Five Years of Teaching English Through English: Responses from Teachers and Prospects for Learners[*]

Sung-Yeon Kim

(Hanyang University)

Kim, Sung-Yeon. (2008) Five years of teaching English through English: Responses from teachers and prospects for learners. *English Teaching*, *63*(1), 51-70.

It has been more than 5 years since the TETE policy came into effect. Now is the time to assess the effectiveness of the policy, particularly from the teachers' point of view. This study aims to identify Korean teachers' responses to the TETE policy through written survey questionnaires. Their perspectives were analyzed with reference to the type of school they work for, the amount of teaching experience they have, and the frequency with which they use English. The findings indicate that most of the teachers perceived TETE as different from simply using English for classroom management purposes. Their definition of TETE included either mostly or only English for all instructional purposes. Teacher anxiety associated with classroom teaching was notable although the teachers did not seem very anxious about interacting with their students in English. They seemed to believe in the benefits of TETE for both teachers and students. These perceptions were, however, found to be significantly different according to school level, teaching experience, and the frequency of English use. The implications of the findings are discussed and some useful strategies for TETE are suggested.

I. INTRODUCTION

The Korean Ministry of Education (MOE), recognizing that the structural or grammatical syllabus would not help to develop communicative competence required of global citizens, launched a curriculum innovation to adopt the tenets of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) in the 6th National Curriculum (effective 1995 for middle school and 1996 for high school). The curriculum reform was grounded in the principles of CLT and aimed at

---

promoting communicative language use. Since CLT considers actual language use to be of utmost importance, classroom instruction also has to facilitate communicative language use (Duk-Ki Kim, 2001). Language teachers are therefore encouraged to use a panoply of activities that are meaningful and authentic (Li, 1998). Due to this seemingly plausible theoretical rationale and these genuinely attractive practical features, CLT has been widely adopted as a remedy for rectifying the problems caused by too much emphasis on grammar translation and reading comprehension.

CLT has indeed contributed to some positive changes in instructional approach, syllabus, materials, and teacher education program. However, the success of CLT appears to hinge upon if and to what extent the teacher creates instructional contexts for authentic language practice. Therefore, classroom teachers have to present a role model for authentic language use (Dickey & Han, 1999). This requires tremendous amount of time and energy on the part of teachers. Accordingly, the implementation of CLT has met strong resistance from classroom teachers. Teachers' accounts of difficulties associated with implementing CLT are well documented in Li's (1998) case study of Korean English teachers.

Despite these problems, the MOE continued to emphasize communication in the 7th National Curriculum. In recent years, teaching English through English (TETE) or using English as an instructional language has become mandatory for Korean English teachers, from primary school (Butler, 2004) to higher education (Normille, 2003). As a result, educational administrators and teachers, having become more attentive to the policy than ever, have been trying to meet this goal in their own contexts. Particularly important is the new policy that introduces English to first graders. To make this policy work, English teachers need to have comparable language skills. Therefore, MOE is planning to include an intensive oral interview and writing test as part of the teacher certification exam beginning in 2009.

Yet, these requirements have worried many teachers. Many Korean teachers have continued to feel anxious about using English as a medium of instruction since the curriculum innovation. The anxiety is so great that it may affect their pedagogical choices. Korean teachers may prefer to use L1 over L2 and a more conventional approach over a more communicative approach. It is therefore important to consider teacher anxiety in relation to teacher roles and teaching contexts. It has been more than five years since the government announced the TETE policy. However, we don't know much about what is really happening in real contexts and how it is being received by teachers. Now is the time to assess its effectiveness and problems from the teachers' perspectives. This study aims to investigate Korean teachers' perceptions of teaching English through English in an attempt to specify if and to what extent their anxiety is relevant to the context of their work environment, the teaching experience, and the frequency of English use in their own teaching.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

1. NNTE and TETE

English teachers in EFL contexts, often called non-native teachers of English (NNTE) now have to accommodate the needs of the recent educational reform. To be able to successfully function as an English teacher, the use of English as an instructional language is not a matter of choice. It is now a must and a requirement. However, teaching English through English (TETE) is a complex matter that calls for a close examination of its theoretical and practical details in order to identify strengths and problems; many studies have explored this issue and reported the beneficial effects of using English as an instructional language and advocated the TETE (Jong-Bai Hwang, 2002; Li, 1998; Duk-Ki Kim, 2001; Sung-Yeon, Kim, 2002; Eun-Ju Kim, 2002, 2003).

Teacher talk in L2 is an indispensible language input particularly for students in EFL context. For example, Duk-Ki Kim (2001) argues, "Without teacher talk there is no language input, and consequently no output" (p. 62). In other words, teachers' use of English will be a catalyst triggering classroom interaction and thus facilitating the students' language use.

English teachers in an EFL context like Korea are often called non-native teachers of English (NNTE). Despite the usefulness TETE brings to EFL classroom, there has been a number of research that documents the difficulties and pressures this new movement incurs for NNTEs in Korea. Grabe (2004) suggests that a greater emphasis be given to the role of NNTE in the field of applied linguistics. As Yo-An Lee (2006) puts, while many NNTEs desire to use English as an instructional language, their limited proficiency in speaking skills creates a psychological barrier and thus influences their pedagogical choices, particularly in adopting CLT in the classrooms. Wigglesworth (2002) also takes a cynical view of the English-only policy, while suggesting that English should remain as the primary language in all communicative activities. Interestingly, Ji-eun Shin and Kellogg (2007), in a comparison of the teacher talk of a novice expatriate Canadian teacher and a Korean general subject teacher, found that the expatriate teacher's language was simpler in both exchange and utterance length, with fewer content words and more grammatical errors. The findings of the study imply that the input provided by native teachers of English (NTE) may not be necessarily better than that of NNTEs.

