영어어문교육, 14권 3호 2008년 가을

Suggestions to Improve Secondary School English Teacher Education in Korea*

Sung-Ae Kim
(Pusan National University)

Kim, Sung-Ae. (2008). Suggestions to improve secondary school English teacher education in Korea. *English Language & Literature Teaching, 14*(3), 133-154.

The purpose of this paper is to address the problems in the secondary school English teacher education in Korea and induce the teacher educators, policy makers and administrators to make more efforts and take the necessary actions to solve the problems. For that purpose the study first administered a questionnaire survey with 108 secondary school English teachers from seven middle schools and seven high schools to investigate the problems in the secondary school English education. It then analyzed the secondary school English teacher education programs in six national universities, focusing on the courses in the curriculum and the academic backgrounds and study areas of the faculty members. Based on the results of the analyses, the study argues that the secondary school English teacher education in this country requires much improvement to meet the needs in the field. Some suggestions are made to improve the secondary school English teacher education.

[secondary school English teachers/teacher education programs/English educators]

I. INTRODUCTION

During the past decades since the mid 70s there have been considerable changes in second/foreign language teaching throughout the world, accompanying intensive debates regarding what to teach and how to teach in the classroom. As the result of these debates intensive research and studies have followed regarding how to educate the pre-service and in-service teachers (e.g. Bernhardt & Hmmadou, 1987; Ellis, 1990; Freeman & Johnson, 1998; Freeman & Richards, 1993; Fullen &Hargreaves, 1992; Glisan & Sullivan, 1993;

* This study was supported by the Research Grant (2 years) of Pusan National University.

Hayes, 1995; Huebner & Bartolome, 1989; Johnson, 1992; Richards, 1987; Thorne & Qiang, 1996; Wilbur, 2007).

Within the country it is only recently that such debates induced active research on the teacher in the classroom (e.g. S. Chang, 2004; H. Y. Han, 2001; S. A. Kim, 2002, 2005, 2007; Y. M. Kim, 2005; J. H. Lee, 1999; S. B. Lee, 2005; Y. A. Lee, 2006; K. N. Park, 2005; K. H. Park & E. S. Park, 2002; Y. S. Ryu & K. W. Sung, 2005; G. Seong, 2006) and also on teacher education (e.g. K. S. Chang, 1999; Y. Choi, 2001; Y. S. Jung, 2001; E. J. Kim, 2002; Y. O. Kim, Y. K. Kahng & M. K. Kang, 2007; Y. K. Kim, Y. K. Kahng & H. S. Song, 2008; S. Y. Lee, 2007; D. B. Pae, 2000). Unfortunately, however, there has been little attention to changing the teacher education programs themselves. Considering the arguments that the quality of education depends on the quality of the teachers (Bernhardt & Hammadou, 1987) and the teacher has the key to successful learning because materials or texts are only as good as the teachers who use them (Shuy, 1981), this lack of attention is a regrettable deficiency in our English teaching profession. In fact, it is quite surprising to recognize how little attention has been devoted to taking appropriate actions on something as obvious as the need to change the teacher education programs.

Historically, the development of second/foreign language teaching during the past decades has produced a substantial degree of professionalization. During this time the theoretical basis of the field has moved from the study of phonetics and grammatical theory to include the study of pedagogical grammar, discourse analysis, second language acquisition, classroom-based research, interlanguage syntax and phonology, curriculum and syllabus design, and language testing (Richards, 1990). This change has been noticed within the country in the curriculum of the pre-service English teacher education programs in universities. However, observations of what the teachers do in the classroom and an examination of the academic backgrounds and study areas of the faculties in universities make one doubt if such a change in the curriculum can bring any real change in the quality of the English education provided to the students in schools.

The purpose of this study is to address the problems in the current secondary school English teacher education in Korea and induce the teacher educators, policy makers and administrators to devote more efforts to improve the situation. The research questions that guided the study were: 1) What are the secondary school English teachers' opinions about the pre-service and in-service teacher education programs and the related issues in this country? and 2) Are the curriculum and the faculties in the secondary school teacher education programs in universities appropriate for effective teacher education? It is hoped that the answers to these questions could induce the teacher educators, policy makers and administrators to make more efforts and take the necessary actions to change the secondary school English teacher education in this country.

II. BACKGROUND

Although it is true that knowledge about teaching and learning has grown significantly during the past decades, how the teachers have access to this knowledge is far from being obvious. This is because of the wide variations in both the nature and quality of teacher education programs (Darling-Hammond & Baratz-Snowden, 2005). In fact, even though there must be more creative and effective ways to teach, there is little proof that any one way of teaching is better in all settings than another (Gebhard, Gaitan, & Oprandy, 1990), and thus specifying what the teachers need to know and should be able to do for effective teaching is not a simple task.

Despite the difficulty involved in defining effective teaching, however, few would disagree on the point that a primary goal of all teacher development, pre-service or in-service, as Wright (1990) claims, should be to link theory and practice. This view is also held by Pennington (1990), who states that effectiveness of any teacher education program can be increased by not maintaining a strict separation of the two components. In a similar vein, Richards (1990) also claims that the intent of any second/foreign language pre-service teacher education must be to provide opportunities for the novice to acquire the skills and competences of effective teachers and to discover the working rules that effective teachers use.

