English Language & Literature Teaching, Vol. 31, No. 3 Fall 2025
https://doi.org/10.35828/etak.2025.31.3.39

Critical Reflections on the Peace Corps/Korea TEFL Program: Success, Failure, and Legacy

Chee Hye Lee
(Hannam University)

Lee, Chee Hye. (2025). Critical reflections on the Peace Corps/Korea TEFL Program: Success, failure, and legacy. *English Language & Literature Teaching*, *31*(3), 39-63.

This paper examines the evaluation of the Peace Corps/Korea TEFL Program (1966-1981). Contrary to prevailing assessments of its success, this study examines the program through the comprehensive interrelationship of the Peace Corps' three proclaimed goals: training manpower through English education and promoting cross-cultural understanding between Americans and host country nationals. Employing qualitative content analysis methods and drawing on primary archival documents, official reports, and volunteer testimonies, the study reveals that despite statistical achievements in formal English instruction, the program fell short in terms of substantive educational impact – particularly in improving students' English communicative competence. However, it also highlights the often-overlooked grassroots aspects of cross-cultural understanding that constituted a different kind of success, especially through extracurricular activities and informal interactions. Special attention is given to university-level TEFL initiatives, where more equitable conditions enabled meaningful cultural connections between volunteers and Korean students. The paper analyzes the institutional and contextual factors behind the relative success of these initiatives and argues that, amid the complex domestic and international political, social, and military challenges faced by both Korea and the U.S. during the 1960s and 1970s, Peace Corps Volunteers and Korean students established mutual understanding that facilitated cross-cultural exchange between the two nations.

[Peace Corps/university-level TEFL/extracurricular activities/qualitative content analysis/cross-cultural understanding]

I. INTRODUCTION

The U.S. Peace Corps Program was established in 1961 by President John F. Kennedy as the fourth dimension of U.S. foreign policy[1], placing particular emphasis on educational and cultural affairs (Coombs, 1964). Framed within the broader aim of promoting world peace, the program was founded on three central goals[2] as follows (Carey, 1970; United States Peace Corps, 1990):

Goal 1 (G1): To help the peoples of participating countries meet their needs for trained manpower
Goal 2 (G2): To promote a better understanding of the American people among the population served
Goal 3 (G3): To foster a better understanding of other peoples among Americans

These three goals remain central to evaluating the outcomes of the Peace Corps, whether from the perspective of the United States or that of the host countries. However, drawing conclusions based on these goals is not always straightforward, as the goals may or may not be inherently interconnected. For example, how are Goal 1 (G1) and Goal 2 (G2), or Goal 1 (G1) and Goal 3 (G3), conceptually and practically related? G1 primarily focuses on the transfer of U.S. knowledge and skills—particularly technical expertise—to developing countries through person-to-person engagement. Meanwhile, G2 and G3 emphasize fostering mutual understanding between Americans and host country citizens, often as a result of, or in tandem with, G1-related activities.

However, despite the widely accepted view that the Peace Corps/Korea Program was successful (Kailian, 1980; Kim, 2016; Peace Corps, 1979, 1981) – particularly in light of Korea's remarkable economic and social development – important questions remain regarding the actual impact of its TEFL component on G2 or G3. More fundamentally, even aside from its relationship to G2 or G3, it is essential to examine whether the Teaching English as a Foreign Language (TEFL)[3] program contributed meaningfully to the improvement of Korea's English communicative competence. If a relationship does exist

[1] The term suggests that educational and cultural affairs in U.S. foreign policy have been preceded by three major fields on the world stage: the military, diplomacy, and the economy.
[2] The three goals of the Peace Corps are explicitly included in the *Declaration of Purposes: The Three Goals of the Peace Corps*, which was amended on September 22, 1961 as part of a Peace Corps Act Public Law 87-293.
[3] The Peace Corps/Korea's English Program has been called either Teaching English as a Foreign Language (TEFL) or Teaching English as to Speakers to Other Languages (TESOL). The two terms are often used interchangeably in the study of the Peace Corps' English Program in Korea. However, it is TEFL that will be used in this study.

between G1 and G2, for example, it raises the question of how G1 may be responsible for- or lead to – G2 outcomes. These inquiries highlight the complex interplay among the Peace Corps' three goals. Unfortunately, systematic and empirical research specifically evaluating G1 – particularly within the then context of TEFL in Korea – remains limited.

This study seeks to examine not only the existing formal English instruction in classroom settings but also the often-overlooked extracurricular activities of Peace Corps/Korea – particularly those centered on English conversation and discussion. While both types of activities fall under the category of G1, for the sake of clarity, the formal TEFL program will be referred to as G1-a, and the English-related extracurricular activities as G1-b. Additionally, this study aims to demonstrate that, due to various contextual factors, G1 activities produced more significant outcomes at the university level than at the secondary level. In particular, it will explore how G1-b activities at the university level created opportunities for G2 and G3 to emerge through interactions between Peace Corps Volunteers (PCVs) and Korean university students.

II. PEACE CORPS/KOREA PROGRAM

Peace Corps/Korea Program operated from 1966 to 1981 and focused on three main service areas: education (approximately 70%), public health (25%), and miscellaneous fields (5%) (Peace Corps Annual Report/Korea, 1975, p. 45). Among these, education—especially English language teaching—was the program's core focus. TEFL was widely recognized as the hallmark activity of Peace Corps/Korea Program. Notably, both Peace Corps officials and the Korean government viewed English not merely as a subject at schools, but as a gateway to economic and social advancement, as well as a medium for engaging with Western culture (Brazinsky, 2007; Hahn et al., 1975; Peace Corps, 1973), implying that the latter is closely linked together with the former (Brazinsky, 2007).

When evaluating whether the Peace Corps/Korea Program was a success or failure from the Korean perspective, there exist certain historical experiences that predispose many to preemptively regard the program as a success, even prior to any substantive analysis. Since the official establishment of diplomatic relations between Korea and the United States in 1882, the two nations have experienced two major phases of large-scale engagement[4], both of which have generally fostered pro-American attitudes among Koreans (Lee & Patterson, 1999; Swartout, 2002).

[4] The first encounter with the U.S. came through missionaries. Their involvement in Korea's liberation in 1945 and the U.S. military intervention during the Korean War established an enduring alliance credited with South Korea's modern development (Lee & Patterson, 1999).

Based on such a good-feeling toward the U.S. historically attributed to these two critical experiences, the Peace Corps/Korea Program is likely to have been launched under particularly favorable condition from the beginning, marked by a notably receptive and welcoming atmosphere from the Korean side. Newspaper coverage, such as articles from *The JoongAng*, one of Korea's major daily newspapers, at the time of the arrival of the first group, designated as K-1[5], of PCVs in September 1966, was overwhelmingly positive—highlighting Korea's high expectations for the program and offering widespread praise for the volunteers.

