences and similarities between participants will also be made following the tables.

Next, each scenario will be responded to by the participant concerning why it was ranked in the manner it was with the given criteria. This method will be to gain insight into personal reasons, issues, questions, or information in the scenarios that is deemed as useful in decision-forcing case studies. It will be expected that the participants new to the EFL context as opposed to those with many years of experience will rank scenarios differently. It is expected that this will be true for scenarios where culture shock, contextually embedded information, and lessons that fail, are the main issues in the scenario.

After the forced case scenarios are completed, an interview will be used. The interview for each NES will be to gain insight into any commonality of issues experienced (see Appendix B). The first question will ask if the participant has any knowledge regarding English education policies. This question will also be in the Korean teachers' interview. Next, participants will answer about the length of time a person studied about Korea, Korean culture, and EFL teaching before embarking to the assignment (or a participant's first EFL country). Question three will have five parts. Some of the question parts may be answered in previous questions. The question will be if there was any material at the school to help understand culture, teaching, and the EFL context. Again, the question will ask about materials personally found or at the school that were studied by the participant. And the participant will answer the last part about the authentic materials helpful points. The interview's fourth question will be about where the participant feels he/she lacked in

understanding in culture and EFL teaching from his/her search for helpful materials. Question five will ask about the participant's struggle with communicative language teaching (CLT). Question six will be directed at the participant answering if the school had useful English materials when they arrived to help teach students. Next to last will be a question about the ratio of teaching hours to hours of preparation for teaching classes. The last question will deal directly with the decision-forcing cases. The participant will be directed to give a comparative statement of the materials read in preparing to come to Korea with the decision-forcing scenarios they just read.

The interview for KETs is a little different since they will not need to be asked about preparing for the culture, preparing for Korea, or studying the Korean EFL context (see Appendix C). Question one will be the same as the interview for NET participants. The second question will have three parts. The first part will ask what the most helpful information was when the participant was a new English teacher followed by specifying this information. And lastly, the participant will be asked how long did he or she review the helpful material to understand English teaching and English policies. The participant will be asked if the helpful material was at the school or communicated to him/her by a colleague. The second part to the question will ask how the KET prepared for co-teaching (team teaching). Similar to question four for NES, this question will have a slight change in asking KETs where they felt a lack of understanding in English teaching, English policies, or co-

teaching. Questions five to eight will be the same as in the NET interview.

The data from the decision-forcing cases and interview will be assessed. Following this, another meeting with the participants will be done. Each participant will see a paper with the rankings of the scenarios. A copy will be given of the scenarios ranked “one” or “three” that also has their comments from the previous research. The participant will read the scenario again and what they wrote. On the following page are two questions that require written answers (see Appendix D). For each scenario that is selected as a decision-forcing case, participants will select the question(s) that made them feel or think a decision must be made will have a table for each participant. The wording of the two questions will be purposefully changed from the exact wording of the decision-forcing rankings since participants may need clarification on the word sense. The intent will be for the participant to feel or think a decision must be made in the scenario in order to be a decision-forcing case.

The researcher’s role in implementing the study will be to first find the right participants in terms of length as a KET or English assistant teacher. Participants that agree will have a meeting arranged to do the first part of the study which will consist of the cases and the interview. The cases will only have further clarification about the term, “sense” in the ranking from the writer while the participant will read and rank the cases. The interview will provide clarification if the participant has trouble understanding the question. Lastly, a time will be arranged to do the last written part about the cases ranked “one” or “three” (see

Appendix D).

The researcher is a NES working at two small rural elementary schools during weekdays. A participant in the research, “Boyeon,” was the researcher’s co-teacher for the 2011 academic year. No scenarios from the researcher’s personal experience have been written with “Boyeon” as the KET in the scenarios.

Chapter 5 - Results and Next Steps

The purpose of the action research was to understand the usefulness of decision-forcing case studies for experienced and new English as foreign (EFL) language teachers. The content of the research is from nine case studies with questions. The purpose of the questions after each scenario was to direct and draw the participant into making a decision as if they were the teacher(s) in the scenario. Each case was ranked according to how the participant's thought the scenario matches the ranking criteria. The participants were then to write a reason with elaboration stating why they ranked the scenario in the manner they chose.

Participant's information

The following list contains information over each participant in the order the study was conducted in.

“Futala” is a 25 year old South African who has been in South Korea for a month and a week. The description of the school was written as a “small town, bus system and mostly a small population” where “students live in walking distance from the school. Others travel by private car or carpool.” She teaches fifth and sixth grade for 20 hours a week. “Futala's” school has between 105 and 120 students. She has a degree in International Relations and English.

“Nari” is a 29 year old with six years of experience as a Korean English teacher. She has traveled to England, the U.S.A., and the Philippines for either holiday or furthering her

English education. The description of the school is as a “small city” where most of the parents are employed by Power Tech. and the two most common places of living is at Dae-rim Apt. and Boo-young Apt. “Nari” teaches 20 hours a week to sixth grade students at a school with 820 students. She has a bachelor’s degree in Elementary Education.

“Boyeon” is a 27 year old with six months’ experience as a Korean English teacher. She teaches third to sixth grade for 23 hours a week. The student population of the school is 77. The school is described as being in Chungnam province, Korea. Most of the parents are farmers and students mostly live in houses. “Boyeon” has a bachelor’s degree in Education. “Boyeon” is the author’s co-teacher at one of two schools.

“Nelson” is a 33 year old South African with two years and three months experience as an English teaching assistant. He teaches 22 hours at a countryside school close to a mountain that has a student population of 460 students. The majority of parents are company or factory workers and live in a company apartment. “Nelson” holds a bachelor’s degree in Education.

Structure of the study

Nine decision-forcing case studies were compiled for research participants to assess by ranking each scenario. The structure of the ranking was separated into two parts. The first part was about ranking the scenario and the second focused on the questions for the scenario. It was structured as being *well set-up and useful, useful, and needs more information* stated

twice for two different rankings. The ranking for the scenario that was *well-set-up and useful* was “one.” A *useful* ranking was “two,” and the ranking of “three” and “four” was *needs more information*. A ranking of “five” was that no answer could be given with the available information. The second part to the ranking statement was based on the questions to the scenario(s).

This was the established ranking system:

- A “one” indicates any well set-up and useful scenario with helpful questions that make you sense an important decision must be made.
- A “two” indicates a useful scenario with questions that do not make you sense any decision needs to be made.
- A “three” indicates a scenario that needs more information with questions that make you sense an important decision must be made.
- A “four” indicates a scenario that needs more information and has questions that do not make sense for any decision needing to be made.
- A “five” indicates no answer can be given with the available information.

The ranking of “one” and “three” are similar though ranking a scenario a “three” did not have the adjective “helpful” within the ranking statement. A ranking of “two” and “four” are the same in that the questions “do not make you sense any decision needs to be made.”

The success of each scenario was based on a ranking where the participant thought

the scenario and the questions made him or her think or feel (sense) an important decision must be made. The rankings of “one” or “three” signify a useful decision-forcing case.

However, the rankings where no decision is thought of or sensed were “two,” “four,” or “five.”

The first method of data gathering was for participants to rank the nine decision-forcing case studies. Next was the gathering of general demographic information and an interview. After the research, a further follow-up gathered information specifically about the scenario(s) ranked “one” or “three.” Each participant read a copy of the scenario ranked “one” or “three” that had his/her comments. Following reading, each was asked to write specifically about what he/she thought it was about the scenario that made him or her think or feel an important decision must be made along with which question(s) helped the participants think or feel an important decision must be made.

It is noted that the participants in the study are two native English speakers (NESs) and two Korean English teachers (KETs). Of the two participants for a category, NES or KET, one was to have years of experience and the other was to be quite new to teaching English. This is why the title of the research is general, English as Foreign Language Teachers, rather than specific to a culture.

Below are the rankings of all participants.

Participant one

“Futala” (South African nationality)

one month and a week experience

Native English Speaker

Table 2.0

Total number of rankings

1- Scenarios 1, 3, 4, 7, & 9 (5)	55%
2- Scenario 8 (1)	11%
3- None	0%
4- Scenario 5 (1)	11%
5- Scenarios 2 & 6 (2)	22%

Participant two

“Nari”

six years experience

Korean English Teacher

Table 2.1

Total number of rankings

1- Scenarios 5, 6, 7, & 9 (4)	44%
2- Scenarios 1 & 8 (2)	22%
3- Scenarios 2 & 4 (2)	22%
4- Scenario 3 (1)	11%
5- None	0%

Participant three

“Boyeon”

six months experience

Korean English Teacher

Table 2.2

Total number of rankings

1- Scenarios 2 & 3 (2)	22%
2- Scenarios 4, 5, 6, 8, & 9 (5)	55%
3- Scenarios 1 & 7 (2)	22%
4- None	0%
5- None	0%

Participant four

“Nelson” (South African nationality)

two years and three months experience

Native English Speaker

Table 2.3

Total number of rankings	
Scenario 1- 1, 4, 7, & 9 (4)	44%
Scenario 2- 8 (1)	11%
Scenario 3- 2 & 3 (2)	22%
Scenario 4- 6 (1)	11%
Scenario 5- 5 (1)	11%

Table 3.0

Combine rankings of all participants

1- 15 total	41.66%
2- 9 total	25%
3- 6 total	16.66%
4- 3 total	8.33%
5- 3 total	8.33%

Observations from the data:

- All scenarios except scenario eight were ranked a “one” among the four participants.
- All participants agreed on scenario eight being ranked “two.”
- All participants agreed on scenario seven being a decision-forcing scenario giving it either a “one” or “three” ranking.
- Three out of the four participants selected scenarios one, two, three, four, and nine as decision-forcing cases.