The literature of English teaching shows a plethora of research that documents psychological anxiety nonnative teachers feel on this issue (Anderson, 1993; Burnaby & Sun, 1989; Chau & Chung, 1987; Li, 1998; Shamin, 1996). For instance, many Korean teachers of English in Li's study (1998) believed that their oral communication skills, compared to their English grammar, reading, writing skills, were not adequate enough to

carry out CLT, as shown in the following quote: "I am good at English grammar, reading, and writing. But my oral English is very poor. Since I can't speak English well, how can I teach it to my students?" (Dong-Soon, July 31, 1995, cited in Li, 1998). Bultler (2004) also found that Korean teachers perceived their proficiency level (particularly in oral communication skills) to be lower than the minimum levels they thought necessary to teach English under current educational policies. To sum up, NNTEs in Korea were reported to experience serious perceptual difficulties in speaking English as an instructional language (Butler, 2004; Sung-Yeon Kim, 2002; Nemtchivona, 2005) and this appears to have limited their instructional options.

While these research studies have offered a broad sketch of the difficulties and pressure on Korean teachers of English, we need to examine more closely to specify to what extent this problem has been influencing the adoption of TETE in Korea. Acknowledging the important role of NNTEs, a plethora of research has been carried out, covering a range of issues, such as NNTEs' view of TETE (Sung-Yeon Kim, 2002), NNTEs' view of CLT (Anderson, 1993; Li, 1998; Shamin, 1996), NNTEs' preferences for different functions of English (Duk-Ki Kim, 2001), NNTEs' classroom talk or discourse (Yo-An Lee, 2006), students' reactions to TETE (Eun-Ju Kim, 2002), comparison of an L2-mediated lecture with an L1-mediated counterpart (Eun-Ju Kim, 2003), etc. The following section offers a brief review of prior research on nonnative teachers as to their perceptions of TETE.

2. Prior Research on NNTEs and TETE

A number of studies have investigated the perspectives of NNTEs on CLT outside of Korea (Anderson, 1993; Burnaby & Sun, 1989; Chau & Chung, 1987; Li, 1998; Shamin, 1996). Such studies on nonnative teachers may be classified into several groups according to the topics of the research, grade (primary, secondary and tertiary), research methods, the research participant group, or the construct in focus. There have been several research studies that examined English teachers at secondary level in Korea as well. For example, Li's (1998) study is informative in telling us how secondary teachers feel about CLT in relation to their speaking skill. Li (1998), using a questionnaire and an in-depth interview, looked into Korean secondary school teachers' perceptions of CLT and identified four sources of difficulties Korean teachers encountered in the process of implementing CLT: difficulties caused by the teacher, by the students, by the educational system, and by CLT itself. There are also other studies that examined the NNTEs' perspectives on CLT outside of Korea (Anderson, 1993; Burnaby & Sun, 1989; Chau & Chung, 1987; Shamin, 1996).

Also notable is the subtle shift in research agenda in this decade as the national curriculum makes it mandatory to use English only in the class. Consistent pressure from the MOE on classroom teachers led researchers to examine NNTEs' preferences for

different functions of English or their views of TETE (Duk-Ki Kim, 2001; Sung-Yeon Kim, 2002) and how they differ according to the grade level they teach. Duk-Ki Kim (2001) in a mail-in survey asked about the primary and the secondary school teachers' preferences for different functions of English: 1) memorized chunks (e.g., greetings, directives, etc.), 2) creative but rehearsable construction (e.g., asking and answering questions, stating learning objectives, etc.), and 3) creative construction (e.g., summarizing, explaining, etc.). The findings of the study indicate that elementary school teachers use all three types of functions whereas high school teachers tend to avoid all those functions. Interestingly, middle school teachers were found to favor more creative use of English. This finding is important as the teachers' beliefs are closely tied to their teaching context: For example, high school teachers seem to be less oriented to communicative language functions.

Sung-Yeon Kim's (2002) study has some commonality with Duk-Ki Kim (2001), in that the study also administered questionnaires to in-service teachers in primary through high school settings. Kim (2002), however, paid attention to the teachers' perceptions of the TETE policy in light of the following three dimensions: teacher anxiety arising from TETE, benefits of TETE for teachers, and benefits of TETE for students. Although the study did not find any significant difference according to the school level, some differences were noted in terms of the frequency of English use. In other words, the more they used English, the lower levels of teaching anxiety they experienced, and the more positive attitudes they held toward TETE. Interestingly, the teachers pointed out the students' lack of motivation for using English as an obstacle to TETE.