> *Arrival of the U.S. Peace Corps in Korea*
> There would be nothing more commendable than if these young people were to further strengthen Korea-U.S. relations through a purely human foundation and the spirit of service.... In this sense, we hope that the young American Peace Corps volunteers coming to Korea this time will actively participate in the fundamental work of building person-to-person connections.... We warmly welcome the arrival of the U.S. Peace Corps in Korea and look forward to meaningful achievements. (The JoongAng, 1966)[6]

Not only were they warmly received in Korea through extensive media coverage, but they were also honored in the United States as Peace Corps trainees by receiving an invitation to a reception hosted by the Korean consulate. The following excerpt offers a glimpse into the warm reception Charles Hobbie (K-7) experienced at this distinguished event.

> After the party at the Korean consulate, I wondered if the warmth, gratitude, and concern toward us, expressed by virtually every Korean with whom I talked that evening, were typical of the peoples of all of the countries where Peace Corps Volunteers were serving. I was deeply moved by what I had experienced that evening... The Koreans in Hawaii were genuinely and deeply happy to meet us, extremely pleased that we were going to Korea, and prepared to help us in whatever way possible. This initial experience was repeated again and again in Korea, when Koreans became aware that we were volunteer teachers. (Hobbie, 2011, p. 68)

The official position of both the U.S. and Korea regarding the Peace Corps/Korea TEFL Program, as evidenced in various documents, is that it was linked to a nation-building objective – namely, the improvement and development of English education as a means to

---

[5] Peace Corps groups in Korea were designated with the letter K and a number to signify their chronological order of arrival in country. K-1 was the first group which came to Korea in 1966 and K-51 was the final group in 1980.

[6] This is a portion of a Korean newspaper article from *The JoongAng*, translated into English by the author.

promote Korea's socioeconomic advancement (Brazinsky, 2007). Accordingly, the development of English education in Korea was regarded as national development, and conversely, Korea's national development was premised on the advancement of English education.

Meanwhile, launched with high expectations in 1966, the program in Korea concluded in 1981 with favorable remarks from both the U.S. Peace Corps and the Korean government. From the U.S. perspective, the Peace Corps' 1981 Annual Report cited Korea's impressive economic development—corresponding to G1—the primary rationale for phasing out the program (Peace Corps Annual Report/Korea, 1982, 1983). In contrast, the Korean Prime Minister's farewell speech emphasized the volunteers' role in fostering mutual understanding, particularly in relation to G2 and G3 (Peace Corps Annual Report/Korea, 1983).

Notably, the Korean government made no mention of G1, while the Peace Corps did not address G2 or G3.[7] This suggests a potential disconnect: the TEFL program may not have been directly linked to Korea's socioeconomic development, and vice versa. It is also worth noting that neither the Peace Corps nor the Korean authorities offered a substantive evaluation of the TEFL program's effectiveness over its 15-year span. If Korea's economic growth was the central reason for ending the program, one must question whether this implies a corresponding advancement in English education—one of the program's original objectives. The Korean Prime Minister's omission of any reference to G1, as well as the TEFL program itself—let alone G2 or G3–further underscores this ambiguity.

With no critical evidence indicating that the Peace Corps/Korea's G1 was of success, there seems to be the aspects that may be equivalent to *all's well that ends well*. Organized by the Korea Foundation, the Peace Corps Revisit Program earned strong approval among returned PCVs. When the Friends of Korea, a group of former PCVs who served in Korea, arranged for the program, 100 Returned Peace Corps Volunteers (RPCVs) and 55 RPCVs revisited Korea in 2012 and 2013, respectively.

[7] When the U.S. Peace Corps withdrew from Korea in 1981, anti-American sentiment among the Korean public was significantly heightened due to the Gwangju Uprising of May 1980. Under such circumstances, it is likely that the U.S. found it difficult to refer to the Peace Corps' original goals of promoting cross-cultural understanding between the two nations—namely, G2 and G3.

III. METHODOLOGY

1. Data Collection

This study employs qualitative content analysis (Hsich & Shannon, 2005) to examine the Peace Corps/Korea TEFL Program, utilizing textual analysis as the primary analytical approach. This methodology allows for critical assessment of both the quantitative achievements reported in official documents and the qualitative dimensions of cultural exchange that emerge from personal accounts and informal interviews. Qualitative content analysis is grounded in interpretive analysis of document/text data, supplemented by survey and narrative data to provide comprehensive understanding of the Peace Corps/Korea TEFL Program's implementation and impact.

The research utilizes data triangulation through multiple source types: primary document sources include Peace Corps official reports, administrative memoranda from Peace Corps Volunteers who served in Korea, Korean Ministry of Education documents related to English language instruction policies. Additional textual materials encompass newspaper coverages, educational textbooks used in TEFL instruction, and curriculum materials developed during the program period. A major document for this research is *Peace Corps Memories in Korea* published by the National Museum of Korean Contemporary History. This publication emerged from an effort to document PCVs' experiences. Between 2012 and 2013, 155 returned PCVs were invited to revisit Korea and participate in face-to-face interviews. Of these, 101 returned PCVs completed a seven-item questionnaire, with 90 interviews[8] ultimately included in the published volume. These interviews encompass each PCVs perceptions and recollection of the Peace Corps' three goals (G1, G2, and G3), providing firsthand accounts of how they understood and experienced the program's objectives during their service. Although the collection of interviews can serve as a secondary source, it has not yet been systematically analyzed for program evaluation. Such analysis could provide valuable, unexplored insights into PCVs' perspectives on goal achievement and the interrelationships among the three goals.

In addition to these primary documents, available survey data from both primary and secondary sources offer further perspectives. The primary sources considered here are Lee (2014) and Lee (2016, 2019). Lee (2014) takes a strictly quantitative approach to evaluating the Peace Corps/Korea TEFL Program, clarifying that the Program introduced communicative teaching methods and offered models for teacher training. Yet the study falls

[8] According to the description in *Peace Corps Memories on Korea* (National Museum of Korean Contemporary History, 2016a), interviews were originally collected from 101 RPCVs in 2012 and 2013. However, due to delays in publication, some of the interviews were lost, and the book was ultimately edited and published with only 90 interviews.

short in two respects: (1) it relies heavily on Kailian (1980), itself a quantitative study, and (2) it confines its analysis to Goal 1—particularly Goal 1-a—without addressing the interplay among all three goals. By contrast, Lee (2016, 2019) examines the program through the lens of language ideology, arguing that the Peace Corps prioritized status planning over acquisition or corpus planning. These studies contribute both empirical data and interpretive frameworks that are utilized in this study.

This study also incorporates informal interviews conducted with a Korean student who participated in the Peace Corps TEFL program during the 1960s and 1970s. Though informal in nature, the narrative offers personal perspectives and experiential insights that complement the documentary record.