- Scenarios two and three were not ranked “two” by any participant.
- Scenarios five, six, and nine were not ranked “three” by any participant.
- Scenarios one, two, four, and nine were not ranked “four” by any participant.
- Scenarios one, three, four, and nine were not ranked “five” by any participant.
- Only NESs gave a ranking of “five” to any of the scenarios.
- For NESs scenarios one, four, seven and nine were ranked “one” and scenario eight was ranked “two.” A total of five scenarios were ranked the same and both participants are South African.
- The average number of scenarios either ranked “one” or “three” is at 55%, or five scenarios.

Case studies facts from participants

The following are facts related to the scenario and the ranking given by the participants.

All participants viewed case study seven as a decision-forcing case since it was either ranked a “one” or a “three.” To summarize, this scenario is about a student understanding the literal meaning of “Come on,” when the meaning was different. You (the NES) state your meaning and the KET translates what you meant. Three participants (“Futala,” “Nari,” and “Nelson”) ranked it “one,” which means the scenario was a *well set-up and useful scenario accompanied with helpful questions that made the participant sense an important decision*

must be made. “Boyeon” ranked it “three” which means the participant *needed more information* for the situation and the *questions made the participant sense an important decision must be made.*

Scenario eight was the longest with the most details. In brief, as the NES in a rural school, you are teaching a fifth grade class about directions. The fifth grade homeroom KET is also the English department head and has many years of experience and training. Students are learning direction words and writing them in their notebooks. After writing the word “straight,” the fifth grade teacher asks three students, “Are you straight?” The ranking of “two” for this scenario means the scenario was *useful with questions that did not make the participant sense any decision needs to be made.*

Results of Korean English teachers

Rankings of Korean English Teachers

Participant two - “Nari”

six years experience

Korean English Teacher

Table 4.0

Total number of rankings

1- Scenarios 5, 6, 7, & 9 (4)	44%
2- Scenarios 1 & 8 (2)	22%
3- Scenarios 2 & 4 (2)	22%
4- Scenario 3 (1)	11%
5- None	0%

Participant three - “Boyeon”

six months experience

Korean English Teacher

Table 4.1

Total number of rankings

1- Scenarios 2 & 3 (2)	22%
2- Scenarios 4, 5, 6, 8, & 9 (5)	55%
3- Scenarios 1 & 7 (2)	22%
4- None	0%
5- None	0%

Table 5.0

Korea English Teachers combine ranking of the scenario

1- 6 total	33.33%
2- 7 total	38.89%
3- 4 total	22.22%
4- 1 total	5.55%
5- 0 total	0%

NOTE: “One” and “three” rankings had a total of ten scenarios done by KETs. The total gives an average of five scenarios, 55% per KET.

Analysis of Korean English teachers: Both participants gave the ranking of “one” or “three” to scenarios two and seven, thus both are decision-forcing cases. Except for scenario eight the participants did not have an agreement on another case not being decision-forcing.

Results of Native English Speakers

Rankings of Native English Speakers

Participant one - “Fulata” (South African nationality)

Table 6.0

Total number of rankings	
1- Scenarios 1, 3, 4, 7, & 9 (5)	55%
2- Scenario 8 (1)	11%
3- None	0%
4- Scenario 5 (1)	11%
5- Scenarios 2 & 6 (2)	22%

Participant four - “Nelson” (South African nationality)

Table 6.1

Total number of rankings	
1- Scenarios 1, 4, 7, & 9 (4)	44%
2- Scenario 8 (1)	11%
3- Scenarios 2 & 3 (2)	22%
4- Scenario 6 (1)	11%
5- Scenario 5 (1)	11%

Table 7.0

Native English Speakers combine ranking of the scenarios	
1- 9 total	50%
2- 2 total	11.11%
3- 2 total	11.11%
4- 2 total	11.11%
5- 3 total	16.67%

NOTE: “One” and “three” rankings have a total of eleven scenarios by Native English

Speakers.

Analysis of Native English Speakers: “Futala” and “Nelson” agreed that scenario one, four, seven, and nine were decision forcing cases with the ranking of “one.” Scenario three was also a decision-forcing scenario. It was ranked “one” and the other participant ranked it “three.” Both participants agreed that scenarios five, six, and eight were not decision-forcing scenarios since they received the ranking of “two,” “four,” or “five.”

Results of experienced English Teachers

Ranking of experienced English Teachers

Participant four - “Nelson” two years and three months experience
 Native English Speaker
 South African nationality
 Table 8.0

Total number of rankings

1- Scenarios 1, 4, 7, & 9 (4)	44%
2- Scenario 8 (1)	11%
3- Scenarios 2 & 3 (2)	22%
4- Scenario 6 (1)	11%
5- Scenario 5 (1)	11%

Participant two - “Nari” six years experience
 Korean English Teacher
 Table 8.1

Total number of rankings

1- Scenarios 5, 6, 7, & 9 (4)	44%
2- Scenarios 1 & 8 (2)	22%
3- Scenarios 2 & 4 (2)	22%
4- Scenario 3 (1)	11%
5- None	0%

Table 9.0

 Experienced teacher's combine ranking of scenarios

1- 8 total	44.44%
2- 3 total	16.67%
3- 4 total	22.22%
4- 2 total	11.11%
5- 1 total	5.55%

NOTE: "One" and "three" rankings total twelve scenarios done by experienced teachers.

Analysis of experienced English Teachers: The average number of decision-forcing scenarios was higher with experienced EFL teachers. The average was 66%; six scenarios with an agreement on the eighth scenario of the three total scenarios that are not decision-forcing. "Nelson" and "Nari" both had scenario seven ranked "one." This scenario means both participants thought the scenario was *well set-up and useful with helpful questions that made both participants sense an important decision must be made*. For the second scenario both ranked it a "three." This ranking means that the scenario *needs more information and the questions made the participant sense an important decision must be made*. The study's fourth scenario was a decision-forcing case though both participants ranked it either "one" or "three."

Results of new English Teachers

Rankings of new English Teachers

Participant three - "Boyeon"

six months experience

Korean English Teacher

Table 10.0

 Total number of rankings

1- Scenarios 2 & 3 (2)	22%
2- Scenarios 4, 5, 6, 8, & 9 (5)	55%
3- Scenarios 1 & 7 (2)	22%
4- None	0%
5- None	0%

Participant one - "Futala"

one month and a week experience

Native English Speaker

South African nationality

Table 10.1

 Total number of rankings

1- Scenarios 1, 3, 4, 7, & 9 (5)	55%
2- Scenario 8 (1)	11%
3- None	0%
4- Scenario 5 (1)	11%
5- Scenarios 2 & 6 (2)	22%

Table 11

 New Teacher's combine ranking of scenarios

1- 7 total	38.89%
2- 6 total	33.33%
3- 2 total	11.11%
4- 1 total	5.55%
5- 2 total	11.11%

NOTE: "One" and "three" rankings total nine scenarios done by new English teachers.

Analysis of new English Teachers: Both participants; “Boyeon” and “Futala,” ranked scenario three a “one” and also scenario eight a “two.” Scenario three indicated that both participants thought the scenario was *well set-up and useful with helpful questions that made both participants sense an important decision must be made.*

Results of an experienced KET and new NES

Rankings of an experienced Korean English Teacher and new Native English Speaker

Participant three - “Nari” six years experience
Korean English Teacher

Table 12.0

Total number of rankings

1- Scenarios 5, 6, 7, & 9 (4)	44%
2- Scenarios 1 & 8 (2)	22%
3- Scenarios 2 & 4 (2)	22%
4- Scenario 3 (1)	11%
5- None	0%

Participant one - “Futala” one month and a week experience
Native English Speaker
South African nationality

Table 12.1

Total number of rankings

1- Scenarios 1, 3, 4, 7, & 9 (5)	55%
2- Scenario 8 (1)	11%
3- None	0%
4- Scenario 5 (1)	11%
5- Scenarios 2 & 6 (2)	22%

Analysis of an experienced Korean English Teacher and new Native English Speaker:

The KET, “Nari,” and NES, “Futala,” ranked scenarios seven and nine a “one.” This ranking

indicated the scenario was a *well set-up and useful scenario accompanied with helpful*

questions that made the participant sense an important decision must be made.