This finding leads us to a different question, namely if there is any difference in their perception of TETE according to the types of activities and tasks in which English is used. It is likely that differences between teachers and their perceived difficulties may have to do with kinds of language functions they are expected to use in the classroom. Compared to English in secondary school, primary school English may emphasize the teaching of the oral language. This contextual difference should be an important factor in determining the type of language training teachers need. In a more recent study, Butler (2004) conducted a survey of Korean, Japanese, and Chinese primary school teachers participating in teacher training programs. Using self-assessment, her study attempted to identify the gap between the teachers' current proficiency level and the desired proficiency levels required to meet the government educational policies. The study found gaps between the two in the Korean teachers' case, and the gaps were found to be significantly greater in productive skills than in receptive skills.

There are also some other studies on TETE conducted in higher education settings (Jong-Bai Hwang, 2002; Eun-Ju Kim, 2002, 2003; Yo-An Lee, 2006). Jong-Bai Hwang (2002) looked into anxiety and achievement motivation of Korean college students enrolled in a content-based course for a period of semester. Hwang's (2002) study

examined how the students' anxiety and motivation would change over time by using anxiety and motivation questionnaires (FLCAS and AMQ, respectively). The study found that the students' anxiety decreased and that their utilitarian goal orientation increased over time. In contrast, Eun-Ju Kim (2003) compared a Korean-mediated lecture with an English-mediated one in which the researcher administered the questionnaires consisting of 13 items asking about their motivation, interest, classroom participation, understanding, note-taking, and interaction with the instructors. The findings showed that the students experienced greater difficulties with specific types of classroom activities in English-medium lectures, such as small group discussions, small group activities, asking and answering questions, oral presentations, etc. This finding seems rather contradictory to Hwang's (2002).

These two studies are similar in that they both examined English-only content-based courses at tertiary education level and limited their focus to the students' responses to English mediated instruction. They, however, seem to differ in research design. Hwang (2002) made a within-group comparison over time with a focus on two affective variables, i.e., anxiety and motivation, whereas Kim (2003) compared an English-medium lecture group with a Korean-medium lecture group with more variables included.

It should be noted that most of the studies on TETE have used survey questionnaires as their instruments. Such survey questionnaires present a number of analytical problems. First, these studies on TETE at higher education settings are limited to reporting descriptive statistics, either frequency analysis or multiple t-tests. However, frequency analysis alone is not sufficient enough to tell us much about the research topic in question. Moreover, the use of multiple t-tests is not recommended since it is likely to increase the likelihood of a Type 1 error.

Another challenging issue here is how many items are used in the survey. There are a number of issues to be covered in the study of participant perception, for example, beliefs, motivation, classroom functions, etc. Conventionally, one survey questionnaire calls for at least 5 items for each sub-construct. And yet, many researchers used a small set of survey items, for instance, just a single item for each construct. This lack of coverage lowers the validity of the scales used, and thus makes it difficult to interpret the findings. In addition, the small number of items reduces internal consistency, i.e., how each item corroborates and confirms other items. In addition, each item is used as a reference point either for a pre-post test comparison or for a between-group comparison. Sometimes the sample size was not big enough to yield statistically significant results. Moreover, there was a gap between the descriptive statistics and the inferential statistics. For example, although the p values indicated in the studies were found to be less than .05 and thus significant, the differences in mean scores seemed too minimal to support the statistical significance. Moreover, these higher education TETE-related studies were more oriented to identifying

the students' reaction rather than the teachers' perception.

Also a notable problem is that not many studies have been conducted on secondary or primary school teachers' responses to TETE (Duk-Ki Kim, 2001; Sung-Yeon Kim 2002; Butler, 2004). This may be due to the difficulty in having access to the research settings. While it is much easier to find intact classes and carry out research in university settings, it is relatively more difficult to do in primary and secondary school settings. Although Sung-Yeon Kim (2002) directly looked into TETE from the primary and secondary school teachers' point of view, the number of participants was not big enough to yield reliable and valid results. Thus, the current study aims to analyze the teachers' responses to the English-only policy in a greater detail by modeling itself upon and filling in the gaps to Kim (2002). This study is unique in that it includes more items in the research instrument to ensure high reliability and validity of the scale, solicits responses from more participants, focuses on teacher perceptions, and examines teacher responses as a whole and across the groups.

III. METHOD

1. Subjects

For the purpose of the study, one hundred thirty-three teachers[1] participated. There were 55 primary school teachers (42.0%), 35 middle school teachers (26.7%), and 41 high school teachers (31.3%). In terms of gender, there were far more female teachers (n=105, 80.2%) than male teachers (n=26, 19.8%). With regard to the area of their work, 34 teachers (26.2%) were working at schools in the Gangnam area of southern Seoul; 55 teachers (42.3%) were teaching at schools in the Gangbuk area and 37 teachers (28.5 %) in other areas of Seoul. Only 4 teachers (3%) of the participant group were teaching in Gyeonggi province. Most of the participants were English education majors (n= 80, 62%); forty-nine teachers (38%) answered they were non English education majors.

Their teaching experiences ranged from less than 3 years to more than 10 years, and 67% of the respondents (n=88) reported they had 3 to 10 years of teaching experience. Those who had less than 3 years and more than 10 years of teaching experience numbered 20 (15.2%) and 24 (18.2%), respectively. With regard to the frequency of TETE, about half of the respondents (57 teachers, 44.2%) reported they used English between 30% and 70% of the class time. Only 23 teachers (17.8%) reported that they used English over 70% of

---

[1] There were some missing data depending on the item. In reporting the frequencies of responses, the study uses valid percent that takes missing data into account.

the class time. The rest of the respondents (n= 49, 38%) selected 'less than 30%'.