2. Data Analysis

The textual analysis focuses on themes, patterns, and discrepancies between stated program objectives and actual outcomes. Specifically, the analysis examines several key thematic categories: institutional conflicts between PCVs and Korean counterparts, including disagreements over pedagogical approaches and administrative procedures; collaborative initiatives and their outcomes; formal English instruction representing the official top-down curricular mandates; informal extracurricular activities reflecting grassroots, volunteer-driven programming; and cross-cultural understanding processes in which both PCVs and Korean participants developed evolving perceptions of each other's cultures and values.

IV. DISCUSSION

This section examines how the Peace Corps/Korea TEFL Program can be assessed in terms of its three intertwined goals, organized into three subsections: (1) Interplay of the goals in RPCV's reflections, (2) Statistical and Substantive Evaluation, and (3) Beyond formal instruction to grassroots achievement.

1. Interplay of Three Goals in RPCVs' Reflections

Shared perspective on Peace Corps/Korea suggests that, although its accomplishments in English education itself—corresponding to G1—may not be particularly noteworthy, the program was generally rendered to be successful due to its achievements in G2 and G3, which highlight mutual understanding through engagement with Korean people and culture. Meanwhile, there appears to be a tendency to interpret the success in G2 and G3 as indicative

of success in G1 as well. This inclination is exemplified in the perspective of Pamela Becker, who served as a member of K-32.

> One thing that really stood out to me—and I think it means a lot to all of us—is the Peace Corps volunteers' three main goals: helping to develop middle-level manpower, helping Korean people get to know Americans better, and helping young Americans learn about different cultures. From everyone I've talked to during this revisit, it's clear that the Peace Corps really made those goals a reality–for us and for the people we worked with. (National Museum of Korean Contemporary History, 2016a, pp. 310-312)

Becker's perspective may be interpreted as suggesting that the success of G2 and G3 either contributes to or attempts to appropriate the success of G1. However, an alternative perspective posits that, within the context of the U.S. Peace Corps/Korea Program, the success of G2 and G3 does not necessarily ensure the success of G1; rather, these may be understood as distinct and independent phenomena. To examine this further, Rosemary K. Alvord, a former K-1 who taught English in a high school in Busan, reflected on her experience.

> I didn't receive much training to teach English – in fact, the training I did get was quite poor. What I ended up doing became tedious very quickly, as it soon became clear that teaching a spoken language effectively ideally requires a small class, maybe around ten students. But I had 65. After about two or three months, I realized that, no, they weren't going to learn to speak English with the methods I was using. (National Museum of Korean Contemporary History, 2016a, p. 58)

Alvord's remark acknowledges the failure of G1—the TEFL Program of the U.S. Peace Corps – by candidly admitting that, given her own qualifications and abilities as an English teacher, along with the large class sizes in Korean high schools, it was virtually impossible to effectively teach spoken English to Korean students. This failure appears to have resulted from insufficient systematic consultation between the U.S. Peace Corps and Korean counterparts regarding program implementation. Another former K-1 PCVs, David Lassiter's account reveals that the original plan for high school-level instruction was expanded to include middle schools without adequate consideration of resource constraints. Consequently, he found himself responsible for teaching approximately 800 students, creating an untenable workload. When he attempted to propose modifications—such as concentrating instruction to three hours per week for high school students only—these suggestions met resistance from the school principal (National Museum of Korean Contemporary History, 2016a). These structural and communication failures led to the

unequivocal conclusion that the Peace Corps' TEFL Program in Korea was destined to fail, with K-1's G1 serving as a clear example of systematic failure.

However, Alvord's assessment reveals a crucial distinction among the program's goals. While acknowledging the TEFL component's failure, she emphasizes a different kind of success:

> It was our learning about Korea and allowing Koreans to see real Americans—not presidents on TV, not movie stars, not GIs, but ordinary Americans doing everyday jobs and living day-to-day within the Korean community. That was a very important part of what we all did. It played a key role in helping Koreans better understand the United States, just as what we learned here was crucial in helping Americans better understand Korea. (National Museum of Korean Contemporary History, 2016a, p. 60)

In stark contrast to the TEFL program's shortcomings, this remark clearly highlights the success of G2 and G3, emphasizing that the activities of the Peace Corps contributed meaningfully to the promotion of mutual understanding between the Korean and American peoples. This discussion unveils the intricate interplay among the three Peace Corps goals and reveals how their implementation simultaneously failed and succeeded in complex, interconnected ways.

2. Statistical and Substantive Evaluation

When evaluating the Peace Corps/Korea's TEFL program, a quantitative perspective is often emphasized over a qualitative one. From the quantitative standpoint, the results appear impressive. Consider the following, based on Hahn et al.'s (1975) research on the various types of contact between PCVs and Korean teachers and students from 1967 to 1973 (p. 3).

TABLE 1
Numerical Overview of Peace Corps TEFL Contacts (1967-1973)

School Level / Number	Secondary	University
PCVs	390	263
Korean English Teachers – Informal PCV Contact	Approx. 2,000	-
Korean English Teachers – Semester Workshop	700	-
Korean English Teachers – Vacation Workshop	2,200	-
Korean Students Taught	350,000	Approx. 4,200

These statistics are based on data available up to 1973, which places it roughly at the midpoint of the 15-year duration of the TEFL Program, considering that the program effectively concluded in 1980. In the absence of comprehensive data covering the entirety of the Peace Corps/Korea Program, it is reasonable to approximate the overall figures by roughly doubling the values provided in the available dataset. Based on this estimation, approximately 1,300 PCVs (around 65%) were engaged in TEFL assignments throughout the duration of the Korea program, and the number of Korean students who received English instruction from these volunteers can be estimated at approximately 700,000.[9] Regarding the training of Korean English teachers, by 1978, PCVs had reached close to the program's "terminal goal of training 90 percent of the 8,200 secondary school English teachers in Korea" (Peace Corps, 1979, p. 125). In short, from a quantitative perspective, the Peace Corps/Korea's TEFL program may be seen as a great success in achieving G1, which likely provided a foundation for subsequent successes in G2 and G3.

It is generally agreed among scholars, Korean government officials, and PCVs that the U.S. Peace Corps/Korea's TEFL Program can be divided into three major stages (Kailian, 1980; Kim, 2016; Krzic, 2016; Ministry of Education, 1981), each reflecting significant shifts in its policy: Stage 1 (1966-1970), Stage 2 (1971-1975), and Stage 3 (1976-1981). Stage 1, covering 1966 through 1970, is characterized by serious conflict between PCVs and Koreans, causing embarrassment for the Peace Corps and generating a sense of perceived uselessness among Koreans. Stage 2 (1971-1975) represents a period of challenging yet earnest efforts by the Peace Corps to improve its TEFL program in cooperation with the Korean Ministry of Education and other relevant authorities. Finally, Stage 3, beginning in 1976, coincides with an overall decline in the education sector during the latter part of the 1970s (Landrum, 1984). Meanwhile, Korea's economic development was remarkable during the 1970s, with per capita GDP surpassing $1,000 by 1980 (Peace Corps, 1981). Partially in response to Korea's rapid economic progress, it was implied that the Peace Corps/Korea would be withdrawn by 1981, with the TEFL program phased out by 1980 (Peace Corps,1979).