Results of new KET and experienced NES

Rankings of a new Korean English Teacher and experienced Native English Speaker

Participant three - “Boyeon”

six months experience

Korean English Teacher

Table 13.0

Total number of rankings

1- Scenarios 2 & 3 (2)	22%
2- Scenarios 4, 5, 6, 8, & 9 (5)	55%
3- Scenarios 1 & 7 (2)	22%
4- None	0%
5- None	0%

Participant four - “Nelson”

two years and three months experience

Native English Speaker

South African nationality

Table 13.1

Total number of rankings

1- Scenarios 1, 4, 7, & 9 (5)	44%
2- Scenario 8 (1)	11%
3- Scenarios 2 & 3 (2)	22%
4- Scenarios 4 & 6 (2)	22%
5- Scenario 5 (1)	11%

Analysis of a new Korean English Teacher and experienced Native English Speakers:

Both participants indicated scenarios one, two, three, and seven as decision-forcing cases

ranked “one” or “three.” For “Boyeon,” scenarios two and three were ranked “one” while “Nelson” ranked them “three.” “Nelson” selected scenario one and seven for the ranking of “one” while “Boyeon” placed them as “three.” The ranking of “one” indicated the scenario was a *well set-up and useful scenario accompanied with helpful questions that made the participant sense an important decision must be made*. The ranking of “three” indicated that the scenario *needs more information and the questions made the participant sense an important decision must be made*.

Individual assessments of results

As a part of the individual assessments, the structure of the rankings for the purpose of the paper was for the participants to sense the scenarios are decision-forcing case studies. The rankings that signify the participants’ sense a decision is to be made are “one” or “three.” Thus, each individual assessment will focus on these two rankings. The second follow-up portion of the assessment was for the participant to read the scenario ranked “one” or “three” again along with his/her comments. After reading the scenario and comments, the participant made comments on a separate sheet of paper with only two questions. Each case will be split into a quote about the individual cases reason for the ranking marked by the participants quote with the following quote(s) from the second part of the research. Keep in mind that in following the participant’s statements some words might be missing or misspelled. Even though scenarios ranked “three” indicated that the KETs or NESs wanted more information,

this question desires to know what information is written that the participant used to feel or think a decision must be made. The desired outcome of the first question is to read the participants thoughts in terms of feelings or thoughts that lead to action within the scenario.

Participant one - "Futala"

Five scenarios were ranked "one," decision-forcing. The ranking of "one" indicated the scenario was a *well set-up and useful scenario accompanied with helpful questions that made the participant sense an important decision must be made*. These five scenarios were the first, third, fourth, seventh, and ninth. Of all the participants "Futala" gave the most "one" rankings. No scenarios were ranked "three."

In the first scenario you are the teacher asks a general question to the class "What did you hear?" after having watched a dialogue clip. No students are answering so the teacher picks one student. He or she does not hear the student answer the first time so they ask them to repeat the answer to which they hear the answer, "Hi." The reason for this answer was written as, "Every week I encounter this situation. I have to find a solution to minimize the scenarios from happening and fixing this probably begins with me."

Towards scenario one she thought that "a decision must be made to increase productivity and not to get the other students, who are advanced feel disadvantaged. If a decision is not made the rest of the class will lag behind." The helpful question was within the scenario, "What did you hear? About the question she wrote, "This is a question I ask

everyday and ‘Did you understand?’ I always get blank stares and that stalls the lesson. Thus as a teacher I end up having to tell them the answer or repeat myself repeatedly. I discovered demonstrating or being animatic helps get your point across.”

The study’s third scenario was the Korean co-teacher disciplining a student for what was said in a greeting. “Futala” wrote, “A situation that has once happened before” as the reason for the “one” ranking.

She stated, she “feels that this scenario is all about who holds the power.” And adding the thought, “There is no need to embarrass any student particularly in front of others.” The main question that made “Futala” think a decision must be made was, “what is my (“your” is written in the scenario question) written reaction and thoughts?” Though not clearly stated further questions are written that might have been provoked from this first question that was written. The following questions are, “Is the punishment of that sort necessary? Did the student ever deserve such a harsh punishment?” Such questions show “Futala’s” has thought about this scenario since it has happened during her month and a week experience as a NES.

The fourth scenario was about you being at a teacher’s dinner and they open up to you about problems experienced with the previous teacher. They are vague and move on in conversation as you inquire for further understanding. She wrote, “Heard a few stories from other native teachers about scenarios like this one” as the reason for why this was ranked “one.”

Feelings and thoughts about the fourth scenario are, “This scenario is nothing new. Native teachers have a hard time already being a foreign country with no friends or family. Now the place where they will spend most of their days could probably have hostility towards the NT due to someone else. That NT is paying for what another NT did and it is just not fair. A clean slate must be made.” With NT the meaning is native teacher whose L1 is English. The important question to the scenario is “What are my (“your” is written in the scenario question) thoughts on common problems with native speakers? This prompted me to think further and as they say, no relationship is one person. Working together is important.”

The seventh scenario was about the phrase, “Come on!” having a different meaning than what one of your students thought. You decide to teach them that this phrase has two meanings. You state what you meant and the meaning the student thought the phrase “Come on!” meant. Your Korean co-teacher then translates what you stated to help students. This scenario “has happened before in my class and I quite enjoy it when this kind of scenario happens” was written as the reason for the ranking.

The study’s seventh scenario was decision-forcing for all participants. “Futala,” states, “There are one ways of learning something new. Additionally, in life not everything goes by the textbook. Slang or colloquial language is part of everyday life.” The researcher believes “Futala” did not completely write all the words she thought of for the first sentence. She selected the questions, “If this possibly happened again would you do the same thing again?”

Why? What would you change & how if it happens again?” Further stating, “I have actually introduced word/sentence of the week. Such as ‘fantastic’ ‘awesome’ which also means very good/extremely good.”

Lastly, in the ninth scenario you are the teacher to twelve higher than average language ability students mixed between second and third grade. They are playing a game with many rounds. A boy just lost one round and a fellow team member states something in Korean that causes the boy to cry. You are told about the situation and try to have an apology for the sad boy. You ask, “Why did you do this when he is your friend?” And the boy says back, “I’m not his friend I am older.” The reason for this ranking was that “Futala” wrote, “I have read on Waygook that this happens quite often.”(NOTE: This is a reference to the website <http://www.waygook.org>.)

From the ninth scenario, her comments were: “Has not happened in my class, it is always good to prepare.” The question that helped “Futala” think or feel an important decision must be made is, “What does this statement cause you to think?” She “never thought about it. Now I think what if a student cried? What would I do? I would probably cry with.”

In the ranking of scenarios as a “one” “Futala” had a pattern. Both scenarios one and seven have keywords in the reason for the ranking. “It has happened before” for the first scenario and “Every week I encounter this situation” in the seventh scenario are the key words of her experience. In the ninth scenario it was, “I have read...” And in the seventh it

was, “Heard a few stories from other native teachers...” This tells us that the participant ranked everything as “one” that has been experienced, read, or heard within her month and a week experience as an English teacher.

Both the survey of cases and the follow-up for specific cases ranked “one” and “three” gave an insight into an issue discussed in the literature review. This insight was in the first scenario by “Futala” as well as the follow-up research sheet. The reason for the ranking was written as, “Every week I encounter this situation. I have to find a solution to minimize the scenarios from happening and fixing this probably begins with me.” Within the literature review Barratt and Kontra (2000) discovered multicultural views of positives and negatives towards NESs. One of the negative points was the perception of coming into an existing system and thinking of fixing problems, making changes or modifying. This shows that decision-forcing cases can be useful for new EFL teachers since the first scenario is built upon Cho (2004) and the researcher’s personal experience. From the follow-up to the scenario, “Futala” states, “A decision must be made to increase productivity and not to get the other students, who are advanced feel disadvantaged. If a decision is not made the rest of the class will lag behind.” Scenarios built to show culture to a new teacher will help to see that such a scenario does not need “fixing” or that “productivity” is diminished.

The third case was one that has happened in “Futala’s” class before. For the follow-up she states she “feels that this scenario is all about who holds the power.” Further a thought

and belief, “There is no need to embarrass any student particularly in front of others.” This scenario was built from a vision Robinson (1994) gave though not directly stated in the article on a method a teacher might use to discipline a students or a class to have control (p. 518). For a new teacher this case can be useful to understand Korean language and culture as both cannot be separated.

This fourth scenario was ranked “one” because “Futala” has “heard” similar stories to this from other NT. Her thoughts and feelings about the scenario stated the struggles NT have in work, living, and now issues from the old NT. The important question to the scenario was, “What are your thoughts on common problems with native speakers.” Though the scenario is not from the literature review this question intends to guide the reader to common international negative issues NESs have in character, actions, and work according to the host country stated in Barratt and Kontra (2000). Further scenarios that expose cross cultural NES issues will benefit new teachers.

From the seventh scenario the reason it was determined to be a decision-forcing case was because it has happened in her class before. In selecting the question that was helpful to the scenario she further wrote on introducing a word or sentence of the week. This case was built using an English pragmatic phrase. From the details of the scenario this mini lesson on the pragmatic meaning and literal meaning is to get at a failed lesson stated in Jackson (1997, p. 6) since in the EFL context L2 is taught by teachers and learned by students.