2. Research Questions

The purpose of this study is to describe and analyze the teacher's perceptions of TETE. More specifically, the study focused on teacher anxiety in association with TETE and the benefits of TETE for teachers and students. Teachers' perceptions of TETE were investigated in relation to their background information that they gave, such as school level, teaching experience, and the frequency of TETE. The purpose is further specified in the following research questions:

1) What are the teachers' definitions of TETE?
2) What are the teachers' perceptions of TETE in light of the following constructs: teacher anxiety, benefits for teachers, and benefits for students?
3) Do the teachers' perceptions differ according to school level (elementary, middle, high school), teaching experience, and the frequency of TETE?

3. Instrument

To identify the Korean teachers' view of the TETE policy, the present study used a scale called Foreign Language Teachers' TETE (FLT-TETE) developed earlier in Kim (2002). The items in the survey emerged from a series of meetings with a focus group that consisted of classroom teachers. Thus, the items in the original scale reflected an emic view from a group of participants. Nonetheless, some items contained several irrelevant items or items that needed change in wording. Thus, the scale[2] was slightly modified.

The revised scale is composed of 23 items on a 4-point Likert scale, ranging from *Not at all true* to *Very true* (See Table 1, 2, and 3 for the items). It was designed to measure the following three sub-constructs: anxiety associated with TETE and benefits of TETE on the part of teachers and on the part of students. The reliability analysis of the scale resulted in the Cronbach's Alphas of .843 (*Anxiety in TETE*), .779 (*Benefits for teachers*), and .807 (*Benefits for students*) for the three constructs. The questionnaire also included 8 questions to obtain the participants' background information, such as gender, major, teaching experience, location of schools, grade level, their own definition of TETE, how often they teach English through English, and for what activities they do so.

---

[2] The questionnaire developed for this study includes 8 items for *Teacher Anxiety*, 8 items for *Benefits for Teachers*, and 7 items for *Benefits for Students*. Since it uses a scale ranging from 1 to 4, with high scores associated with higher levels of teacher anxiety and more beneficial effects for students and teachers, the total scores for those three factors are 32, 32, and 28, respectively.

4. Data Collection and Analysis

The FLT-TETE questionnaire was administered to 133 teachers participating in teacher training courses. To learn about the teachers' definitions of TETE, frequency analysis was performed. To identify differences in the teachers' views according to group factors, the three sub-scores (Teacher Anxiety, Benefits for Teachers, and Benefits for Students) were used as the dependent variables; school level, gender, teaching experience, and the frequency of TETE were used as fixed factors.

After calculating scores for the three factors, a multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was used to examine whether the fixed factors (e.g., school level, teaching experience, the frequency of TETE) would explain differences in the teachers' perceptions of TETE.

IV. RESULTS

To answer the research questions stated earlier, the participants' responses to the survey items were analyzed using SPSS. The following sections described the results of the study in more detail.

1. Teachers' Definitions of TETE

Some teachers tended to perceive TETE as equivalent to the use of English in managing the classroom. This confusion may be due to the fact that the Korean MOE, after announcing the TETE policy, named the materials they designed to aid in-service teachers as 'classroom English' (CE) materials. However, in literature, they do not mean the same. CE refers to English used for classroom management, such as greetings, checking attendance, introducing different stages of the lesson, beginning or ending the lesson, etc. On the other hand, TETE refers to a state of affairs in which English is used to the full extent, for any pedagogical purposes, when organizing teaching activities or chatting to students socially (Willis, 1981). TETE means establishing English as the main language of communication between students and instructors. Duk-Ki Kim (2001) differentiated the two by different functions of English. Kim's (2001) Type 1 functions such as greetings and directives are close to classroom English whereas Type 3 functions (e.g., summarizing and explaining concepts) are a more extended type of discourse directly related to classroom instruction.

The way in which most teachers conceptualized TETE was similar to the more general use of TETE found in the literature. When asked the question, "what is your definition of TETE,"

84.9% of the respondents (n=112) thought of TETE as using English mostly (68.2%, n=90) or English only (16.7%, n=22). Some considered it as half and half (9.1%, n=12). It seems that most of the teachers perceived TETE as different from simply using English to manage the classroom. For most of the teachers, TETE was about using English for classroom instruction, which indicates the need for speaking English either mostly or only in class.

2. Teacher Anxiety Arising from TETE

As shown in Table 1, the teachers reported they experienced anxiety associated with TETE. For example, 61.4% of the respondents selected either 'not at all true' or 'not true' for item 6: "I am not nervous about teaching English through English." In addition, over 40% of the respondents found it painful to teach English in English. This is in line with their lack of confidence in teaching English in English as indicated in their responses to Item 7. However, as to the items about teaching anxiety arising from interaction with their students—such as items 2, 3, 4, 5, and 8—the teachers' responses displayed relatively low levels of agreement.