1) Stage 1: Conflicts and Discordant Expectation

It is crucial to understand what happened with K-1, the first group of PCVs who arrived in 1966, particularly regarding their experience of culture shock in classroom settings. The sixty-nine TEFL volunteers were assigned to their own sites—whether rural or urban—as

[9] This figure, 700,000 is an estimate made by the author. Since the statistics in Table 1 cover only half of the Peace Corps' service period, the author arrived at the estimate by doubling 350,000, resulting in 700,000.

planned by local education boards in cooperation with the Peace Corps. However, aside from the issue of teaching locations, there was a lack of well-organized mutual cooperation between the two sides. The Korean government appeared confused, with little understanding of how to effectively utilize these highly-educated volunteers— "embodied manpower in the form of a recent college graduate" (Krzic, 2016, p. 5). Several challenges faced during Stage 1 (1966-1970) are noteworthy:

- All 69 PCVs in K-1 were assigned to high schools, with little consideration of the extreme focus on college entrance examinations at that level (Ministry of Education, 1981).
- Some K-1 volunteers had to teach both high school and middle school, leading to rigorous schedules and heavy teaching load (Krzic, 2016).
- Korean secondary school classes typically had 60 or more students, making it nearly impossible to develop students' English communication skills (Author, 2015).
- No special textbooks for English conversation were provided; PCVs had to use grammar-oriented textbooks used by Korean students and teachers (Kailian, 1980).
- PCVs were unfamiliar with or alien to traditional Korean classroom norms, such as students wearing black military-style uniforms and having shaved heads, among others (National Museum of Korean Contemporary History, 2016a).

As Krzic (2016) noted, placing the volunteers in high schools was not the best use of personnel. Although Korean high school students initially welcomed the PCVs with curiosity, their interest soon faded, given that conversational English was irrelevant to their primary goal of college entrance. As David Lassiter (K-1) remarked, the PCVs' English classes were seen as ineffective and a waste of time, and there was widespread concern that the overall Peace Corps effort in Korea might not succeed if the situation continued unchanged.

This situation not only perplexed the U.S. Peace Corps but also threw the Korean government into disarray, particularly since hosting the Peace Corps had been a long-cherished goal since 1961 (National Museum of Korean Contemporary History, 2016b), the Peace Corps' founding year. From the Peace Corps' perspective, several factors contributed to early challenges:

- Approximately 70 percent of PCVs were not English or English Education majors (Lee, 2015).
- Most were recent university graduates in their early twenties with no teaching experience (National Museum of Korean Contemporary History, 2016).
- Despite three months of Korean language training, their Korean proficiency remained low, making communication difficult (Hobbie, 2011).

During Stage 1, the Korean side faced a range of challenges in operating the Peace Corps/Korea TEFL Program. These difficulties, combined with the inherent limitations of the Peace Corps itself, made it hard to view the program as having made a significant contribution to the improvement of English education in Korea. One of the most critical issues during this period was the lack of effective management of PCVs at the local school level. In several cases, volunteers originally assigned as science teachers were instead instructed by school to teach English – contrary to their initial training and intentions. This often resulted in a mismatch between the volunteers' preparation and their actual teaching responsibilities.

One illustrative example is that of N. Fitzpatrick of K-1, who was assigned as a biology teacher at Yeongwol High School in Gangwon Province. Consider the article contributed to the inaugural issue (November 1966) of *Yobosayo*[10], the journal of Peace Corps/Korea.

> I began teaching English today. I urgently need any available TESOL materials—please send them to me as soon as possible. … Even now, the principal continues to assure the education board official that I will only teach English. … But I would much rather teach biology.

When PCVs were dispatched to Korea, each group was assigned a specific field of service while still in the U.S. and received corresponding training for over a period of three months prior to their arrival. Upon arrival, however, volunteers sometimes encountered assignments that deviated from their original designations. For instance, as in the case of Fitzpatrick, a biology teacher was compelled to teach English – without access to TEFL materials—under the directive of the local school principal.

This case illustrates that once PCVs were assigned to a school, responsibility for their management was entirely entrusted to the Korean side—more specifically, to the principal of the host school. Moreover, the Korean authorities appeared to operate under the misconception that any American, by virtue of being a native English speaker, could serve as a panacea for English education, regardless of their academic background or the specific learning environment. As such, while Stage 1 of the Peace Corps/Korea TEFL Program may be evaluated positively from a quantitative standpoint – namely, the increased exposure of Korean students to native English speakers – it ultimately fell short in terms of qualitative effectiveness.

In this context, the study by Hahn et al. (1975) revealed that PCVs themselves did not perceive the effectiveness of their work to be as high as expected. Specifically, when 96

---

[10] *Yobosayo* here literally means *hello* in Korean and was the title of the monthly newsletter published by Peace Corps/Korea at the time. According to today's Korean romanization standard, it should be written *Yeoboseyo*.

PCVs engaged in the education sector were surveyed, the responses indicated that 45.8% considered their work "Effective," while an equal percentage (45.8%) assessed it as "Not so effective." When the data were disaggregated by educational level, the results showed that at the university level, 60% rated their work as "Effective" and 35.5% as "Not so effective," whereas at the middle school level, only 41.6% rated it as "Effective," with a higher 51.4% indicating it was "Not so effective" (Hahn et al., 1975, pp. 27-28). Apart from the slightly higher perceived effectiveness at the university level compared to the middle school level, the overall outcomes appear rather modest relative to the efforts invested by the volunteers.

2) Stage 2: Cooperative Efforts and Program Improvement

Consequently, during Stage 2 of the Peace Corps/Korea TEFL Program, the strategy shifted away from directly teaching Korean students and instead emphasized strengthening workshop programs for Korean English teachers. This marked a transition to a *social multiplier approach* strategy (Glaeser et al., 2003), focusing on teacher training as a means of amplifying educational impact through broader societal effects. In response to this, the Korean Ministry of Education decided "in 1971 to grant credit to teachers attending the vacation workshops taught by PCVs" (Hahn et al., 1975, p. 2). Furthermore, starting in 1973, during the second year of their service, PCVs began systematically conducting teacher training workshops at schools other than their assigned institutions.

On the other hand, by 1974 the Korean Ministry of Education finally decided to create a single standardized English textbook for middle schools, extending beyond the context of many different English textbooks leading PCVs to experience confusion (Kailian, 1980). Meanwhile, the Peace Corps/Korea published two important resources: *English for Teachers*, a practical English handbook for PCVs and Korean teachers (Holt et al., 1974); *Methodology for Teachers*, a comprehensive guide to English teaching methodology in Korea (Holt et al., 1975). Unlike Stage 1, when no primary or supplementary materials were available, Stage 2 is characterized by active efforts to enhance English education in Korea.