According to “Futala,” the ninth scenario was ranked a “one” since she has read a similar scenario on a website. In the follow-up to the decision-forcing cases, she stated that she has never thought about such a scenario wondering what she would do if a student cries and admitting she might cry. This scenario is based on Korean Confucian culture where age is important. For new EFL teachers’ scenarios that reveal a different concept than the culture of NES would be beneficial to understanding more about the host country.

Participant two - “Nari”

The scenarios ranked as a “one” were five, six, seven, and nine. A total of two scenarios were ranked “three,” scenarios two and four. A total of six were decision-forcing scenarios.

In the second scenario your co-teacher takes the teacher guide book from your hand while teaching through a section you were asked to lead. “Nari’s” view of the reason for this ranking was, “This situation can be from lack of communication between co-teachers and worth be thought over.”

The study’s second scenario had this written, “If I were the foreign teacher I would give the book to the Korean teacher at that moment, but after the class I will ask what her/his situation was like let her/him know I was a little embarrassed at that moment to be taken the book away.” The question that helped “Nari” feel or think an important decision must be made is question one, “Other than having to share a teacher guide book why is it likely they

stated this?"

The fourth scenario was about you being at a teacher's dinner and they open up to you about problems experienced with the previous teacher. They are vague and move on in conversation as you inquire for further understanding. "Nari" wrote, "I think this kind of thing can happen easily and it's good to know how to react or ask for more in this situation."

"Nari" wrote, "If I were the foreign teacher in the scenario, I would be dying to know what happened to the previous foreign teacher. I will politely ask again about what's it about, saying it's good for me to know how to react in certain kind of situation." The scenario's helpful question was the second, "How do you get more information?"

In scenario five your middle school lesson has ended with five minutes remaining. You ask them to tell you about Korea. They then ask you questions about your knowledge and it leads to many in the class to share something. Students do not like your response on the "Sea of Japan" being the name of the body of water between Japan and Korea. The students then make a comparison of themselves and Japanese people, a joke about a Japanese greeting, and that Japan has Korean artifacts in a museum and has not given it back. The reason for the ranking was written as "It's good to know about historical/cultural matters about the country I'm teaching in."

According to "Nari" in the fifth scenario, "If I were the foreign teacher in the scenario, I would have no idea how I should react with the given situation." She thought the helpful

question to feel or think a decision must be made was the second, “What is the subject you were told about with Korea?”

The sixth scenario was where the students have a similar pronunciation to the English word, supermarket. It was an English word that has the Korean language following the phonetics. In Korean, the word is 슈퍼마켓 [su-peo-ma-ket]. “Nari” wrote, “It can happen easily in English class (in Korea).”

In scenario six her thoughts and feelings were, “If I were the foreign teacher I would worry a lot about how to react on students’ errors or wrong pronunciation.” She thought the question stating, “For Korean words that phonetically are similar to English is it important to force English pronunciation repeatedly?” helped in making a decision for the scenario.

The seventh scenario was about the phrase, “Come on!” having a different meaning than what one of your students thought. You decide to teach them that this phrase has two meanings. You state what you meant and the meaning the student thought the phrase “Come on!” meant. Your Korean co-teacher then translates what you stated to help students. “It’s good to teach certain expression with proper usage in a proper situation,” was the reason for the “one” ranking.

Scenario seven which was determined to be a decision-forcing item for all participants stated these feelings and thoughts, “If I were the foreign teacher I would have wanted to elaborate more about certain expression with a proper use.” The helpful question was, “Did

your students gain an understanding of “Come on!” other than literal?” for a decision to be made in the scenario.

The last “one” ranking was the ninth scenario. Scenario nine, you are the teacher to twelve higher than average language ability students mixed between second and third grade. They are playing a game with many rounds. A boy just lost one round and a fellow team member states something in Korean that causes the boy to cry. You are told about the situation and try to have an apology for the sad boy. You ask, “Why did you do this when he is your friend?” And the boy says back, “I’m not his friend I am older.” Again the reason for the ranking was, “It’s good to know how the kids usually think and react when they are with peers.”

Firmly “Nari” stated her feelings and thoughts, “If I were the foreign teacher I would have wanted to know more about how to react/punish/educate those selfish/mean students in Korean traditional way, along with dealing the problem in my own way.” The first question with three parts was the helpful question to the scenario, “What does this statement cause you to think? Realize? React?”

A pattern may be seen within the way a scenario was ranked by the wording for the reason. Within the fifth and ninth scenarios, which both were ranked a “one,” the participant wrote the phrase, “It’s good to know.”

The fifth scenario stated, “It’s good to know about historical/cultural matters about the

country I'm teaching in." The ninth scenario stated, "It's good to know how the kids usually think and react when they are with peers." The fifth scenario's statement was about the context of the country and the ninth scenario statement was about the teaching position by knowing about the students' thinking and reactions.

The sixth scenario was ranked "one" with the statement, "It can happen easily in English class (in Korea)." The sixth scenario was where the students have a similar pronunciation to the English word supermarket. This is called Konglish since it is Korean following the phonetics of an English word. In Korean the word is 슈퍼마켓 [su-peo-ma-ket]. "Nari's" statement hints that there are many more words such a situation could easily happen again. Such a statement would mean that it can benefit a teacher to understand this within the classroom.

For the seventh scenario, ranked "one" the participant stated, "It's good to teach." Fully stating, "It's good to teach certain expression with proper usage in a proper situation." This statement makes the scenario about teaching expressions and the context. The scenario built has a pragmatic meaning to the phrase, "Come on!" while a student shows how this statement is understood literally.

A pattern may be seen in the research follow-up where the scenarios, comments, and questions are read again. In the follow-up only, two questions are asked on a sheet of paper. The first question asked, what is it about the scenario that makes you feel or think an

important decision must be made? On the sheet the second question states, which question(s) helped you feel or think an important decision must be made in the scenario? The pattern was for the first question in that “Nari” continuously stated, “If I were the foreign teacher I would.” Her thoughts on each scenario lead an action or the focus of problem solving for such a situation. These comments were fully written out previously and in summary again “Nari” would share her feelings and ask questions (2), “politely” asking again for more information (4), bewilderment on how to react (5), worrying how to react to students’ errors (6), a desire to elaborate on expressions and proper use (7), and wanting to discipline students in a Korean traditional way (9). The benefit of decision-forcing cases may be seen in that an action is taken or problem solving steps are written by “Nari.” The manner of problem solving could involve finding information or asking for information in how to correct students and discipline in a Korean traditional manner. As teachers know general and unique situations in the classroom happen every day so the benefit is in thinking of them in advance before such situations arise.

Participant three - “Boyeon”

Five total scenarios were ranked “two.” Two scenarios were each ranked “one” and “three.” No scenarios were ranked “four” or “five.” Scenario two and three were ranked “one.” The first and seventh scenarios were ranked “three.”

In the first scenario, the teacher asks a general question to the class “What did you

hear?" after having watched a dialogue clip. No students are answering so the teacher picks one student. He or she does not hear the student's answer the first time so they ask them to repeat the answer to which they hear the answer, "Hi." The reason for the ranking was, "teacher has to keep their eyes on students' responses all the time." This statement goes to the responsibility and duty of teaching and being a teacher.

From the information in scenario one "Boyeon's" thoughts lead to the action, "This happening to me I would recognize some students don't have much confidence. So I will practice with the song, chant, and make them think they can do it." "From the view of the student what are the possible thoughts or reasons?" was the helpful question to feel or think an important decision must be made.

In the second scenario the co-teacher takes the teacher guide book from the teacher's hand while teaching through a section you were asked to lead. "Boyeon's" view was that, "When foreign teacher and Korean teacher have a good connection and suitable conversation, they can teach the students very well and make a synergetic classroom." The view of this statement is that the teacher's relationship has an effect on the classroom.

"Boyeon's" view of scenario two was, "This happening to me I would ask, 'Do you have to get this book now?' As you see I need it now." The helpful question for scenario was the first question, "Other than having to share a teacher guide book why is it likely they stated this?" In this statement "Boyeon" puts herself in the scenario by asking a question back to the

co-teacher.

The study's third scenario is the Korean co-teacher disciplining a student for what was said in a greeting. A written reason was, "This is always what I have to consider." Such a statement could mean disciplining students is part of being a teacher and always is a tool to consider.

The third scenario states, "This happening to me I would say nothing about that. Because I respect my co-teacher and after class I will talk with him or her about that problem." The second question was helpful to making an important decision in the scenario, "What is likely being taught?"

The seventh scenario is about the phrase, "Come on!" having a different meaning than what one of your students thought. The teacher decides to teach them that this phrase has two meanings. He or she states what is meant and the meaning the student thought the phrase "Come on!" meant. The Korean co-teacher then translates what was stated to help students. "Boyeon" wrote, "I think it's the common sense situation when we teach." 'We' was written as "Boyeon" and the author is each other's co-teacher.