TABLE 1
Anxiety Associated with TETE

Items about Teacher Anxiety from TETE	Not at all true	Not true	True	Very true
1. I find it painful to teach English through English.	7.6	49.2	37.9	5.3
2. I worry about my students not being able to understand me because of my poor pronunciation.	19.7	52.3	27.3	0.8
3. I worry about students asking questions about English expressions I don't know.	17.4	53.0	28.0	1.5
4. I worry about not being able to understand proficient Students' questions in English.	18.2	60.6	21.2	0.0
5. I worry about making grammatical mistakes when I teach English in English.	8.5	53.1	38.5	0.0
6 I am not nervous about teaching English through English.	10.6	50.8	34.8	3.8
7. I am not confident about teaching English in English.	9.2	45.8	43.5	1.5
8. I feel embarrassed when my students don't understand what I say in English class.	7.6	62.1	28.8	1.5

3. Benefits of TETE for Teachers

As to the items about the benefits of TETE for teachers, the participants' responses showed a strongly positive tendency. As shown in Table 2, the teachers were found to hold the belief that TETE is beneficial for developing speaking skills (90.1%), confidence in teaching (80.3%), English proficiency in general (82.4%), and one's professional career (89.4%). In addition, 68.1% of the respondents either agreed or strongly agreed with Item

7: "TETE helps teachers get recognition from others." As to Item 5 and 6, about half of the participants showed agreement. Surprisingly, the teachers' association of TETE with promotion was not powerful enough to display strong agreement (20.1%).

TABLE 2
Benefits of TETE for Teachers

Items about Benefits of TETE for Teachers	Not at all true	Not true	True	Very true
1. TETE helps teachers develop English speaking skills.	0.0	9.8	79.5	10.6
2. TETE helps teachers develop confidence in teaching.	0.0	19.7	75.0	5.3
3. TETE helps teachers develop English proficiency.	0.0	17.6	77.1	5.3
4. TETE facilitates teachers' professional development.	0.0	10.6	82.6	6.8
5. TETE helps teachers better understand target cultures.	5.3	45.5	45.5	3.8
6 TETE helps teachers better understand the content they plan to teach.	4.5	45.5	47.7	2.3
7. TETE helps teachers get recognition from others.	0.8	31.1	63.6	4.5
8. TETE helps teachers when they want to get promoted.	17.8	62.0	17.8	2.3

4. Benefits of TETE for Students

Table 3 summarizes the teachers' responses to the items about the benefits of TETE for students. As indicated in the responses, the teachers tend to believe TETE helps students develop language skills: listening skills (88.5%), speaking skills (75%), and vocabulary knowledge (68.7%). Interestingly, most of these teachers (95.5%) seemed to believe in the power of TETE as source of input for students. This is an important finding. Such beliefs may lead them to dwell on the notion of native-like speech, rather than carrying out classroom tasks. On the other hand, with regard to learner affect, about half of the teachers believed TETE enhances learning interest (47.8%) and motivation (46.1%). Only 32.5% of the respondents believed TETE promotes learners' attention.

TABLE 3
Benefits of TETE for Students

Items about Benefits of TETE for Students	Not at all true	Not true	True	Very true
1. TETE helps students develop listening skills.	0.0	11.5	78.6	9.9
2. TETE helps students develop speaking skills.	0.8	24.2	72.0	3.0
3. TETE helps students expand vocabulary knowledge.	0.8	30.5	65.6	3.1
4. TETE expands opportunities for students to access English.	0.0	4.5	81.1	14.4
5. TETE promotes students' attention in English class.	9.8	57.6	29.5	3.0
6. TETE heightens students' interest in learning English.	3.8	48.5	47.0	0.8
7. TETE enhances students' motivation for learning English.	3.8	50.0	44.6	1.5

5. Differences in Teacher Perceptions of TETE According to School Level

The teachers' perceptions of TETE were investigated in light of the following three constructs: *Teacher Anxiety*, *Benefits for Teachers*, and *Benefits for Students*. Then, their perceptions were compared across the following group factors: the school level, the amount of teaching experience, and the frequency of TETE.

To identify the differences according to the school group, school was used as a fixed factor, and the subscores for the three constructs were used as dependent variables. The multivariate analysis of variance[3] was performed, and, as shown in Table 5, significant differences were obtained in the following two dimensions: teacher anxiety (p=.000) and benefits for students (p=.000). Table 4 summarizes the mean scores of the three dimensions that represent the teachers' perceptions of TETE.

TABLE 4
Descriptive Statistics: School Level

Dependent Variables	School Level	Mean	SD	N
Teacher Anxiety	Elementary	16.78	3.789	55
	Middle	18.54	2.737	35
	High	19.73	3.585	41
Benefits for Teachers	Elementary	21.87	3.049	55
	Middle	20.60	2.659	35
	High	21.27	2.440	41
Benefits for Students	Elementary	19.93	2.795	55
	Middle	17.26	2.463	35
	High	18.07	2.638	41

TABLE 5
Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Source	Dependent Variables	Mean Square	df	F	Sig.
School Level	Teacher Anxiety	105.423	2	8.739	.000
	Benefits for Teachers	17.492	2	2.283	.106
	Benefits for Students	85.618	2	14.551	.000

To closely look into the group differences, the Scheffe test was used. Table 6 summarizes the results from the post-hoc comparisons of the means.

---

[3] According to the Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances, the error variances of the dependent variables were equal across the school levels: anxiety [F (2, 128)= 1.652, p =.196], benefits for teachers [F (2, 128)= .766, p =.467], and benefits for students [F (2, 128)= .270, p =.764].