As previously mentioned, during Stage 1, the Peace Corps' English education efforts in Korea primarily emphasized English conversation in reaction to the country's traditionally grammar-focused approach. However, this emphasis led to a period that could arguably be described as unproductive, as it spotlighted the very area in which Korean English education was weakest, without creating the necessary conditions for meaningful improvement. In response to this limitation, Peace Corps/Korea appeared to adjust its approach. The two instructional books published during Stage 2 reflect a more nuanced understanding of English education, suggesting a shift toward methods better aligned with the local context and educational needs.

Specifically, while English conversation remained the ultimate goal, these materials were

grounded in the recognition that conversational competence does not exist in isolation. Rather, it must be supported by the integration of various components such as grammar, reading, and writing. This conceptual shift is evident in the design of the books, which combine communicative objectives with structural language elements. In doing so, the Peace Corps effectively created a pedagogical bridge that enabled PCVs – many of whom, despite being native speakers, lacked formal knowledge of English grammar – to teach English more effectively. Simultaneously, this approach also appealed to Korean English teachers who were proficient in grammar but lacked access to authentic communicative practice.

Considering that the failure of the K-1 program, which focused exclusively on high school English education, stemmed from a clash between the Peace Corps' emphasis on spoken English and the grammar-oriented, college entrance exam-driven reality of Korean high school classrooms, it is noteworthy that *Methodology for Teachers* (Holt et al., 1975) also addresses students' needs in relation to English examinations. More specifically, each unit's *Note* section in *Methodology for Teachers* (Holt et al., 1975) includes guidance on "how the suggested Processes will help prepare students for exam" (Holt et al., 1975, p. 7). One of the suggestions to the PCV, mentioned in the book's Foreword, is as follows.

> There are many references in the Notes in the Units that show the teachers how the Processes can help students prepare for examinations. The PCV can make this point even more effectively if he can procure a copy of a high school entrance exam from a third-year middle school teacher or another source. (Holt et al., 1975, p. 9)

As outlined above, the TEFL Program during Stage 2 was implemented through the cooperative efforts of the Peace Corps and the Korean government, specifically the Ministry of Education. This collaboration facilitated a compromise between the Peace Corps' focus on spoken English and the Ministry's emphasis on traditional English grammar instruction. As a result, the overall quality of English education in Korea began to show signs of improvement in a positive direction.

3) Stage 3: Decline and Setbacks

The final stage of the Peace Corps/Korea Program, spanning from 1976 to 1981, marked a period of decline that ultimately led to its termination. This downturn was driven by a confluence of shifting domestic and international circumstances that made the continuation of the program increasingly untenable. Key contributing factors included changes in U.S. foreign aid policy under the Carter administration and escalating political and diplomatic tensions between Korea and the United States. These developments appear to have influenced the U.S. decision to withdraw the Peace Corps in late 1979 (Brown, 2011; Kwak

& Patterson, 1999). Moreover, the rise of anti-American sentiment in Korea following the Gwangju Uprising in 1980, coupled with the general instability of the Korean political climate, further prompted both governments to reach a mutual agreement to end the Peace Corps presence.

In this context, the TEFL Program not only failed to make notable advancements but also experienced setbacks in achievements made during Stage 2. A prominent example of this regression was the discontinuation of the standardized middle school English textbooks—Middle School English 1, 2, 3—which had been jointly developed and published in 1974 through bilateral cooperation. The system reverted to its previous model, whereby multiple English textbooks produced by various private publishers were adopted for classroom use.

Despite the various efforts made over the course of fifteen years to enhance the quality of English education in Korea, the Peace Corps/Korea TEFL Program cannot be said to have achieved substantial outcomes, as evidenced by several statistical indicators (Lee, 2015).

TABLE 2
Rate of PCV's Participation in School Curricula[11]

Question	Response	Percentage
Was what you taught in class included in the English assessment to measure students' academic achievement?	Yes	17.83%
	No	20.16%
	Not available	62.01%
As an English teacher, were you able to attend any teacher, staff, or faculty meeting related to English education?	Yes, all the time	19.38%
	Yes, sometimes	37.41%
	No, I wasn't	43.41%

The data indicate that, during Stage 2, despite the formal collaboration between the Peace Corps and the Korean Ministry of Education, such cooperation remained largely at the policy level. On-the-ground collaboration—specifically within schools between PCVs, Korean English teachers, and school principals—was minimal or virtually nonexistent. While assessment is essential to achieve meaningful educational outcomes, only 17.83% of PCVs confirmed that the content taught in class was reflected in the English assessment used to measure students' academic achievement. In contrast, 20.16% explicitly indicated that the assessment did not align with what was taught. Notably, for the remaining 62.01% of responses, relevant information was either not provided, unavailable, or unrecorded. Furthermore, although the Peace Corps/Korea TEFL initiative represented a new and ambitious educational endeavor, 43.41% of PCVs reported having never participated in any faculty meetings or conferences related to English education. On the other hand, while

[11] Survey data presented here was collected as part of the author's doctoral research for *Language ideological approaches to English education in Korea: A sociolinguistic perspective* (2016), involving 131 PCVs who served in the field of English education, including English teachers, teacher trainer, and advisors.

Korean English teachers generally expressed a considerable level of trust in the Peace Corps' instructional methodology – *Methodology for Teachers* (Holt et al., 1975)– the actual rate at which they implemented this methodology in practice was found to be significantly low (Kailian, 1981).

In contrast to the relatively positive conclusions drawn from the quantitative assessment, the qualitative evaluation of the Korea TEFL Program—namely, the Peace Corps/Korea's G1 objective—reveals that, despite their efforts over three stages, it cannot be said to have achieved clear or significant outcomes. From a logical standpoint, this apparent failure of G1 should reasonably be seen as leading to shortcomings in G2 and G3 as well. However, one is confronted with the issue of identifying the grounds upon which both the Peace Corps and the Korean government assert the success of G2 and G3.

3. Beyond Formal Instruction to Grassroot Achievement

Peace Corps/Korea TEFL Program's Goal 1 was subdivided into two categories: G1-a, referring to formal English instruction within schools, and G1-b, denoting English-related extracurricular activities involving PCVs. In practice, volunteers were responsible for both classroom teaching and extracurricular engagements. Individual PCVs often tailored their participation in G1-b activities according to their personal interests and the specific circumstances of their placements.

This section examines the extent to which the shortcomings identified in G1-a were offset by the relative successes of G1-b. It presents a case study of an English Conversation Club at a secondary school, alongside additional G1-b initiatives implemented at the university level. Particular attention is given to the cultural exchange experiences that took place between Korean students and PCVs in university settings, analyzed through Victor Turner's concepts of the *liminal period* and the *betwixt and between* (Turner, 1969).