The scenario was decision-forcing for all participants, "This happening to me I would have a time to teach words which have various meaning because it's helpful to teach live English." She thought that the second question with three total parts to the question was helpful to feel or think an important decision must be made, "If this possibly happened again

would you do the same thing again? Why? What would you change and how if it happens again?”

“Boyeon” had the lowest combined ranking of “one” and “three” with two ranked for each respectively. A pattern that was relevant to the research is that “Boyeon” made quite a few comments about the usefulness of the cases back to being a teacher. The first was about the duties of being a teacher, next was about the co-teaching relationship (2), followed by having to consider the use of discipline as a tool (3), and a situation that is common sense to teach (7).

Within the follow-up research of scenarios ranked “one” and “three,” “Boyeon” had a pattern in her written statements to the first question. She stated, “This happening to me I would.” All of the statements following this patterned phrase lead to an action. “Boyeon” would go about building student confidence by practicing the chant and song (1), she would ask a question to the KET about her current need for the book (2), after the class she would talk with her co-teacher about the problem (3), and she would use time to teach words and various meanings (7). Each of the cases are useful decision-forcing cases for “Boyeon.”

Participant four - “Nelson”

The scenarios ranked a “one” or “three” were six total. As the experienced NET, this was the same number of decision-forcing scenarios as the experienced KET ranked. The scenarios ranked “one” are also very close to the rankings by the other NES participant,

“Futala”.

In the first scenario you are the teacher asking a general question to the class “What did you hear?” after having watched a dialogue clip. No students are answering so you pick one student. You do not hear the students answer the first time so ask them to repeat the answer to which you hear the answer, “Hi.”

“Nelson” ranked this scenario a “one” stating the reason for this ranking as, “With more questions and explanations to the dialogue the students will be able to come out with some possible answers to your questions.”

Scenario one in the follow-up, “Nelson” stated, “In such a scenario I will to repeat what has said for the students to get enough information before asking them what did you hear.” The question that helped think or feel a decision must be made was the second question, “From of the student what are their possible thoughts or reasons?” “One can realize that students didn’t get enough information in order to understand the questions and answer them. So I think in such a situation a vital decisions need to be made from that point.”

In the second scenario your co-teacher takes the teacher guide book from your hand while teaching through a section you were asked to lead. The scenario was ranked “three” and “Nelson’s” view was, “This scenario shows that as a teacher you should prepare in advance before getting into your classroom.”

According to “Nelson,” “In this scenario I feel important decision needs to be make

because teacher's guide book is the only material that teachers normally based on it to prepare their lesson plans." For scenario two, it was the first question that helped "Nelson" to decide an important decision must be made, "Other than having to share a teacher guide book. why is it likely they stated this?"

The study's third scenario was the Korean co-teacher disciplining a student for what was said in a greeting. "Nelson" wrote, "Korean teachers need to teach the kids about the role that the native teacher plays so that he or she can be respected as others," for this reason it was ranked "three."

The information in scenario three that was important to for a decision stated, "Discipline a child is for wrong doing is very important, however, it must be done in appropriate manner so that other kids will not follow others footsteps." The decision-forcing cases second question helped "Nelson," "What is likely being taught?" Further commenting it, "helps me to make an important decision because is about students behavior and towards a foreign teacher."

The fourth scenario was about you being at a teacher's dinner and they open up to you about problems experienced with the previous teacher. They are vague and move on in conversation as you inquire for further understanding. "One must except a person as a different person altogether not to categories him or her as the same," was stated about the reason for a "one" ranking.

“Nelson’s” view from scenario four was, “The fact they didn’t like the former native teachers behaviour must give you some clues of how to communicate or be with them.” It was the third question, “What are your thoughts on common problems with native speakers?,” that helped feel or think a decision must be made within the scenario.

The seventh scenario was about the phrase, “Come on!” having a different meaning than what one of your students thought. The teacher decides to teach them that this phrase has two meanings. He or she states what was meant and the meaning the student thought the phrase “Come on!” meant. The Korean co-teacher then translates what was stated to help students. “Nelson” ranked the scenario a “one” quite firmly stating the reason of, “I think as a native teacher you need to teach or explain such phrases so that they don’t misunderstand it with someone else.”

The study’s seventh scenario was the decision-forcing scenario for all participants. “Nelson” wrote, “Actually in such a scenario the teacher needs to explain certain phrases to the class, so that such incident shouldn’t be repeated again.” “Did your students gain an understanding of “Come on!” other than literal?” was important to the scenario with “Nelson” further stating, “in order not to repeat the same mistake.”

Lastly, in the ninth scenario there was a class of twelve higher than average language ability students mixed between second and third grade. They are playing a game with many rounds. A boy just lost one round and a fellow team member states something in Korean that

causes the boy to cry. The participant is told about the situation and tries to have an apology for the sad boy. You ask, "Why did you do this when he is your friend?" And the boy says back, "I'm not his friend I am older." This scenario was ranked a "one" stating, "As a native teachers with different background and understanding you must use your knowledge to explain to the kids how different each of us are in different levels of studies and capabilities."

"In this scenario one must take an important decision to solve such a situation so that the low level kids will not be shy to participate in a classroom situation" was written by "Nelson". It is the first question, "What does this statement cause you to think? Realize? React?" that made him "feel" an important decision must be made by further commenting, "And this will help you to improve classroom situations in the school."

A unique pattern may be seen when reading the reasons for the ranking of scenarios four and nine. In reading both reasons together a person may distill "Nelson's" personal philosophy and understanding of human nature for all people (4), "not to categories him or her as the same," and specifically in our differences (9), "background and understanding," also, "levels of studies and capabilities." According to "Nelson" in his statements scenarios one, two, and seven result in a direct action. In case one it is to give more questions and explanations to help students have answers. Case two is the action of preparing in advance before class and in the seventh scenario it is to explain phrases to not have misunderstandings.

In the follow-up scenario, "Nelson" stated the action of repeating the dialogue again

to give students more information before asking the question, “What did you hear?” From “Nelson’s” knowledge, he thought in scenario two a decision needs to be made because the teacher guide book has all the information on lesson plans. Within the third scenario his knowledge tells him that discipline is important and should be in a manner other students do not follow. For the fourth scenario, it is unclear whether from feelings or thought, “Nelson’s” statement can be summarized that there is an acceptable behavior and way of communication with Koreans. Again, the follow-up for scenario seven specified the action of explaining phrases so such an incident does not happen again. “Nelson” explained further that, in scenario nine, a person must decide and act to have low level students participate.

Interview results

Each person’s experience is different and visible within the interview. A transcript of each participant’s interview was made. Parts of the interview between participants showed similarity as well as some differences. Most of the interview will not be directly stated but summarized in points of similarity, differences, or patterns from the participants.

Both KETs have knowledge of English education policies. “Nari” made a reference to improving the English education program nationwide. This relates to the literature review in which the government wanted an improvement on the quality of the textbook so a competition was designed for publishers to gain approval (Jung & Norton, 2002). Those that gained approval were put on an English curriculum list for schools to choose the materials

from particular publishers (Jung & Norton, 2002). A further extension of this competition was that the recently approved Chun Jae Education books by Sohn, Ham, Bak, Lee, Kim, and Ahn (2011) follows the policy of English being an international language.

“Boyeon” knows of *Teach English in English* (TEE). Within the literature review, “It is a policy in the Korean government for CLT to teach language through the medium of English” (Butler, 2005, p.437). The policy for teachers and students is thought a burden because teachers are not confident in their ability and because students can comprehend and express very little English (Butler, 2005; Dash, 2002). The policy still predominates among education officials and some teachers.

It is not a surprise that the new NES does not have any knowledge of policies as “Futala” had a month and a week experience. Her reliance is based on the information told to her by the schools KET (co-teacher). Her co-teacher was also her response as a source to help understand culture, teaching, and the EFL context in the interviews third question.

The NES’s in the interviews did not give any answer for knowledge of English policies. Both NES’s gained little information about Korea, culture, and English teaching before coming to Korea.

KETs have websites and books to study for helpful information when they are new to teaching English. For “Nari,” she learned about co-teaching not from any sources but by doing it, so she talks with her co-teacher often. While “Boyeon” asked other English teachers

and searched the internet about co-teaching. Both KETs think they lack in English policies for different reasons. For “Nari” she felt indifferent about the policies and for “Boyeon” it is that the students’ English level is so low that she cannot adapt TEE. Again both KETs have materials to help teach students. “Futala” acknowledged that helpful material was at her school because of the previous NES. “Nelson” stated his schools previous native teacher was not getting materials. He used some orientation materials to gain knowledge about Korean culture and teaching. When he was at the school he noticed not enough materials to help teach students so he organized materials and also made recommendations of materials to buy.