TABLE 6
Post-hoc Comparisons of the School Groups

Dependent Variables	School (I)	School (J)	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.
Teacher Anxiety	Elementary	Middle	-1.76	.751	.068
		High	-2.95*	.717	.000
	Middle	Elementary	1.76	.751	.068
		High	-1.19	.799	.334
	High	Elementary	2.95*	.717	.000
		Middle	1.19	.799	.334
Benefits for Teachers	Elementary	Middle	1.27	.598	.108
		High	.60	.571	.573
	Middle	Elementary	-1.27	.598	.108
		High	-.67	.637	.578
	High	Elementary	-.60	.571	.573
		Middle	.67	.637	.578
Benefits for Students	Elementary	Middle	2.67*	.525	.000
		High	1.85*	.501	.001
	Middle	Elementary	-2.67*	.525	.000
		High	.82	.558	.347
	High	Elementary	-1.85*	.501	.001
		Middle	.82	.558	.347

As indicated in the post-hoc comparisons, elementary school teachers' anxiety in TETE was significantly lower than high school teachers'. High school teachers in particular reported the highest levels of anxiety. Teacher anxiety associated with TETE seems to grow when we examine the higher grades. The gap in their perceptions can be attributed to the differences in instructional activities or procedures between the school groups. In other words, the most commonly used classroom activities in primary school are chants, songs, and pronunciation, whereas reading and grammar are the focus of study in high school settings. These areas are relatively more difficult to present in English, which may heighten the levels of teacher anxiety. In particular, high school teachers have additional pressures to prepare their students for college entrance exam.

In other words, unlike primary school teachers who use English for simple classroom administrative and pedagogical tasks illustrated above, high school teachers are less likely to use English even for administrative purposes. As a result, high school teachers have far less opportunities to use English. This may be the reasons why high school teachers are not as enthusiastic as primary school teachers about the benefits of TETE for students. With regard to the beneficial effects of TETE for teachers, their views did not differ so much according to the school level.

6. Differences in Teacher's Perceptions of TETE According to Teaching Experience

Table 7 summarizes the descriptive statistics of the teachers' perceptions of TETE according to teaching experience. To investigate the differences in teacher perceptions were significant according to teaching experience, a MANOVA[4] was performed. As presented in Table 8, the tests of between-subject effects yielded significant differences in the following two dimensions: teacher anxiety (p=.001) and benefits for students (p=.025).

TABLE 7
Descriptive Statistics: Teaching Experience

Dependent Variables	Teaching Experience	Mean	SD	N
Teacher Anxiety	less than 3 yrs.	15.50	4.136	20
	3-10 years	18.75	3.367	88
	more than 10 yrs.	18.50	3.563	24
Benefits for Teachers	less than 3 yrs.	21.50	3.052	20
	3-10 years	21.27	2.690	88
	more than 10 yrs.	21.54	3.021	24
Benefits for Students	less than 3 yrs.	19.30	2.130	20
	3-10 years	18.19	2.617	88
	more than 10 yrs.	19.67	2.884	24

TABLE 8
Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Source	Dependent Variables	Mean Square	df	F	Sig.
Teaching Experience	Teacher Anxiety	87.280	2	7.022	.001
	Benefits for Teachers	.926	2	0.118	.889
	Benefits for Students	25.781	2	3.808	.025

Table 9 summarizes the results of the post-hoc comparisons of the group means. As seen in the table, teacher anxiety was found to be lowest for those who had less than 3 years of teaching experience. On the other hand, those who had over 3 years of teaching experience were found to experience higher levels of anxiety associated with TETE. This may be due to the differences in English education these teachers received. Those with less than 3 years of teaching experience, although they were novice teachers, had learned English with a communicative approach at college and thus experienced lower levels of anxiety than those

---

[4] According to the Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances, the error variances of the dependent variables were equal across the groups (less than 3 yrs., 3-10 years, and more than 10 yrs.): anxiety [$F (2, 129)= 1.214, p =.300$], benefits for teachers [$F (2, 129)= 1.157, p =.318$], and benefits for students [$F (2, 129)= .459, p =.633$].

with more than 3 years of teaching experience.

TABLE 9
Post-hoc Comparisons of the Experience Groups

Dependent Variables	Teaching Experience (I)	Teaching Experience (J)	Mean difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.
Teacher Anxiety	Less than 3 yrs.	3-10 years	-3.25*	.873	.001
		More than 10 yrs.	-3.00*	1.067	.022
	3-10 years	Less than 3 yrs.	3.25*	.873	.001
		More than 10 yrs.	.25	.812	.954
	More than 10 yrs.	Less than 3 yrs.	3.00*	1.067	.022
		3-10 years	-.25	.812	.954
Benefits for Teachers	Less than 3 yrs.	3-10 years	.23	.695	.948
		More than 10 yrs.	-.04	.850	.999
	3-10 years	Less than 3 yrs.	-.23	.695	.948
		More than 10 yrs.	-.27	.646	.917
	More than 10 yrs.	Less than 3 yrs.	.04	.850	.999
		3-10 years	.27	.646	.917
Benefits for Students	Less than 3 yrs.	3-10 years	1.11	.645	.233
		More than 10 yrs.	-.37	.788	.897
	3-10 years	Less than 3 yrs.	-1.11	.645	.233
		More than 10 yrs.	-1.47	.599	.052
	More than 10 yrs.	Less than 3 yrs.	.37	.788	.897
		3-10 years	1.47	.599	.052

As to the construct 'Benefits for Teachers', however, the teacher perceptions did not differ so much, as indicated by the minimal differences in mean scores. In addition, with regard to the 'Benefits for Students' construct, the group differences were not significant.