1) A Case of English Conversation Club at High School

PCVs' informal extracurricular activities are characterized by greater freedom and informality, and are also driven by the voluntary motivations of both volunteers and Korean students, in contrast to their more structured formal activities in classroom settings. Consequently, research and attention focused on these informal activities are relatively limited. Nevertheless, whether in secondary school TEFL or university TEFL, it has been observed that small-scale initiatives such as English Conversation Clubs have enabled some degree of achievement in terms of G1 objectives, specifically ending up G1-b, which in turn contributing to facilitating progress towards G2 and G3 goals.

Here is an example of English Conversation Club in a high school TEFL. Mr. Baek[12], now 75 years old, was a student in 1966 at the High School Affiliated with Gongju National University of Education. At the time, Bonnie Taylor, a member of K-1, was assigned to the school as a TEFL instructor to teach English Conversation. In addition to her regular English classes, she established an English Conversation Club with five students – four male and one female. The club operated in a format similar to the audio-lingual method, without the use of any textbook, note-taking, or explicit grammar instruction. Instead, students engaged in free conversation, practicing expressions like those in Table 3. While these expressions posed little difficulty for the students at least in written form, Mr. Baek recalls that understanding them in spoken English was initially quite challenging. Despite hearing the same expressions repeated for nearly an hour, the students often failed to comprehend them until Ms. Taylor finally wrote them on the blackboard at the end of the session. The visual reinforcement enabled the students to connect the sounds with their meanings. Mr. Baek reflects that this method helped them grasp specific phonetic features of spoken English that were unfamiliar to Korean learners at the time.

TABLE 3
Authentic English through English Conversation Club

Learned Expressions	Analyzed Phonetic Features Learned
Help me!	The [p] in "help me*"* is unreleased.
Is Mr. Kim in?	*'Kim in*' is perceived as [ki-min] rather than [kim-in].
Not at the moment.	The medial [t] in "not at" and "cottage" is realized as a flap
cottage	sound.
	The vowels in "caught" and "brought" can be heard as [ɑ] as
caught/brought	well as [ɔ], a distinction generally unfamiliar to Korean students.

This experience illustrates how Mr. Baek became acquainted with authentic English pronunciation through Bonnie Taylor's communicative approach. Although this may seem like a singular anecdote, it reflects a broader pattern: many PCVs employed similar methods to teach English conversation in Korea.[13] According to Hahn et al. (1975), from 1967 to 1973, approximately 5,000 Korean students received intensive oral instruction through small special classes, although these were not part of the regular curriculum. While no further

[12] Two informal interviews were conducted on July 5, 2016 and July 7, 2016 with a retired professor of English Language and Literature (name changed for confidentiality) who shared his classroom experiences with a PCV. Table 3 contrasts his recalled expressions with the author's analysis of authentic American pronunciation features he acquired through natural exposure.

[13] Beyond teaching regular English classes, numerous testimonies regarding PCV's extracurricular activities—particularly those centered around English Conversation Clubs—can be found throughout Peace Corps memories on Korea. Notable examples include accounts by Morrin Lee (K-19), Peggy Mcleod (K-19), Noah Engelberg (K-21), James Middleton (K-21), Jack Maisano (K-21), Reta Bohling (K-23), Robert Beatty (K-25), Mary Barco (K-26), and William Skofield (K-32), among others.

statistical details are available regarding this matter, it is nevertheless considered that such G1-b activities may have significantly contributed to advancements in G2 and G3 objectives of the Peace Corps/Korea program. Therefore, these club activities deserve more comprehensive recognition in evaluations of the Peace Corps/Korea's TEFL Program.

2) From the Secondary Level to the University Level

The failure of the K-1 group in 1966, which had been assigned exclusively to high school English education, resulted in considerable embarrassment for both the Peace Corps and the Korean government. In the absence of effective bilateral cooperation regarding the TEFL program in Korea, the two parties ultimately decided to abandon the high school TEFL initiative and shift their focus to middle school TEFL. During this transitional period, some K-1 Volunteers were reassigned to university positions, and by 1973, a group was formally organized for university-level TEFL.

Through this process, the Peace Corps/Korea Program demonstrated, in terms of the number of participating PCVs—that is, quantitative outcomes—a greater contribution to middle schools, followed by universities, and lastly high schools. Given below is the distribution of where (at which school level) PCVs[14] were assigned to teach English (Author, 2015).

TABLE 4
Distribution of PCVs by School Level

School Level	Number of PCV	Percentage
Middle school level	94	73%
High school level	37	29%
University level	46	36%

This indicates that middle and high schools, though both classified as part of the secondary education level, were not functionally equivalent in the program's context; in fact, TEFL at the university level made particularly significant progress. Nevertheless, discussions of the Peace Corps program in Korea have rarely given due attention to the TEFL efforts at the university level. As shown in Table 4 above, the scale of university TEFL is smaller than that of middle school TEFL; however, in terms of its impact on G1—whether G1-a or G1-b—it is essential to recognize that the university-level TEFL program yielded the most distinct and meaningful outcomes.

Several factors may have contributed to the relatively successful evaluation of the university-level TEFL program carried out by the Peace Corps/Korea. First of all, one of the

[14] The sum of these three percentages is more than 100% due to multiple responses to the levels in question. Some PCVs were available to serve in more than one school level.

most challenging aspects for PCVs teaching at the secondary level—whether in middle or high schools—was the class size. In the 1960s and 1970s, classrooms in Korean secondary schools typically accommodated 60 to 70 students. In contrast, at the university level, PCVs were usually assigned to departments such as English Literature or English Education, or to departments where English was in high demand (Peace Corps, 1973). As a result, they were able to teach classes with a more manageable size of approximately 20 to 30 students. Freed from the constraints of overcrowded classrooms, PCVs were better positioned to deliver effective instruction in spoken English. Second, at the secondary level, the content taught by PCVs—primarily English conversation—was often not reflected in student assessments or examinations (Lee, 2015). This lack of evaluative accountability limited the educational impact of their teaching. By contrast, PCVs teaching at universities were granted autonomy to design their own assessments and assign grades based on the content they taught. The presence of evaluation mechanisms tends to enhance learning outcomes, thus increasing the likelihood of success in university-level TEFL programs. Third, Korean university students were highly motivated to learn English—particularly spoken English—from native speakers like PCVs. Unlike their counterparts in secondary schools, these students were no longer constrained by English as merely a test subject for college entrance examinations. Fourth, at the secondary level, PCVs were often supervised by principals who lacked English proficiency, making effective communication and guidance nearly impossible. However, in the university setting, PCVs typically interacted with professors and students from English-related departments, where communication was comparatively smoother and more constructive. Finally, the minimal age gap between PCVs and Korean university students fostered a more collegial and friendly atmosphere (National Museum of Korean Contemporary History, 2016a). This allowed for classroom discussions that extended beyond textbook content to cover a broad range of topics, including social, political, economic, cultural, and historical issues. Such exchanges not only offered Korean students valuable opportunities to practice English in meaningful contexts but also stimulated the intellectual curiosity of PCVs, enabling them to broaden their own worldviews.