When asked about the effectiveness of decision-forcing cases to prepare a teacher for the EFL context all of the answers were affirming. “Nelson” viewed it as a great way to gain an insight into “classroom situations you are going to deal with”. According to the new NES, “Futala,” the scenarios were “very enlightening so at least I know it is quite true and it actually happens. And I think it is a great way to know how to deal with things next time in the near future and actually have to think about other things of the scenario and actually how to deal with them.” Regarding the new KET “Boyeon” stated, “It will be affective. As an English teacher, we can face various and unpredictable situation when we teach English.” Lastly, “Nari” said, “I think those scenarios were practical and useful and they can happen everywhere, anytime, anytime and anywhere. I mean if you are teaching English in Korea so those questions and scenarios were... need to be thought of at least once and it is good to

know in advance so I think those were good to be thought of.”

Connections between decision-forcing cases and the interviews

“Futala” within the decision-forcing cases revealed a pattern in everything having a “one” ranking from things she has experienced, read, or heard; this from her month and a week experience in Korea. Within the interview, her pattern also was in not knowing much information on Korea, culture, teaching, and the EFL context. The means of gaining such information was either the internet, a friend she knows in Korea, while mostly mentioning her co-teacher. When it came to the effectiveness of decision-forcing cases, she thought of it as important while emphasizing that these are true from her experience, what she has heard from other teachers, and read from the website waygook.org.

Results of “Boyeon’s” decision cases show a pattern in that important decisions are made in scenarios about a teacher’s duty of listening to students responses all the time, having to discipline, and having a good teaching relationship. The most scenarios were ranked “two” by the participant with a written theme of it being about culture; “Korean teachers” (4), “country’s culture” (5), “Korean think” (6), and “cultural problem” (8). Her view is that the decision-forcing cases are effective since, “As an English teacher, we can face various and unpredictable situation when we teach English.”

Thematic comments made by “Nari” in the decision forcing cases stating, “It’s good to know” gives a view that the information in the scenarios are useful to foreign language

teachers. More specifically, the comments are related to knowing about the historical and cultural matters of the country (5), being good to teach certain expressions (7), and the children's thinking and reactions (9). From the interview about the effectiveness of decision-forcing cases, an answer from "Nari," by far the most experienced as an English teacher states, "I think those scenarios were practical and useful and they can happen everywhere, anytime, and anytime and anywhere. I mean if you are teaching English in Korea so those questions and scenarios were...need to be thought of at least once and it is good to know in advance so I think those were good to be thought of." "Nari's" comments and statement show that decision-forcing cases are useful for new and experienced English as foreign language teachers since it introduces teachers to scenarios that can happen anytime and anywhere across Korea.

There are no connections that can be made between the decision-forcing cases for "Nelson" and the statements made in the interview. This is because the ranking of decision-forcing cases reveal "Nelson's" statements that can be seen as his personal philosophy for all people as well as differences (p.99). For example, in the interview "Nelson" commented on a lack of school resources four times and differences in English education focus between the KET and NES two times. These have no connections.

Assessment of questions for decision-forcing cases

In the previous section the participant selected questions that he/she thought or felt an

important decision must be made in the scenarios ranked “one” or “three.” The question selected and comments to this were written. In this section, a table will be made to find out if any questions show a pattern in being selected. The arrangement will change from the exact order the research was done. The order will closely match the similarity participants have in selected decision-forcing cases.

“Futala”

Scenario one- the question within the scenario
 Scenario three- first question
 Scenario four- third question
 Scenario seven- second question
 Scenario nine- first question in the series of three was written

“Nelson”

Scenario one- second question
 Scenario two- first question
 Scenario three- second question
 Scenario four- third question
 Scenario seven- first question
 Scenario nine- first question specified without noting any separation from the question series

“Nari”

Scenario two- first question
 Scenario four- second question
 Scenario five- second question
 Scenario six- third question
 Scenario seven- first question
 Scenario nine- first question specified without noting any separation from the question series

“Boyeon”

Scenario one- second question
Scenario two- first question
Scenario three- second question
Scenario seven- second question

The analysis of the information is provided below.

- The experienced NES and new KET selected question two for scenario one.
- The experienced KET, NES, and new KET selected question one for scenario two.
- The experienced NES and new KET selected question two for scenario three.
- The experienced and new NESs selected question three for scenario four.
- The experienced KET and NET selected question one for scenario seven. The new KET and NES selected question two for this scenario.

There were some similarities in the questions selected that made a participant feel or think an important decision must be made. The importance of the questions again was to guide and evoke a decision a person would make when facing such a scenario. Also, it was stated in the preface to the decision-forcing cases not to answer the questions but provide the reason for the ranking and elaboration. There is an actual benefit for the participants to answer these questions since writing a rationale for each question does mean the questions fit

the scenario and guided the participants. Even though two participants did not specify the question for the ninth scenario, this question has a main part followed by two one word questions based on the first. It would be fair to say that the main question helped the participant with the scenario and that it should be edited into one question.

Assessment of all results

The average for all participants was five decision-forcing cases. All participants agreed that on the seventh scenario as “one” of the decision-forcing cases. The eighth scenario was the only case that was not considered a decision-forcing case by all participants. Thus, experienced and new KETs or NESs thought the decision-forcing cases were useful.

A purpose for the decision-forcing cases may be seen in the pattern of the participant’s thoughts. One participant ranked cases as decision-forcing for those she experienced in one and a half months as a NES teacher. Another participant ranked decision forcing cases according to helpful things to know about English teaching in Korea. Lastly, another participant had a pattern of the thoughts and requirement of being an EFL teacher.

Many of them are decision forcing cases since the participants gave answers of actions or problem solving for the scenarios. Two KETs gave a patterned answer of “If I were the” and “If it were to happen to me” with answers that ranged from actions, problem solving steps, to further thoughts. The experienced NES answers of actions for the scenarios, and the new NES gave answers that run contrary to parts of the literature review. For such a person,

having a training class using decision-forcing cases would be beneficial. Such a class would have a lecture and class discussion to gain understanding and knowledge for teaching English.

These results were affirmed in the interviews done by the participants. All participants relayed the usefulness of decision-forcing cases in the interview. In brief, one participant stated they give an insight into situations a person will deal with and another participant stated these situations can happen anywhere and anytime in Korea. Further elaborating it helps a person to think of them in advance. In short, another thought regarding their usefulness may be due to teaching in unpredictable situations. Lastly, the scenarios were useful to another participant in that the cases do happen and are true. Thus, it may be concluded from this study, that decision-forcing cases are a useful and beneficial method for training both NESs and KETs.

Suggestions for further study

Even though the questions to each scenario were meant to be rhetorical, there is a benefit to the reader in answering these questions. Having a Korean research partner to help during the interview process might make this aspect less intimidating for KETs along with having a free-flowing interview rather than such set questions. Additionally, being able to follow up with a “Why?” “How so?” or “What does this look like to you?” questions would gain more elaborate answers in Korean and not in English.

In order to have a larger training focused on decision-forcing scenarios, more

scenarios need to be created. This training would be videotaped. The first step would be for people to write answers for the cases. The second part would be to have a lecture about the available research for various issues within each case followed by class discussion. Next, participants would write about changes they would make to the previous viewpoints they held before the lecture and class discussion. Finally, the participants will write down what they learned from the class.

References

- Ahn, S. H. (2003). A case study of a Korean learner. *Asian EFL Journal* 5, (4). Retrieved from http://www.asian-efl-journal.com/dec_03_sub.K1.php.
- Bailey, B., & Lee, G. H. (1992). Early childhood education in Korea. Orlando, FL: Florida Association for Children Under Six. (ED 354069)
- Barratt, L., & Kontra, E. (2000). Native-English-speaking teachers in cultures other than their own. *TESOL Journal* 9, (3), 19-23.
- Butler, Y. (2005). Comparative perspectives towards communicative activities among elementary school teachers in South Korea, Japan and Taiwan. *Language Teaching Research* 9, 4, 423-446. doi:10.1191/1362168805lr176oa.
- Cho, B. E. (2004). Issues concerning Korean learners of English: English education in Korea and some common difficulties of Korean students. *The East Asian Learner* 1, (2), 31-36.
- Chungcheongnam-do. (n.d.). *Administrative districts*. Retrieved from http://www.chungnam.net/cn_contents/lang/english/02_Administration/04/administration_0403.html.
- Chungcheongnam-do. (n.d.). *Population and household*. Retrieved from http://www.chungnam.net/cn_contents/lang/english/02_Administration/04/administration_0402.html.

Chungcheongnam-do Office of Education (CNOE). (n.d.). *Offices of education in*

Chungcheongnam-do. Retrieved from <http://www.cnoe.go.kr>.

Dash, P. (2002). English only (EO) in the classroom: Time for a reality check? *Asian EFL*

Journal 4, (4). Retrieved from <http://www.asian-efl->

[journal.com/december_02_pd.php](http://www.asian-efl-journal.com/december_02_pd.php).

EPIK. (n.d.). *English program in Korea*. Retrieved from <http://www.epik.go.kr>.

Han, S. A. (2005). Good teachers know where to scratch when learners feel itchy: Korean

learners' views of native speaking teachers of English. *Australian Journal of*

Education 49, (2), 197-213.

Howard, J., & Millar, S. (2008). Ongoing challenges with language curriculum innovations in

Asia: A South Korean case study. *General issue* 20, (2), 59-75.