Even though the final goal of pre-service teacher education may be, as Freeman (1990) states, to help the prospective teachers achieve independence in teaching, an immediate goal of pre-service teacher education would be to provide a solid body of knowledge and skills to help the teacher candidates develop an integrated set of theories and belief systems that can provide them with a framework for effective teaching (Day, 1990). However, given the relatively short time available for preparing teachers and given the fact that not everything that a teacher will ever need to know can be taught, teacher education should be designed to help teachers learn not only from their practice and but also from the insights of others when they assume their initial teaching responsibilities and lay a foundation for lifelong learning (Darling-Hammond & Baratz-Snowden, 2005; Watson & Fullen, 1992).

Given the goal of pre-service teacher education, teacher education today requires changes in the role of teacher educators as well as teacher candidates. As Richards (1990) argues, the role of the teacher educator is no longer simply that of a trainer. Instead, he must, according to Richards, guide the teacher candidates in the process of generating and testing hypothesis and in using the knowledge so acquired as a basis for further development. This position was also expressed more recently by Darling-Hammond and Baratz-Snowden (2005), who maintain that in order to make a program successful in producing effective teachers, the job of the teacher educator must be to construct integrated learning experiences, model the practices they want teacher candidates to adopt, provide

clear examples and standards that reflect what good teaching looks like and consists of. In other words, teacher educators must ensure that they are doing the proper job in providing the five fundamental components that are necessary for the development of skills and their transfer into regular practice: theory, demonstration, practice, feedback, and coaching (Joyce & Showers, 1980).

One important factor that determines the success of a teacher education program and thus the quality of education in schools is the faculties who teach the courses in the curriculum of the program. In fact, it is not exaggerating to say that the faculties are the ones who determine the quality of the curriculum. Even an ideal curriculum of the program does not guarantee a successful production of effective teachers when the faculties in the program fail to provide the necessary education. That is, when the faculties do not possess the necessary knowledge and skills or do not realize that their job is to develop effective teachers rather than simply transmit the knowledge they have, it is very doubtful that their teaching can actually produce competent teachers.

In addition to the faculties in the pre-service teacher education programs, there is another important factor that determines the quality of education in schools: Support of the policy makers and administrators. Especially when the educational policies are created and implemented in a top-down fashion, like in Korea, the role of the policy makers and administrators, as Sikes (1992) notes, becomes more important because imposition generally implies criticism by older teachers who have some experientially-based confidence that they are the ones best qualified to make professional decisions. As a result, the imposition of change can lead to low morale, dissatisfaction and reduced commitment. If the policy makers and administrators want to witness any policy implemented in schools successfully, therefore, they need to find out first what the change means for the teachers and for the institution (Sikes, 1992). It must be borne in mind that since teachers interpret and give changes meanings only when they make sense to them, simply forcing the teachers without taking enough considerations into the constraints they face can hardly bring about any satisfactory result. Expert teaching of teachers, as advocated in Darling-Hammond and Baratz-Snowden (2005) and Stoll (1992), takes time, effort, and support - and its success depends on a supportive policy environment including a supportive school system and training network, for which the policy makers and the administrators should take the responsibility and play an active role.

Still another important factor that determines the quality of education in schools is the collaboration between schools and universities (Huebner & Bartolome, 1989; Watson & Fullen, 1992). According to Watson and Fullen (1992), school improvement and teacher development are inextricably related and collaboration between schools and universities has been increasingly advocated as a potentially more powerful strategy for improving education. Despite the importance of collaboration, however, it is very unfortunate that

within the country there has been little collaboration witnessed between the two sides and that few, if any, studies have been conducted to deal with this issue. This lack of collaboration, it is suspected, has mainly resulted from the unwillingness to accept the accompanying change. In the mean time schools have been routinely criticized for their inability to alter the learning experiences of students, while faculties of education programs have been criticized for being indifferent to what happens in schools.

III. METHOD

1. Questionnaire Survey

1) Participants

The participants in this study were 108 secondary school English teachers from 7 middle schools (38 teachers) and 7 high schools (70 teachers) in a metropolitan city in Korea. The reason for the rather big difference in the sizes of the participants between the two school levels is that the number (i.e., 4 to 7) of the English teachers in the middle school is smaller than that (i.e., 7 to 13) in the high school. Even though the sizes of the participants from the two school levels were different, each was considered to be large enough for a statistical analysis of the similarities and/or differences between the middle school teachers and the high school teachers in their opinions about the teacher education and the related issues.

TABLE 1

Lengths of the Participants' Teaching Experiences

Length (Yrs.)	M.S. (n=38)	H.S.(n=70)	Total (N=108)
20 & above	7 (18.42%)	22 (31.44%)	29 (26.85%)
15 – below 20	4 (10.27%)	14 (20.0%)	18 (16.67%)
10 – below 15	5 (13.16%)	4 (5.71%)	9 (8.33%)
5 – below 10	8 (21.05%)	18 (25.71%)	26 (24.07%)
0 – below 5	14 (36.84%)	12 (17.14%)	26 (24.07%)

The lengths of the middle school teachers' teaching experiences ranged from 0.3years to 22.3years with the average of 9.85years, while those of the high school teachers ranged from 0.6years to 32.1years with the average of 13.74years. As indicated in Table 1, the participants consist of a variety of teachers in terms of the length of teaching experience and the result of the data analysis is expected to reflect the teachers' opinions in general, without a possible bias caused by age.