3) University TEFL as a Gateway to Cross-Cultural Dialogue

Drawing on the terminology of cultural anthropologist Victor Turner (1969), PCVs who served in Korea found themselves in a *betwixt and between context*. As described in National Museum of Korean Contemporary History (2016a), the PCVs in Korea found their American identity increasingly challenged while living under challenging conditions. As a result, they were inevitably confronted with the realities of Korea – a society rooted in Confucian ethics and values, rich in historical and cultural traditions, and striving for economic advancement. According to Krzic (2016), this *liminal period* experience served as a turning point for many

PCVs, shifting them away from a mono-cultural American world view toward a more open, intercultural perspective. This transformation was particularly evident among volunteers working at the university level, where the conditions proved more conductive to successful cross-cultural dialogue and where PCVs navigated the undemocratic political circumstances that were a major catalyst for anti-government demonstrations by university students. Some volunteers initially assigned to high schools during their first year as members of K-1, experienced limited results and subsequently transferred to universities in their second year, while others were assigned directly to universities from the outset as TEFL instructors. These individuals consistently reported not only a high level of satisfaction from teaching conversational English at the university level, but also described meaningful personal growth through diverse interactions with Korean students (National Museum of Korean Contemporary History, 2016a). The PCV's political *betwixt and between* position in Korea fostered a psychological sense of solidarity with Korean university students, as this sense of shared experience ultimately served as a lever for facilitating mutual understanding and appreciation, covering both G2 and G3 between the U.S. and Korea.

Many PCVs arrived in Korea motivated by opposition to the Vietnam War, seeking draft deferment through Peace Corps service. Joseph Balconi (K-6) exemplified this motivation: "I just didn't want to be part of that whole war theatre... my main motivation was to try to defer getting into the war if possible" (National Museum of Korean Contemporary History, 2016a, p. 140). However, these anti-war Americans encountered Korean students who viewed their nation's Vietnam involvement positively. Leslie Desmond (K-2) recalled the stark contrast: "I told some people that I thought Vietnam war was bad... and the Koreans said, 'Oh, no, no, it's very good'" (p. 94). This collision of perspectives forced both sides into deeper reflection. Desmond eventually understood that Koreans viewed their Vietnam deployment as assistance to help "ease Vietnamese hardship," shaped by Korea's own war experience and loss of "family members and loved ones" (p. 94). This realization moved him beyond binary thinking, recognizing that "things are rarely absolute—nothing is entirely good, nor entirely bad" (p. 94).

Simultaneously, Korean students witnessed American democracy's self-correcting mechanisms through the Watergate scandal and Nixon's 1974 resignation. This proved particularly significant given Korea's authoritarian context under Park Chung Hee's indefinite rule following the 1972 Yushin Constitution. Christopher Delker (K-21) described how Korean students "wanted to know more about America... our political system" and asked him to explain "what it all meant" regarding Watergate (p. 244-246). For students living under authoritarianism, witnessing a sitting president held accountable and forced from office offered a "striking contrast" and prompted reflection on democratic principles.

The most profound transformation occurred as PCVs experienced Korea's authoritarian reality firsthand. Patricia Little (K-30) witnessed her classes interrupted when students

"would empty the classroom... to demonstrate against the oppressive government," and became "accustomed to complete silence" when asking about absent students who had been arrested or appeared "with black eyes or broken noses" (p. 300-303). Dennis Halpin (K-16) found himself literally running with students from tear gas during university shutdowns, experiencing moral conflict upon realizing the gas was "made in the U.S.A." (p. 442-444).

These shared experiences of repression created unexpected solidarity between PCVs and Korean students. Despite their seemingly opposite positions as aid providers and recipients, both groups converged in opposition to authoritarianism. Halpin's participation in students' reunification hopes—drinking "tongil makkeoli" and toasting "to reunification of two Koreas"—illustrated how PCVs became "increasingly assimilated" into Korean political consciousness.

This period represents a classic *betwixt and between* experience in which political circumstances suspended normal cultural boundaries. PCVs could no longer maintain purely American perspectives while witnessing Korean authoritarianism, just as Korean students could not ignore democratic alternatives while living under repression. The Vietnam War debates, Watergate discussions, and shared experiences of political repression created a liminal space where both groups began to transcend their original worldviews. This mutual political awakening facilitated a form of cross-cultural understanding that extended beyond the formal goals of the Peace Corps. Rather than merely providing English instruction, PCVs became witnesses to—and, in some ways, participants in—Korea's democratization struggles, while Korean students gained firsthand exposure to democratic values and critical political discourse. This reciprocal transformation illustrates how political contexts can serve as catalysts for deeper cultural exchange, fostering not just surface-level interactions but fundamental shifts in perspective and solidarity across national boundaries.

V. CONCLUSION

This study has examined the U.S. Peace Corps in Korea (1966-1981) with emphasis on its three stated goals—G1, G2, and G3—and their interrelationships. While the TEFL program achieved quantitative success, its substantive educational impact was limited. Distinguishing between G1-a (formal English instruction) and G1-b (extracurricular activities, especially conversation clubs), this study finds that the latter proved particularly significant at the university level, where conditions enabled more equitable and meaningful exchanges between PCVs and students.

The evaluation was structured along three dimensions: (1) divergence in perceptions of goal achievement between Korean authorities and the U.S. Peace Corps, (2) variation in outcomes across program stages, and (3) differentiation by school level. The results are

summarized in the following Table 5 and Table 6:

TABLE 5
Goal Achievements: Korea vs. U.S.

Goal \ Country	Korean Government Authorities	U.S. Peace Corps
G1	Intermediate outcome	Success
G2	Success	Intermediate outcome
G3	Success	Intermediate outcome

TABLE 6
Outcomes by Program Stages

Stages	Success of Failure
Stage 1 (1966-1970)	Failure
Stage 2 (1971-1975)	Success
Stage 3 (1976-1981)	Intermediate outcome

TABLE 7
Success by School Level

School Level	Higher Education Aspiration	Potential for TEFL Success
Middle School	Intermediate	Intermediate
High School	Strong	Weak
University	Weak	Strong

Table 7 further reveals an inverse relationship between higher education aspiration and potential for TEFL success.

Taken together, these findings suggest that the Peace Corps/Korea TEFL Program cannot be reduced to a simple binary of success or failure. Outcomes fluctuated across differing goal achievements, program stages, and school levels, yet the program left enduring legacies through Friends of Korea, the Revisit Program for Returned PCVs, and KOICA, modeled on the Peace Corps.