Jackson, J. (1997). Cases in TESOL teacher education: Creating a forum for reflection. *TESL*

Canada Journal 14, (2), 1-16.

Jackson, J. (1998). Reality-based decision cases in ESP teacher education: Windows on

practice. *English for Specific Purposes* 17, (2), 151-167.

Jackson, J. (2000). The case for decision-forcing cases: Preparing teachers for EFL settings.

TESOL Journal 9, (3), 5-9.

Jo, S. (2008). English education and teacher education in South Korea. *Journal of Education*

for Teaching 34, (4), 371-381. doi:10.1080/02607470802401594.

- Jung, S. K., & Norton, B. (2002). Language planning in Korea: The new elementary English Program. Tollefson, J. (Ed.), *Policies in education: Critical issues* (pp.245-265). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Kim, S. J. (2004). Coping with cultural obstacles to speaking English in the Korean secondary school context. *Asian EFL Journal* 6, (3). Retrieved from http://www.asian-efl-journal.com/September_04_ksj.php.
- KORVIA. (2010). *EPIK sample contract*. Retrieved from, http://www.korvia.com/downloads/contract_application/epik_contract.pdf.
- Kwon, Y. I. (2002). Western influences in Korean preschool education. *International Education Journal* 3, (3), 153-164.
- Lee, G. L. (1997). Today and yesterday in early childhood education in Korea. Myrtle Beach, SC: Southern Early Childhood Association. (ED 407103)
- Lee, K. S. (1995). Culture and the Korean kindergarten curriculum. San Francisco, CA: American Educational Research Association. (ED 390564)
- Li, D. (1998). "It's always more difficult than you plan and imagine": Teachers' perceived difficulties in introducing the communicative approach in South Korea. *TESOL Quarterly* 32, (4), 677-703. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3588000>.
- Ministry of Education, Science, and Technology (MOE). (n.d.). *Introduction: Education System- Overview*. Retrieved from

http://english.mest.go.kr/1692/site/contents/en/en_0203.jsp.

Ministry of Education, Science, and Technology (MOE). (n.d.). *Introduction: Education*

System- Primary School. Retrieved from

http://www.english/mest.go.kr/web/1695/site/contents/en/en_0205.jsp.

O'Donnell, T. (2006). Learning English as a foreign language in Korea: Does CALL have a

place? *Teaching articles: Asian EFL Journal 10*, (1). Retrieved from

http://www.asian-efl-journal.com/pta_april_06_tjo.php.

Oh, S. Y. (2007). Research and development of evaluation tools for primary school

students' English speaking skills. *Pan-Pacific Association of Applied Linguistics 11*,

(1), 35-47.

Reed, J. (2002). The pedagogical challenges for Western ESL teachers in Asia. *Contact 28*,

(4), 1-8.

Robertson, P. (2002). The pervading influence of Neo-Confucianism on the Korean education

system. *Asian EFL Journal 4*, (2). Retrieved from [http://www.asian-efl-](http://www.asian-efl-journal.com/june2002.conf.php)

[journal.com/june2002.conf.php](http://www.asian-efl-journal.com/june2002.conf.php).

Robinson, J. (1994). Status and academic success in South Korea. *Comparative Education*

Review 38, (4), 506-530.

Robinson, J. (1993). Teacher expectations of students in Korean classrooms. *Korea Journal*

33, 44-59.

Shiga, M. (2008). Development of primary English education and teacher training in Korea.

Journal of Education for Teaching 34, (4), 383-396. doi:

10.1080/02607470802401651.

Soon, S. (2011). Personal communications, July 21, 2011.

Soon, S. (2011). Personal communications, August, 9, 2011.

Sorenson, C. (1994). Success and education in South Korea. *Comparative Education Review*

38, (1), 10-35.

Suh, J. S. (1999). Pragmatic perception of politeness in requests by Korean learners of

English as a second language. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in*

Language Teaching 37, (3), 195-213.

TaLK. (n.d.). *Teach and learn in Korea*. Retrieved from <http://www.talk.go.kr>.

Yoon, K. E. (2004). CLT theories and practices in EFL curricula: A case study of Korea.

Asian EFL Journal 6, (3). Retrieved from <http://www.asian-efl->

[journal.com/september_04_yke.php](http://www.asian-efl-journal.com/september_04_yke.php).

Waygook. (n.d.). Retrieved from <http://www.waygook.org>.

함순애, 박선호, 이양순, 김현아, 안소연, Sohn, F. [Ham, S. E., Bak, S. H., Lee, Y. S., Kim,

H. A., Ahn, S. Y.]. 유범[You, B.][Ed.]. (2011). *초등학교 영어 3 [Elementary*

School English 3]. Seoul, South Korea: 천재교육 [Chun Jae Education].

함순애, 박선호, 이양순, 김현아, 안소연, Sohn, F. [Ham, S. E., Bak, S. H., Lee, Y. S., Kim,

H. A., Ahn, S. Y]. 이종화 [Lee, J. H.][Ed.]. (2011). *초등학교 영어 4* [*Elementary School English 4*]. Seoul, South Korea: 천재교육 [Chun Jae Education].

Appendix A

Preface

Please read the following scenarios as if you are the focal teacher in each scenario. When the scenario has two teachers please take extra time thinking about what they are doing or saying from their view. The scenario is to give a person the feeling of teaching in the EFL context.

With the information in the scenario the reader is to feel compelled to make a decision. The questions are meant to guide and evoke an answer of a decision. This is a decision that should balance your relation to students, co-teacher(s) or (homeroom teachers), the department head, cultural differences and about things that are understandable and not understandable to students. The questions are **not** to be answered but are to be a guide for the readers thinking in making a decision within the scenario. Please, rank these scenarios according to how you think they would be useful to a person in study about culture and the EFL context before beginning such an endeavor as a native speaker. At the end of each scenario, please write what you thought about and why you ranked the scenario the way you did. Also, please think about how you would change or add any question(s) for a reader to get the idea of English teaching in the EFL context and that a decision needs to be made and write them down in the space provided.

Next to each scenario, please write a number using the following scale. The scale is on a separate sheet of paper for it to be your guide in ranking each scenario.

- A “one” indicates any well set-up and useful scenario(s) with helpful questions that make you sense an important decision must be made.
- A “two” indicates a useful scenario with questions that do not make you sense any decision needs to be made.
- A “three” indicates a scenario that needs more information with questions that make you sense an important decision must be made.
- A “four” indicates a scenario that needs more information and has questions that do not make sense for any decision needing to be made.
- A “five” indicates no answer can be given with the available information.

1. You are to ask questions about a dialogue clip just watched by 30 sixth grade students. The teacher guide book has you ask, "What did you hear?" This is a general question asked to the whole class while no one is openly answering. So you ask one student the question. As you chose a student to answer for the class immediately the student chosen has their head angled so you can only see the mouth move. You approach the student since you cannot make out exactly what the student says. You crouch a little and ask them to speak again. You hear that their answer is, "Hi."

What are the factors that caused the student to respond as they did?

From the view of the student what are their possible thoughts or reasons?

Reasons for your ranking and elaboration.

2. Due to the school budget your co-teacher and you share the teacher guide book. You have known your Korean co-teacher for about eight months and they are close in age to you.

Before the lesson you were asked to lead some specific sections of the lesson. Your class is ten minutes into the lesson when your Korean co-teacher states, "Give it to me." while you are using it (the teacher guide book) to teach through a section of the lesson you were asked to lead. Quickly afterwards he or she takes it from your hands.

Other than having to share a teacher guide book why is it likely they stated this?

How do you think you would react to this? Thinking about the students in the classroom do you think they will perceive your thoughts or feelings towards this situation and how?

Reasons for your ranking and elaboration.

3. When a student comes into the room, they say in Korean, “안녕.” (An nyung - Hello).

Your Korean co-teacher has the student hold a chair above their head until they allow the student to put it down.

What are your reactions and thoughts?

What is likely being taught?

Reasons for your ranking and elaboration.

4. You are two months into working at the school and are told by teachers and your co-teacher about problems that occurred from the previous native speaker employed at a school dinner. In telling about the problem they are vague. You inquire for further understanding while the teachers just move on to something else to discuss.

What are your reactions or thoughts?

How do you get more information? What do you likely do to find out the problem without asking again?

What are your thoughts on common problems with native speakers?

Reasons for your ranking and elaboration.

5. Your class has nine middle school students with two tables set down in the middle that are parallel to a whiteboard. You have finished your lesson five minutes early so with the remaining time you want to have a discussion. You ask the students to tell you about their country, Korea.

Female student – “You know Dokdo?”

You – “No.”

Female student 1 – “It is ours. Japan wants it.”

Female student 2 – “What do you call the sea between Japan and Korea?”

You – “It is the Sea of Japan.”

Female student 2 - Firmly stating, “No! It is the East Sea,” as she gives you an angry glare.

Female student 3 - “They are so evil. Their eyes are like this.” as the student slants her eyes to near closed. “They know only hair as jet black and straight style. Not like my hair,” as she shows her hair is dyed and styled.