2) Data Collection

The data for this study were collected by a questionnaire survey. The questionnaire which was designed to investigate the problems in the English teacher development in Korea in the era of communication-oriented language teaching was composed of 28 items which asked about the teachers' opinions about the pre- and in-service teacher education, use of English as the medium of instruction, and themselves and their colleagues as teachers and their schools as supporters.

Since the purpose of the questionnaire was to find out what the teachers think or do, the items in the questionnaire were developed based on the information obtained from the teachers. Written descriptions of the problems in the secondary school English teacher education programs were collected in a graduate course taught by the researcher. Based on the problems found, the researcher developed the questionnaire items. The items thus developed were descriptive rather than prescriptive in nature.

For the coding of the data a 5-point Likert scale was used for the responses, where 5, 4, 3, 2, and 1 mean 'strongly agree,' 'Agree,' 'Undecided/Neutral,' 'Disagree,' and 'Strongly disagree,' respectively. Data collection was completed in 10 days with the cooperation of the teachers who enrolled in a graduate course taught by the researcher.

3) Data Analysis

Since both the middle school teachers and the high school English teachers are educated following the same path, there may not be any important differences in the two groups in terms of their opinions about the pre-service and the in-service English teacher education programs. Thus, the data were first analyzed with no distinction between the two groups. The mean score (M) and the standard deviation (SD) were calculated for each questionnaire item. Also, for an easier interpretation of the results, the participants' responses to each item were categorized into three types of responses: P (Positive: Strongly agree(5) or Agree (4)), U(Undecided/Neutral (3)), and N (Negative: Strongly disagree(1) or Disagree (2)). The frequency and percentage of each type of responses were then calculated for each item. However, since the participants are teaching students on different school levels, their opinions based on their experiences with the students may not be the same. Thus, the analysis also included a comparison between the two groups using a t-test to see if there were any statistically significant differences in the opinions of the two groups.

The result of the questionnaire analysis was described in five categories: 1) Teachers' opinions about the pre-service English teacher education, 2) teachers' opinions about the in-service English teacher education, 3) teachers' opinions about using English as the

medium of instruction, 4) teachers' evaluation of themselves, their colleagues and their schools, and 5) comparison between the middle school and high school English teachers. Although the categories are not exhaustive, they are expected to reveal the problems in our secondary school English teacher education fully enough to contribute to the improvement of the quality of teacher education in this country.

2. Secondary School Pre-service English Teacher Education Programs

1) Data Collection

With the belief that the quality of education in a program depends very much on the curriculum and the people who teach the courses in the curriculum, the study also analyzed the secondary school pre-service English teacher education programs in six national universities, focusing on the kinds of the courses offered and the academic backgrounds and study areas of the faculties. The six national universities (i.e., U1, U2, U3, U4, U5 & U6) were chosen from different provinces in the country to obtain information on what the current secondary school pre-service English teacher education is like nationwide. Even though the secondary school pre-service English teacher education programs in the universities selected for the analysis may not be the same with those in the other universities, they were still considered to provide important information about the quality of secondary school pre-service English teacher education in this country since they are the institutions which produce the majority of the teachers in their local areas.

The faculties examined were limited to the Korean professors in the program since in most universities the native English professors, who are usually employed to teach some general English courses such as conversation and writing, are not required to hold a Ph.D. degree and their status as a faculty member is somewhat different from that of the Koreans. Information about the faculties was mostly obtained from each department's homepage and the website of the Korea Research Foundation.

2) Data Analysis

The courses offered in the curriculum of each university were divided into three areas: English Education, Linguistics and English Literature. The faculties in each university were examined in terms of their academic backgrounds and study areas. The result obtained from these analyses was expected to be useful in evaluating the appropriateness of the program for effective teacher education. Even though the result may not give exhaustive information about what goes on in the secondary school English teacher education programs in different universities, they are expected to provide a general picture

of them and thus are considered to be useful for the discussion on how to improve the programs for better teacher education.

The academic background of each faculty was examined in their BA degree (B), MA degree (M), and Ph.D. degree (P) and divided into English Education (EE), Linguistics (LS), English Literature (EL), and Other Areas (OA). Thus, for instance, if the person majored in English education in the BA program, Linguistics in the MA program, and English literature in the Ph.D. program, s/he was described as possessing an academic background of BEE, MLS, and PEL. When the person has degrees in both English education and another area, then s/he was categorized as having the EE background.

The study area of each faculty was also examined in order to see how actively the person is engaged in teacher education. For this purpose, the publications and academic activities by the person were examined and divided into three categories considering his/her major area of research and study: English education (EE), Linguistics (LS), or English literature (EL). Though the analysis of the faculties' academic backgrounds and their study areas may not give all the information necessary to evaluate the quality of education in the program, it is expected to give a general idea about the quality of education provided and the efforts made by the faculties to help their students become competent teachers.

IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

1. Questionnaire Survey

1) Teachers' Opinions about Pre-service English Teacher Education

Analysis of data shows that the secondary school teachers are very negative about the pre-service English teacher education they received in their universities. As indicated in Table 2 (See Items 1, 2, & 4), only 9.30% of the respondents are satisfied with the curriculum in their universities, only 6.48% of them think they learned enough in the university, and only 7.41% think the curriculum was well organized. In addition, as many as 81.48% of them think the pre-service teacher education program needs a lot of improvement, and 70.37% think that some courses in the program were not helpful for them to become competent teachers (See Items 3 & 6).

TABLE 2

English Teachers' Opinions about Pre-service Teacher Education (N=108)

It. #	Content of Item	Mean (SD)	Frequency of Responses P (%)	U (%)	N (%)
1	I am satisfied with the pre-service TE system in this country.	2.59 (0.68)	10 (9.30)	46 (42.59)	52 (48.15)
2	I learned enough during my university days to become a competent teacher.	2.56 (0.69)	7 (6.48)	48 (44.44)	53 (49.07)
3	The pre-service TE system in this country needs a lot of improvement.	3.93 (0.61)	88 (81.48)	18 (16.67)	2 (1.85)
4	The curriculum in my university was well organized to prepare the students to become competent teachers.	2.41 (0.75)	8 (7.41)	37 (34.26)	63 (58.33)
5	Under the current pre-service TE system one can become a teacher without possessing enough teacher techniques.	3.41 (0.95)	57 (52.78)	33 (30.56)	18 (16.67)
6	Among my university courses there were courses not helpful for the students to become competent teachers.	3.69 (0.74)	76 (70.37)	22 (20.37)	10 (9.26)

TE: Teacher Education

2) Teachers' Opinions about In-service English Teacher Education

As Table 3 shows, even though the teachers feel the necessity of the in-service teacher education programs (See Items 7 & 13), they are not so satisfied with the in-service teacher education teacher programs they participated in. This is because the in-service teacher education that they had received lacked a good balance between theory and practice and failed to respond to their needs in the classroom (See Items 8, 9 & 10). In addition, the responses show that the teachers had difficulty in applying what they had learned in those programs in their classroom practice. It seems that in-service teacher educators must take it seriously that as many as 91.67 % of the teachers responded that they would participate in the in-service teacher education program if it is helpful for their teaching, while only 15.74% of them think the in-service program they participated in satisfied their needs (See Items 11 & 12). In addition, in-service teacher educators must recognize that only 11.11% of the teachers responded that they did not experience difficulty in applying what they had learned in the in-service teacher education program in their own classes, while 54.63% of them responded that they did (See Items 11, 12, 14 & 15).

TABLE 3
English Teachers' Opinions about In-service Teacher Education (N=108)

It. #	Content of Item	Mean (SD)	Frequency of Responses P (%)	U (%)	N (%)
7	Teachers need to participate in the in-service TE programs not to fall behind.	3.85 (0.71)	80 (74.07)	24 (22.22)	4 (3.70)
8	The in-service TE programs thus far were helpful in solving the problems in the classroom.	3.01 (0.70)	24 (22.22)	61 (56.48)	23 (21.30)
9	The in-service TE programs thus far kept a good balance between theory and practice.	3.07 (0.75)	27 (25.0)	60 (55.56)	21 (19.44)
10	The in-service TE programs that I participated helped me improve my classes.	3.12 (0.81)	34 (31.48)	52 (48.15)	22 (20.37)
11	If the in-service TE program is helpful for my class, I am willing to participate.	4.25 (0.66)	99 (91.67)	7 (6.48)	2 (1.85)
12	The in-service TE programs that I participated satisfied the teachers' needs.	2.95 (0.62)	17 (15.74)	70 (64.81)	21 (19.44)
13	I tried to avoid the in-service TE programs because I thought they did not help me.	2.57 (0.92)	19 (17.59)	34 (31.48)	55 (50.93)
14	I tried to apply what I learned in the in-service TE programs in my own classes.	3.46 (0.77)	55 (50.93)	43 (39.81)	10 (9.26)
15	I did not have difficulty in applying what I learned in the in-service TE program in my own classes.	2.52 (0.72)	12 (11.11)	37 (34.26)	59 (54.63)

3) Teachers' Opinions about Using English as the Medium of Instruction

Despite the movement toward communicative language teaching (CLT) and the policy makers' efforts to implement it in our English education, it seems that teachers still find it difficult to implement CLT in their contexts. As shown in Table 4, the secondary school English teachers generally do not agree on employing the English-only policy in their classes for the reason that their students cannot cope with the policy. As many as 84.26% of the teachers responded positively to the item that they don't have to employ the English-only policy in their classes (See Items 16, 17 & 19). This suggests that there is a wide gap between the policy makers who try to implement the 'Teaching English in English' and the teachers who have to practice it in their opinions regarding the use of English as a medium of instruction.

Teachers tend to feel comfortable with the teaching strategies they have previously employed and see no real reason to alter them (Hayes, 1995). In order to bring about a real

change in their practice, therefore, it is necessary to let them see the value of the change, which requires a strong theoretical and practical basis. In this respect, the recent educational policy that has encouraged the English teachers to use English as the medium of instruction has not been successful. Policy makers need to realize that policy change and its effect on practice may not be a simple linear relation. To advance communicative language teaching in our English classrooms, practical and constructive suggestions acceptable to the teachers must be generated.