Finally, the shared socio-political milieu of the 1970s—the U.S. antiwar movement, Watergate, and Korea's Yushin authoritarianism—provided common ground for PCVs and Korean university students. Immersed in authoritarian constraints yet bound by neutrality, PCVs occupied a liminal space that allowed them to foster solidarity through dialogue and shared humanistic values. From this vantage point, the program was most effective at the university level, especially through G1-b, by cultivating authentic cross-cultural engagement grounded in empathy and shared ideals.

REFERENCES

Brazinsky, G. (2007). *Nation building in South Korea: Koreans, Americans, and the making of a democracy.* The University of North Carolina Press. https://doi.org/10.5149/9780807867792_brazinsky

Brown, A. S. (2011). *The pains of withdrawal: Carter and Korea, 1976-1980* [Master's thesis, North Carolina State University]. NC State Repository. https://repository.lib.ncsu.edu/items/0c4576b7-facb-4f7c-a057-e607dcf82bb1

Carey, R. G. (1970). *The Peace Corps.* Praeger Publishers.

Coombs, P. H. (1964). *The fourth dimension of foreign policy: Educational and cultural affairs.* Harper & Row.

Glaeser, E., Sacerdote, B. I., & Scheinkman, J. A. (2003). The social multiplier. *Journal of European Economic Association, 1*(2-3), 345-353. https://doi.org/10.1162/154247603322390982

Hahn, B., Ko, U. R., Lee, H., & Kim, H. (1975). *An evaluative study of the Peace Corps program in Korea.* Seoul.

Hobbie, C. A. (2011). *The time of the monkey, rooster, and dog: A Peace Corps volunteer's years in Korea.* iUniverse.

Holt, D. D., Song, Y. O., & Dunham, D. (1974). *English for teachers.* Peace Corps. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED289352

Holt, D. D., Song, Y. O., & Dunham, D. (1975). *Methodology for teachers.* Peace Corps. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED116453

Hsich, H., & Shannon, S. (2005). Three approaches to qualitative content analysis. *Qualitative Health Research, 15*(9), 1277-1288. https://doi.org/10.1177/1049732305276687

Kailian, G. S. (1980). *English test and attitude measures among Korean students of United States Peace Corps volunteers* [Doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California]. ProQuest Dissertation Publishing.

Keeton, J. (2011). *The U.S. Peace Corps and the Korean development experience.* Asia Foundation Center for U.S.-Korea Policy.

Kim, S. M. (2016). The U.S. policy toward Korea and the U.S. Peace Corps: Activities and its meaning of the Peace Corps Korea [Commentary]. In National Museum of Korean Contemporary History (Ed.), *Peace Corps memories on Korea* (pp. 494-525). National Museum of Korean Contemporary History.

Kwak, T.-H., & Patterson, W. (1999). The security relationship between Korea and the United States, 1960-1982. In Y.-B. Lee & W. Patterson (Eds.), *Korean-American relations 1866-1997* (pp. 83-97). State University of New York Press.

Krzic, G. A. (2016). *Peace Corps Korea: A story of personal, professional and national transformation*. Friends of Korea. https://www.friendsofkorea.net/uploads/1/5/0/0/15002110/peace_corps_korea_story_krzic_2016.pdf

Lee, C. H. (2015). *Compilation of data: Peace Corps*. [Unpublished data set]

Lee, C. H. (2016). *Language ideological approaches to English education in Korea: A sociolinguistic perspective* (Publication No. 10103668) [Doctoral dissertation, University of Arizona]. ProQuest Dissertations Publishing.

Lee, C. H. (2019). Peace Corps English program and language planning in Korea: 1966-1981. *Journal of Language Science, 26*(1), 265-290. http://doi.org/10.14384/kals.2019.26.1.265

Lee, K. S. (2014). The impact of the Peace Corps Program on English education in Korea. *The Mirae Journal of English Language and Literature, 19*(4), 537-560.

Lee, Y.-B., & Patterson, W. (1999). *Korean-American relations 1866-1997.* SUNY Press.

Lippert, M. W. (2016, September 12). Congratulatory message. In National Museum of Korean Contemporary History (Ed.), *Peace Corps memories on Korea* (pp. 8-9). National Museum of Korean Contemporary History.

Ministry of Education. (1981). *Mi Pyeonghwabongsadan Hwaryong Baeksuh* [White Paper on the Evaluation and Utilization of the U.S. Peace Corps].

National Museum of Korean Contemporary History. (2016a). *Peace Corps Memories on Korea*.

National Museum of Korean Contemporary History. (2016b). *Beautiful Journey, Endless Friendship: Special Exhibition in Commemoration of U.S. Peace Corps Service in Korea.*

Peace Corps Act, Public Law 870293 U.S.C. Sec 2 (1961). Eighty-seventh Congress of the United States of America.

Peace Corps. (1973). *Peace Corps annual report/Korea, 1973*. JFK Presidential Library and Museum. https://www.jfklibrary.org/

Peace Corps. (1975). *Peace Corps annual report/Korea, 1975*. JFK Presidential Library and Museum. https://www.jfklibrary.org/

Peace Corps. (1979). *Peace Corps annual report/Korea, 1979*. JFK Presidential Library and Museum. https://www.jfklibrary.org/

Peace Corps (1981). *Peace Corps annual report/Korea, 1981.* JFK Presidential Library and Museum. https://www.jfklibrary.org/

Peace Corps. (1982). *Peace Corps Annual Report/Korea, 1982.* JFK Presidential Library and Museum. https://www.jfklibrary.org/

Peace Corps. (1983). *Peace Corps Annual Report/Korea,* 1983. JFK Presidential Library and Museum. https://www.jfklibrary.org/

Seth, M. J. (2002). *Education fever: Society, politics, and the pursuit of schooling in South Korea.* University of Hawaii Press.

Sorensen, C. W. (1994). Success and education in South Korea, *Comparative Education Review*, *38*(1), 10-35. https://doi.org/10.1086/447223

Swartout, R. R. (2002, May). *The evolution of Korean-American relations: A personal and historical perspective* [Paper presentation]. *International Academic Symposium in Commemoration of the 50th Anniversary*. Jeju. South Korea.

The JoongAng. (1966, September 15). *Mi Pyeonghwabongsadan ui naehan* [U.S. Peace Corps' visit to Korea]. The JoongAng. *https://www.joongang.co.kr/article/1076412*

Turner, V. (1969.) *The ritual process: Structure and anti-structure*. Aldine Publishing.

United States Peace Corps. (1990). *The United States Peace Corps handbook*. Peace Corps.

Examples in: English
Applicable Languages: English
Applicable Level: Tertiary

Chee Hye Lee (professor)
Dept of English Education
Hannam University
34430 Hannam-ro 70, Daedeok-gu, Daejeon, Korea
Email: chlee@hnu.kr

Received: July 27, 2025
Reviewed: September, 1, 2025
Revised version received: September 21, 2025