Male student 1 - “You know the greeting, Ohayoogozaimasu? What does it sound? A train is coming.” As all the students laugh at the joke.

Female student 4 - “They stole our things. Put in museum. They don’t give it back. It is so beautiful.”

What is your feelings and belief after such a conversation? What is your reaction?

What is the subject you were told about with Korea?

Reasons for your ranking and elaboration.

6. You are teaching a lesson about places to fourth grade students. On a piece of paper is the English paired with the Korean. You read the words with students listening first and then they follow what you are reading while pointing to the word. You notice every time you read and say supermarket students have a similar pronunciation. In speaking the students sound like, supeomaket.

What is your assumption with students speaking?

Do you continue to practice the pronunciation of this word? Why?

For Korean words that phonetically are similar to English is it important to force English pronunciation repeatedly?

Reasons for your ranking and elaboration.

7. Elementary school students are in your room and it is only minutes before the lesson is to start. You can finish reading an internet article before class is to begin. In finishing the article that you find to be ridiculous so you firmly say, "Come on!" A student comes over and says, "Yes, teacher." Now the lesson is to begin and for likely a quick lesson you decide to teach what you meant. "Come on! meant that the people in the news article were ridiculously not thinking. While if I call on you and am waiting I would say, 'Come on' I am expecting you to hurry." Your Korean co-teacher translates.

Did your students gain an understanding of "Come on!" other than literal?

If this possibly happened again would you do the same thing again? Why? What would you change and how if it happens again?

Reasons for your ranking and elaboration.

8. You are a teacher at two rural schools because both have a small amount of students. At one of these schools the biggest class is the fifth grade with fifteen students. The school is an old building set near a mountain with a view of a small village a quarter of a kilometer to the left and many rows of rice fields until the main road to the village is seen. The policy the school has in English teaching is for the native speaker to work with homeroom teachers that are comfortable in speaking English. For third and fourth grade a teacher has volunteered to assist the native speaker in teaching English.

The fifth grade teacher at the school is the head of the English department, the second senior teacher at the school, has over five years of elementary education experience, has been trained by the province education department in English, and is ten years older. Your schedule at the school has two periods of forty minute lessons in English being taught to fifth grade students in one day. The fifth grade homeroom teacher leads the classroom for anywhere from both periods to seventy minutes.

Together you are teaching a lesson about asking where a place is and giving directions. Fifth grade students understand the opening dialogue to the lesson as well as two important phrases to a lesson about asking where a place is and giving directions. Now the class is working on writing these words in their notebook with the Korean meaning to the word. When the word “straight” is to be written the Korean homeroom teacher has accompanied this by speaking sentences or questions using the word while students write. After writing the word straight

three times your Korean teacher proceeds to call specific students and ask each, “Are you straight?” doing this three times. The students look confused at their homeroom teacher. The homeroom teacher then states the meaning to this question in Korean.

How would you assist the teacher in the use of specific words that help students grasp the meaning knowing your relation at the school?

How do you draw the line as an adult with knowledge you know to be connected to the level of your students since such things are not connected in their mind?

Reasons for your ranking and elaboration.

9. You are the teacher to a class of second and third grade students totaling twelve. It is mixed due to the higher language ability of the students. They understand quite well what is spoken while having hints of good and poor output construction. One boy has made another boy in the class cry after speaking Korean to him. Other students tell you who caused this reaction. They further tell you that he has remarked to the other boy about, "How stupid he is losing." These boys are on the same team in a game that just lost one round in a game of many rounds with many turns for each student. You now tell this boy to say, "I'm sorry." The boy just looks at you for a minute with nothing being said. You further pry at him saying, "Why did you do this when he is your friend?" The boy replies back, "I am not his friend I am older."

What does this statement cause you to think? Realize? React?

Reasons for your ranking and elaboration.

Appendix B
Interview Background Information

Demographics

Nationality: Level of Education: Degree major: Age:

Length in Korea:

Other places in Korea you have taught and the length at those places:

Grades taught while at these other places:

Name any other country you have stayed in and the length of time you stayed there as an

English teacher:

School grades taught while in this country:

Grades you teach now:

Hours you teach now:

What is the student population of your school? If you do not know give an answer of somewhere between two numbers.

Description of where the school is:

Please state the major employer to parents in the area of your school or common place/area most of your students live: (Please be general)

General Interview

- 1) What are some national English education policies that you have knowledge regarding?
- 2) How long did you gain information about Korea, culture, and English teaching before embarking for Korea? Or for your first EFL country?
- 3) What material was at your school that helped you understand culture, teaching, and the EFL context? If there was no material medium what resource helped you understand any one of these above? How long did you examine the school materials

or materials personally found? Was any of it authentic material of experiences in the setting of culture and teaching? If it was authentic describe some helpful content points.

- 4) Where do you think you lacked in understanding any of these (culture and EFL teaching) from your search for helpful materials?
- 5) What is your struggle with communicative language teaching (CLT)?
- 6) Were there useful English materials already at your school when you arrived to help teach students? ~ What were they?
- 7) What do you think is the time ratio of teaching hours to hours in preparation for teaching classes? Example: Every two hours of teaching has 30 minutes for preparation.
- 8) How effective do you think decision forcing scenarios are for a person preparing to be a teacher in the EFL context? Give a comparison statement on the effectiveness of what materials you used to prepare with the decision forcing scenarios you just read.

Background Information

Demographics

인구통계

Level of Education:

Degree major:

Age:

학위:

전공:

나이:

Length of teaching experience:

Length of teaching experience as an English teacher:

교육경험기간 :

영어선생님으로서의교육경험기간

Name any English countries you have visited?

방문했던영어권국가의이름

Was the purpose for further English education?

추가적인영어교육을위한목적이있습니까?

Other places in Korea you have taught and the length at those places:

한국외에다른나라에서영어를가르친경험이있습니까? 있으면얼마동안가르쳤습니까?

Grades taught while at these other places:

그리고몇학년을가르치셨습니까?

Grades you teach now:

지금은 몇 학년을 가르치고 계십니까?

Hours you teach now:

몇 시간을 가르치고 계십니까?

What is the student population of your school? If you do not know give an answer of somewhere between two numbers.

지금 가르치고 계시는 학교에는 몇 명의 학생이 있습니까?

정확한 숫자를 알지 못하면 대략 몇 명이 되는지 레인지로 대답해 주십시오.

Description of where the school is:

이 학교는 어디에 있습니까?

Major employer to parents in your school or common place/area most of your students live

대부분의 부모님들은 어떠한 직장에서 일하고 있는지,

대부분의 아이들은 어느 동네에서 살고 있습니까?

General Interview:

인터뷰:

- 1) What are some national English education policies that you have knowledge regarding?

당신이 알고 있는 국가의 영어 교육 정책이 무엇입니까?

- 2) What was the most helpful information when you were new to teaching English?
What was this information (i.e. internet site(s), training course, or books)? Give a guess of how many hours you studied any helpful material to understand teaching English or English policies.

당신이 영어를 처음으로 지도하였을 때 어떤 정보가 가장 도움이 되었습니까?

이 정보는 무엇이었나요? (예: 인터넷 사이트, 훈련코스, 책)

도움이 되는 이 자료를 공부하는데 얼마나 많은 시간을 공부하였습니까?

- 3) Was any of this helpful material (books or internet site(s)) at your school or communicated to you by a colleague? How did you prepare for co-teaching/team teaching?

도움이 되는 자료(책 또는 인터넷 사이트)가 여러분의 학교에 있었습니까? 아니면 대학이 당신에게 알려주었습니까? 여러분은 어떻게 co-teaching/team teaching 을 준비하였습니까?

- 4) From your search of materials and studying where do you think you lacked in understanding English teaching, English policies, or co-teaching?

여러분이 자료를 찾고 공부하는데 있어 영어 강의, 영어 정책, 또는 co-teaching 을 이해하는데 어디가 가장 어려웠습니까?

- 5) What is your struggle with communicative language teaching (CLT)?

CLT 를 하면서 어떤 부분이 가장 힘 들었습니까?

- 6) Were there useful English materials already at your school to help teach students? ~

What were they?

학생들을 지도하는데 도움이 되는 영어 자료가 이미 여러분의 학교에 있었습니까?
있다면 그것은 무엇입니까?

- 7) What do you think is the ratio of teaching hours to hours in preparation for teaching classes?

학생들을 가르치기 위해 준비한 시간과 직접 가르친 시간의 비율은 어떻게 됩니까?

- 8) How effective do you think decision forcing scenarios are for a person preparing to be a teacher in the EFL context? Give a comparison on the effectiveness of what materials you used to prepare for being an English teacher with the decision forcing scenarios.

decision forcing scenarios가 EFL 상황하의 선생님이 되기를 준비하는 사람을 위하여 얼마나 효과가 있을 것이라고 생각하시는지요?

decision forcing scenarios을가지고준비해본적이있다면각자료들의효과에대하여비교를
해주세요.

Appendix D

What is it about the scenario that makes you feel or think an important decision must be made?

Which question(s) helped you feel or think an important decision must be made in the scenario?