TABLE 4

Teachers' Opinions about Using English as the Medium of Instruction (N=108)

It. #	Content of Item	Mean (SD)	Frequency of Responses P (%)	U (%)	N (%)
16	I agree on the English-only policy in the English classes.	2.19 (0.75)	7 (6.48)	22 (20.37)	79 (73.15)
17	I don't think we have to employ the English-only policy in the English classes.	3.92 (0.70)	91 (84.26)	10 (9.26)	7 (6.48)
18	The English-only policy helps the students develop listening/speaking ability.	3.16 (0.81)	42 (38.89)	41 (37.96)	25 (23.15)
19	My students are able to cope with the English-only policy.	2.19 (0.74)	5 (4.63)	26 (24.07)	77 (71.30)
20	The English-only policy has more negative effects than positive effects.	3.43 (0.82)	51 (47.22)	43 (39.81)	14 (12.96)

4) Teachers' Opinions about Themselves, Their Colleagues, and Their Schools

As can be noticed in Table 5, even though the teachers see the need to teach communicatively, they do not seem to practice it successfully enough partly due to their own lack of competence (See Items 21, 22 & 23). The result also shows that even though most teachers understand that teacher cooperation in the same school is crucial for a systematic and effective education, they are not very successful in this matter. Only 29.63% of the teachers responded that they are cooperative with each other (See Items 25 & 26). Another finding is that the teachers in many secondary schools do not have enough support from the administrators in their schools (See Item 27). This is very unfortunate considering that the cooperation among the teachers and support from the administrators are crucial for a systematic and effective education in a given school. What seems interesting is that despite the teachers' recognition of their lack of competence and lack of cooperation among the teachers and support from the administrators, not a few teachers still feel that they are providing their students with the most effective education possible.

TABLE 5

Teachers' Opinions about Themselves, Their Colleagues, and the School (N=108)

It. #	Content of Item	Mean (SD)	Frequency of Responses P (%)	U (%)	N (%)
21	I try to use as much English as possible in my classes.	3.43 (0.82)	58 (53.70)	34 (31.48)	16 (14.81)
22	I use more English than Korean in my classes.	2.76 (0.88)	20 (18.52)	42 (38.89)	46 (42.60)
23	I am familiar with various teacher techniques to teach my classes communicatively.	2.95 (0.68)	22 (20.37)	59 (54.63)	27 (25.0)
24	My English is good enough to employ the English-only policy in my classes.	3.11 (0.69)	29 (26.85)	62 (57.41)	17 (15.74)
25	Teacher cooperation in the same school is crucial for a systematic and effective education.	4.04 (0.64)	90 (83.33)	17 (15.74)	1 (9.26)
26	In my school the English teachers are cooperative with each other.	3.18 (0.83)	32 (29.63)	55 (50.93)	21 (19.44)
27	The administrators in my school are helpful in improving the quality of English education.	2.66 (0.82)	18 (16.67)	41 (37.96)	49 (45.37)
28	My school provides the students with the most effective English education in the current situation.	3.28 (0.80)	47 (43.52)	44 (40.74)	17 (15.74)

5) Comparison between Middle School and High School Teachers

The result of the comparison between middle school and high school English teachers in their opinions about the teacher education and related issues is introduced in Appendix A. As indicated in Appendix A there are similarities and differences between the two groups. The similarities seem to result from their similar experiences with pre-service and in-service English teacher education programs, while the differences seem to result from their experience with the students of different school levels. As well known, high school teachers cannot ignore the College Scholastic Ability Test (CSAT) and they must feel it more difficult to adjust their teaching to communicative language teaching than middle school teachers do.

The result also shows that the high school teachers are generally more negative about the in-service English teacher education than middle school teachers reflecting that it does not help them teach their students whose main goal of English learning is to obtain a good score in the CSAT. That is, high school teachers generally feel that the in-service teacher education, which mostly focuses on communicative language teaching, does not help them

very much. This result shows that even the same educational policy may or may not work depending on the teaching/learning context.

2. Secondary School Pre-service English Teacher Education Programs

1) The Curriculum

As indicated in Table 6, different universities have different percentages of courses offered in different study areas, suggesting that the curriculums of the secondary school pre-service English teacher education programs are different from school to school and the teacher candidates in different parts of the country receive different educations.