7. Differences in Teacher's Perceptions of TETE According to the Frequency of TETE

TABLE 10
Descriptive Statistics: Frequency of TETE

Dependent Variables	Freq. of TETE	Mean	SD	N
Teacher Anxiety	less than 30%	19.98	3.244	49
	30%-70%	17.89	3.374	57
	more than 70%	15.26	3.493	23
Benefits for Teachers	less than 30%	20.84	2.734	49
	30%-70%	21.25	2.805	57
	more than 70%	22.57	2.727	23
Benefits for Students	less than 30%	17.55	2.467	49
	30%-70%	18.60	2.463	57
	more than 70%	20.74	2.340	23

Table 10 summarizes the descriptive statistics of the variables in relation to the frequency of TETE. As can be seen in the mean score differences between the three groups, the more the teachers used English as an instructional language, the lower levels of anxiety they experienced. In addition, the more frequently they used English as an instructional medium, the more they appreciated the beneficial effects of TETE both for teachers and students.

To see if the mean score differences were significant, a MANOVA[5] was used (See Table 11). The tests of between-subject effects of the frequency of TETE found significant group differences for all the three constructs: teacher anxiety (p=.000), benefits for teachers (p=.048), and benefits for students (p=.000).

TABLE 11
Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Source	Dependent Variables	Mean Square	df	F	Sig.
	Teacher Anxiety	179.570	2	16.038	.000
Frequency of TETE	Benefits for Teachers	23.709	2	3.102	.048
	Benefits for Students	79.559	2	13.326	.000

TABLE 12
Post-hoc Comparisons of the TETE Groups

Dependent Variables	Frequency of TETE (I)	Frequency of TETE (J)	Mean difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.
	less than 30%	30-70%	2.08*	.652	.007
		More than 70%	4.72*	.846	.000
Teacher Anxiety	30-70%	Less than 30%	-2.08*	.652	.007
		More than 70%	2.63*	.827	.008
	more than 70%	Less than 30%	-4.72*	.846	.000
		30-70%	-2.63*	.827	.008
	Less than 30%	30-70%	-.41	.539	.750
		More than 70%	-1.73	.699	.050
Benefits for Teachers	30-70%	Less than 30%	.41	.539	.750
		More than 70%	-1.32	.683	.159
	More than 70%	Less than 30%	1.73	.699	.050
		30-70%	1.32	.683	.159
	Less than 30%	30-70%	-1.05	.476	.094
		More than 70%	-3.19*	.618	.000
Benefits for Students	30-70%	Less than 30%	1.05	.476	.094
		More than 70%	-2.14*	.604	.002
	More than 70%	Less than 30%	3.19*	.618	.000
		30-70%	2.14*	.604	.002

---

[5] According to the Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances, the error variances of the dependent variables were equal according to the frequency of TETE: anxiety [F (2, 126)= .323, p =.725], benefits for teachers [F (2, 126)= .030, p =.970], and benefits for students [F (2, 126)= .175, p =.840].

For detailed group comparisons, a Scheffe test was performed. All the group differences were found to be significant with regard to anxiety associated with TETE, as shown in Table 12. In other words, the more the teachers used English as an instructional language, the lower levels of anxiety they experienced. With regard to the 'Benefits for Teachers' construct, however, none of the group differences were significant. Regarding the construct 'Benefits for Students', the differences between Group 1 and 3, and between Group 2 and 3 were significant.

V.   DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The purpose of this study was to explore whether such factors as school level, teaching experience, and the frequency of TETE have effects on teacher perceptions of TETE in terms of its anxiety-provoking nature and its beneficial effects on both learners and on teachers. As described earlier, teachers' perceptions of TETE differed depending on which grade level they taught, how long they had taught, and how often they used English. In general, primary school teachers experienced lower levels of anxiety and believed in the beneficial power of TETE for student more strongly than secondary school teachers. This is a significant finding because their perception differs and thus is likely to change as their experience with TETE increases. The types of classroom tasks that require English use in primary school are quite different from high school settings. This means that if high school teachers find some tasks that can be conveyed in English readily, it will help them begin using English. The more English they use, the less the anxiety they may feel.

With regard to teaching experience, the teachers with less than 3 years of teaching experience were found to have the lowest levels of anxiety. This implies that younger teachers may have had sufficient experience with speaking English before coming to school and are thus less anxious about TETE. For the older group with more than 10 years of experience, they may be too experienced and too fixed to change their teaching approach. As for the group of teachers with 3-10 years of experience, TETE has an immediate effect on their work schedule and teaching duty; they have to accommodate TETE in some way but they know it is challenging.

Interestingly, more frequent use of English as an instructional language was a factor that contributed to lower levels of anxiety and more positive views of TETE. This is a very important finding. The survey seems to indicate that the anxiety levels differ according to the teachers' experience with TETE. TETE can not be generalized into only one way of using English; the types of tasks and English are widely different from primary school to high school. Nonetheless, teacher's anxiety with TETE is usually described as a bit general and generic. If we bring out specific details of what types of English should be used and

which types of tasks call for easy English, then, we might be able to find a way to gradually introduce teachers to the use of English in their classes.