TABLE 6

Courses in the Secondary School English Teacher Education Programs in Universities

	E. Education # (%)	Linguistics # (%)	E. Literature # (%)	General E. # (%)	TOTAL # (%)
U1	4 (13.79%)	9 (31.03%)	11 (37.93%)	5 (17.24%)	29 (100%)
U2	9 (24.32%)	11 (29.73%)	9 (24.32%)	8 (21.62%)	37 (100%)
U3	7 (21.88%)	6 (18.75%)	11 (34.38%)	8 (25.0%)	32 (100%)
U4	14 (36.84%)	5 (13.16%)	3 (7.89%)	16 (42.11%)	38 (100%)
U5	11 (27.50%)	5 (12.50%)	12 (30.0%)	12 (30.0%)	40 (100%)
U6	7 (25.0%)	6 (21.43%)	10 (35.71%)	5 (17.86%)	28 (100%)
M #	8.67	7.0	9.33	9.0	34
(%)	(24.89%)	(21.10%)	(28.37%)	(25.64%)	(100%)

U: University, E: English, M #: Mean number

Among the courses offered in the programs, the mean number of English Education courses is 8.67 (24.89%), whereas that of Linguistics courses is 7.0 (21.10%), that of English Literature courses is 9.33 (28.37%), and that of General English courses is 9.0 (25.64%). These numbers and percentages do not provide any exact information about the courses that individual students in the program actually take because they include both the required and elective courses. However, they seem to be enough to show that despite the national efforts made thus far to reform them, the curriculums in the teacher education programs still include too many courses in Linguistics and Literature areas. This is very unfortunate in that even though some knowledge in those areas is also necessary, it causes lack of time for teaching what are considered to be more necessary and helpful to the teachers in the classroom.

2) Academic Backgrounds and Study Areas of the Faculty Members

As indicated in Table 7, the academic backgrounds and study areas of the faculty members in the teacher education programs cannot be said to be ideal. The percentage of the faculty members specializing in study areas other than English Education is simply too high. Only 30 % of the faculty members in the six universities are Ph.D. degree holders in English education. And there are not a few faculty members who do not have any background in English Education. For instance, 5 out of 9 faculty members in University 2 and 4 out of 7 in University 6 have no background in English Education throughout their undergraduate and graduate studies. What is more surprising is that none of the four faculty members in University 3 has chosen English Education as their study area, even though all of them hold a BA degree in English Education and currently teach in the department of English education (See Appendix B for details).

TABLE 7

Academic Backgrounds and Study Areas of the Faculty Members

	BA				MA			Ph.D.			Study Area		
	EE	LS	EL	OA	EE	LS	EL	EE	LS	EL	EE	LS	EL
U1 (N=8)	7	1	0	0	4	2	2	3	3	2	3	3	2
U2 (N=9)	4	0	5	0	2	3	4	3	2	4	3	2	4
U3 (N=4)	4	0	0	0	1	2	1	0	2	2	0	2	2
U4 (N=6)	2	0	3	1	2	0	4	2	2	2	2	2	2
U5 (N=6)	2	0	4	0	3	0	3	3	0	3	3	0	3
U6 (N=7)	3	0	4	0	1	3	3	1	3	3	2	2	3
Mean # (%) of EE	3.67 (55.0%)				2.17 (32.50%)			2.0 (30.0%)			2.17 (32.50%)		

The faculty members in the teacher education programs must take into a serious consideration the content of their teaching and see if they are really helping the prospective teachers. It must be borne in mind that for the development of specific teaching skills and strategies, theory alone does not ensure teachers' mastery of particular techniques.

V. CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

The result of data analyses shows that the secondary school English teachers are satisfied neither with the pre-service nor with the in-service teacher education programs. And it is suspected that a large part of this dissatisfaction results from the inappropriate education provided by the faculty members in the teacher education programs in universities. The conclusion drawn from this study is that the English language teaching profession in this country has a long and arduous task ahead to meet the demands for reform in teacher education. It is argued that teacher development must be conceptualized much more thoroughly than it has been if we want to have it closely related to the educational change we want to bring about. It should not be just a matter of better implementation of selected innovations but more basically, as advocated in Fullen and Hargreaves (1992), a change in the profession of teaching, and in the institutions in which teachers are trained and in which they work.

Our educational policy is mostly top-down, while the reform practice is bottom-up. When the policy-makers are not familiar with what goes on in the schools or when the teachers are not equipped with the necessary knowledge and skills to practice the policy in the right way, the practice of any educational policy, however ideal it may look, is doomed to be a failure. Described in the following are some suggestions made on the secondary school English teacher education and on the role of teacher educators, policy makers and administrators to improve the current situation.

Firstly, the curriculums of the secondary school pre-service English teacher education programs in universities need to include more practical courses, reducing ancillary courses such as those in linguistics and literature. As partly revealed in the analysis of data, not a few faculties in those programs have any academic background in secondary school English teacher education. As such, it often happens that what they study and teach is one thing, while what their students need to learn is another. Efforts must be made in the part of the government as well as the universities to ensure the employment of faculties who can do their job properly as teacher educators.

Secondly, the faculties in the secondary school English teacher education programs in universities need to make efforts to reinvent themselves. It is very unfortunate that there are courses in the programs that are evaluated by their graduates as unhelpful and unnecessary. Given that we need to produce teachers who are equally effective regardless of where they teach and who they teach, it is definitely necessary to establish some kind of national standard to ensure that the teacher educators themselves possess the abilities required to educate the teacher candidates properly. As the little change in the employment of faculties in many universities for several decades suggests, this cannot be accomplished

by the university people alone. The governmental intervention seems inevitable to a certain extent in order to ensure the employment of qualified teacher educators.

Thirdly, it must be guaranteed that the major study area and teaching of any faculty member in the teacher education program, regardless of his/her field of final degree, must be related to teacher education. The professors in English teacher education programs must be different in their study areas as well as their focus of teaching from those in the department of English Language & Literature or Linguistics. We need to remember that simply changing the name of the course from Syntax to Pedagogical Grammar, for instance, cannot make much difference in the quality of education provided to the students when the instructor himself/herself has no intention to change.

Fourthly, since school improvement and teacher development are inextricably related, university-school collaboration is required to improve the quality of education in schools. Unfortunately, however, little collaboration between the two sides exists in our current English teaching profession, often resulting in a serious gap between what the teachers actually do and what they need to do in their classrooms. University faculties must take a more active role for this collaboration to happen and in order to make the collaboration fruitful enough, they must first pay more attention to the problems and difficulties that teachers experience in schools.

Fifthly, in-service teacher education programs must be based on teachers' needs. As shown in the survey result, teachers in schools long for the kinds of in-service programs that can help them to improve their teaching. Also, just as there are individual differences in the students, so are there individual differences in the teachers in terms of their English proficiency, knowledge and teaching skills. A variety of different types of in-service programs responding to the different needs of these teachers must be developed and provided.

Lastly, policy makers and administrators must keep in mind that however good an educational policy may look, it cannot be realized in the schools unless the teachers who have to practice it themselves do not see the value or do not accept it as plausible. We have witnessed in the teaching profession that when the educational policy is top-down only without taking a full consideration of the reality and the difficulties teachers experience, it is doomed to be failure. In order not to waste our energy and time as well as money, policy makers and administrators must be ready to help rather than force the teachers, understanding that it all depends on the teachers in the classroom.

REFERENCES

Bernhardt, E., & Hammadou, J. (1987). A decade of research in foreign language teacher education. *The Modern Language Journal, 71*(3), 289-299.

Chang, S. (2004). Look who's talking? *English Teaching, 59*(2), 3-21.

Chang, K. S. (1999). Approaches to teacher supervision and their implications for pre/in-service language teacher education. *English Teaching, 54*(3), 197-211.

Choi, Y. (2001). Suggestions for the re-organization of English teaching program by native speakers in Korea. *English Teaching, 56*(1), 101-122.

Darling-Hammond, L., & Baratz-Snowden, J. (Eds.) (2005). *A good teacher in every classroom*. The National Academy of Education Committee on Teacher Education. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Day, R. R. (1990). Teacher observation in second language teacher education. In J. C. Richards & D. Nunan (Eds.), *Second language teacher education* (pp. 43-61). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Ellis, R. (1990). Activities and procedures for teacher preparation. In J. C. Richards & D. Nunan (Eds.), *Second language teacher education* (pp. 26-39). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Freeman, D. (1990). Intervening in practice teaching. In J. C. Richards & D. Nunan (Eds.), *Second language teacher education* (pp. 103-118). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Freeman, D., & Johnson, K. E. (1998). Reconceptualizing the knowledge-base of language teacher education. *TESOL Quarterly, 32*(3), 397-417.

Freeman, D., & Richards, J. (1993). Conceptions of teaching and the education of second language teachers. *TESOL Quarterly, 27*(2), 193-216.

Fullen, M., & Hargreaves, A. (1992). Teacher development and educational change. In M. Fullen & A. Hargreaves (Eds.), *Teacher development and education change* (pp. 1-9). Washington, DC: The Palmer Press.

Gebhard, J. G., Gaitan, S., & Oprandy, R. (1990). Beyond prescription: the student teacher as investigator. In J. C. Richards & D. Nunan (Eds.), *Second language teacher education* (pp. 16-25). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Glisan, E. W., & Sullivan, V. J. (1993). Strengthening foreign language teacher preparation through teacher-supervisor exchange. *Foreign Language Annals, 26*(2), 217-225.

Han, H. Y. (2001). Effective teaching strategies for non-native English instructors. *English Teaching, 56*(1), 81-100.

Hayes, D. (1995). In-service teacher development: some basic principles. *ELT Journal, 49*(3), 252-261.

Huebner, T., & Bartolome, L. (1989). Integrating language education, teacher training, and university-school collaboration: A pilot project. *The Modern Language Journal, 73*(1), 23-33.

Johnson, K. E. (1992). Learning to teach: Instructional actions and decisions of preservice ESL teachers. *TESOL Quarterly, 26*(3), 507-535.

Joyce, B., & Showers, B. (1980). Improving in-service training: The messages from research. *Educational Leadership, 37*(5), 379-385.

Jung, Y. S. (2001). Toward an effective EFL teacher development program focusing on multimedia and the Internet. *English Teaching, 56*(4), 141-162.

Kim, E. J. (2002). A study on the quality of good foreign language teachers in EFL contexts. *English Language Teaching, 14*(1), 71-96.

Kim, S. A. (2002). A critical reflection on the 'Teaching English through English' classes in the Korean context. *English Teaching, 57*(4), 315-346.

Kim, S. A. (2005). A call for effective homework assignments in middle school English classes. *English Teaching, 60*(4), 23-46.

Kim, S. A. (2007). The quality of language input as revealed in teacher talks and classroom activities. *Modern English Education, 8*(3), 85-106.