These findings have valuable implications for successful implementation of the TETE policy. First of all, an understanding of in-service teachers' perceptions of TETE helps to identify their needs and to design teacher training programs accordingly. More importantly though, there should be a close examination of specific aspects of English use in classroom tasks whether they are administrative tasks or pedagogical explanations. Then, teacher training programs can be organized to offer informed advice, which might lower in-service teacher's anxiety.

Also, the findings of the study suggest some useful strategies for making TETE successful. It seems essential to provide concrete resources that are tailored to motivating teachers in particular contexts such that they can use English appropriately. In order to construct such contexts, class size should be reduced, which would ensure enhanced communication between teachers and students, and among students. In case of high school settings, language instructions is planned and designed to prepare students for the Korean SAT. However, as long as classroom instruction is bound by college entrance exam, it is difficult to implement TETE.

While the survey shows that high school teachers show high degree of anxiety, their anxiety also has to do with the fact that they do not have extensive experience with using English. As I argued before, TETE does not mean that teachers should use English all the time; tasks can be tailored to facilitate some English use by the classroom teachers. This will increase their confidence, which leads to more occasions of using English. The analytic task is to locate such occasions for high school teachers.

Another way to fully establish the TETE policy is to help teachers acquire intermediate or advanced levels of proficiency in English. Since Korean teachers' limited proficiency in English is a barrier to the successful implementation of the TETE policy, it is essential to plan intensive teacher training programs that are specifically oriented toward developing communicative skills. In that aspect, the recent change in the teacher certification exam such that both speaking and writing are to be assessed is timely and desirable. The inclusion of speaking and writing in the exam will eventually motivate pre-service teachers or prospective teachers to work on their communicative skills. Finally, teachers in collaboration with researchers should keep on studying how TETE is being implemented in real contexts, as well as developing strategies that are useful for making TETE successful. For future research, it would be meaningful to look into actual classroom contexts where TETE is being carried out. Discourse features in classroom teacher talk, interaction patterns in TETE, and learner performance in TETE classroom context can be the focuses of further research.

REFERENCES

Anderson, J. (1993). Is a communicative approach practical for teaching English in China? Pros and cons. *System, 21*, 471-480.

Burnaby, B., & Sun, Y. (1989). Chinese teachers' views of Western language teaching: Context informs paradigm. *TESOL Quarterly, 23*, 219-238.

Butler, Y. (2004). What level of English proficiency do elementary school teachers need to attain to teach EFL?: Case studies from Korea, Taiwan, and Japan. *TESOL Quarterly, 38*(2), 245-278.

Chau, L., & Chung, C. (1987). Diploma in education graduates' attitude towards communicative language teaching. *Chinese University Education Journal, 15*(2), 45-51.

Choi, S. (2000). Teachers' beliefs about communicative language teaching and their classroom teaching practices. *English Teaching, 55*(4), 3-32.

Dickey, R. J., & Han, H. (1999). Classroom English for enhanced student learning. The Korea *TESOL Journal, 2*(1), 43-51.

Grabe, W. (2004). Perspectives in applied linguistics. *AILA Review, 16*, 105-132.

Hwang, (2002). L2 learners' anxiety and motivation in an English-only content-based class. *English Teaching, 57*(1), 193-211.

Kim, Duk-ki. (2001). CLT and TETE for non-native teachers: A reading comprehension approach. *Journal of the Applied Linguistics Association of Korea, 17*(2), 55-72.

Kim, Eun-Ju. (2002). Voices of learner from English-medium lectures. *Journal of the Applied Linguistics Association of Korea, 18*(1), 145-163.

Kim, Eun-Ju. (2003). A comparative study of academic oral interaction in English-medium lectures and Korean-medium lectures. *English Teaching, 58*(3), 3-20.

Kim, Simg-Yeon. (2002). Teachers' perceptions about teaching English through English. English *Teaching, 57*(1), 131-148.

Lee, Yo-An. (2006). Speaking proficiency of non-native English teachers: Constructing multiple utterances. *English Teaching, 61*(3), 189-212.

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.

Medgyes, P. (1992). Native or non-native: Who's worth more? *ELT Journal, 46*(4), 340-349.

Nemtchivona, E. (2005). Host teachers' evaluation of nonnative English speaking trainees: A perspective from the classroom. *TESOL Quarterly, 39*(2), 235-262.

Normille, D. (2003). New Asian schools look west for high-quality instruction. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, March 21, 1832-1833.

Shamin, F. (1996). Learner resistance to innovation in classroom methodology. In H. Coleman (Ed.), *Society and the language classroom* (pp. 105-121). Cambridge:

Cambridge University Press.

Shin, J., & Kellogg, D. (2007). The novice, the native, and the nature of language teacher expertise. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics, 17*(2), 159-177.

Wigglesworth, G. (2002). The role of the first language in the second language classroom: Friend or foe. *English Teaching, 57*(1), 17-31.

Sung-Yeon Kim
Dept. of English Education
Hanyang University
Email: sungkim@hanyang.ac.kr