Kim, Y. M. (2002). An analysis of the use of medium of instruction in elementary English classroom. *English Teaching, 57*(4), 387-407.

Kim, Y. O., Kahng, Y. K., & Kang, M. K. (2007). The analysis of the in-service training program for the 1st grade English teacher in a secondary school. *English Language & Literature Teaching, 13*(3), 203-226.

Kim, Y. K., Kahng, Y. K., & Song, H. S. (2008). The study of trainees' satisfaction with in-service training for the qualification of 1st grade English teachers in a secondary school. *English Language & Literature Teaching, 14*(1), 97-122.

Lee, J. H. (1999). Errors in classroom English used by elementary school English teachers and ways of improving them. *English Teaching, 54*(4), 353-371.

Lee, S. B. (2005). Comparison of teacher talks from three different elementary school ESOL teachers. *English Teaching, 60*(2), 161-183.

Lee, S. Y. (2007). Preservice EFL Teachers' perceptions of their student-teaching experiences. *English Teaching, 62*(4), 355-371.

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

Pae, D. B. (2000). The development of teacher education program models for English teachers in elementary and secondary schools. *English Language Teaching, 12*(1), 113-144.

Park, K. N. (2005). An analysis of teacher talk in primary EFL classrooms. *Foreign Languages Education, 12*(3), 323-353.

Park, K. H., & Park, E. S. (2002). A study of the effects of elementary school English teaching through the frequency of a teacher's English use in the classroom. *English Language Teaching, 14*(1), 115-136.

Pennington, M. C. (1990). A professional development focus for the language teaching practicum. In J. C. Richards & D. Nunan (Eds.), *Second language teacher education* (pp. 132-151). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Richards, J. C. (1990). The dilemma of teacher education in second language teaching. In J. C. Richards & D. Nunan (Eds.), *Second language teacher education* (pp. 3-15). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Ryu, Y. S., & Sung, K. W. (2005). Teacher talk in an EFL university classroom. *English Teaching, 60*(1), 41-68.

Seong, G. (2006). Choices they make: How ESL teachers initiate repair in the classroom. *English Teaching, 61*(1), 227-255.

Shuy, R. W. (1981). What the teacher knows is more important than text or test. *Language Arts, 58*(8), 919-929.

Sikes, P. J. (1992). Imposed change and the experienced teacher. In M. Fullen & A. Hargreaves (Eds.), *Teacher development and education change* (pp. 36-55). Washington, DC: The Palmer Press.

Stoll, L. (1992). Teacher growth in the effective school. In M. Fullen & A. Hargreaves (Eds.), *Teacher development and education change* (pp. 104-122). Washington, DC: The Palmer Press.

Thorne, C., & Qiang, W. (1996). Action research in language teacher education. *ELT Journal, 50*(3), 254-262.

Watson, N., & Fullen, M. G. (1992). Beyond school district-university partnership. In M. Fullen, & A. Hargreaves (Eds.), *Teacher development and education change* (pp. 213-242). Washington, DC: The Palmer Press.

Wilbur, M. L. (2007). How foreign language teachers get taught: Methods of teaching the method course. *Foreign Language Annals, 40*(1), 79-101.

Wright, T. (1990). Understanding classroom role relationships. In J. C. Richards & D. Nunan (Eds.), *Second language teacher education* (pp. 82-99). New York: Cambridge University Press.

APPENDIX A

Result of Comparison between Middle School and High School Teachers

It. #	Content of Item	TOTAL (N=108) M.S.(n=38)/ H.S.(n=70) M (SD)	p-value
1	I am satisfied with the pre-service TE system in this country.	2.59 (0.68) 2.71 (0.69) / 2.53 (0.68)	0.1881
2	I learned enough during my university days to become a competent teacher.	2.56 (0.69) 2.68 (0.70) / 2.49 (0.68)	0.1532
3	The pre-service TE system in this country needs a lot of improvement.	3.94 (0.61) 3.89 (0.45) 3.94 (0.68)	0.6959
4	The curriculum in my university was well organized to prepare the students to become competent teachers.	2.41 (0.75) 2.45 (0.72) / 2.39 (0.77)	0.6850
5	Under the current pre-service TE system one can become a teacher without possessing enough teacher techniques.	3.41 (0.95) 3.45 (0.83) / 3.39 (1.01)	0.7484
6	Among my university courses there were courses not helpful for the students to become competent teachers.	3.69 (0.74) 3.76 (0.63) / 3.64 (0.80)	0.4251
7	Teachers need to participate in the in-service TE programs periodically because they are helpful.	3.85 (0.71) 4.03 (0.64) / 3.76 (0.73)	0.0588
8	The in-service TE programs thus far were helpful in solving the problems in the classroom.	3.01 (0.70) 3.24 (0.71) / 2.89 (0.67)	0.0126*
9	The in-service TE programs thus far kept a good balance between theory and practice.	3.07 (0.75) 3.16 (0.64) / 3.02 (0.80)	0.3916
10	The in-service TE programs that I participated helped me improve my classes.	3.12 (0.81) 3.55 (0.72) / 2.89 (0.75)	0.0000*
11	If the in-service TE program is helpful for my class, I am willing to participate.	4.25 (0.66) 4.40 (0.50) / 4.17 (0.72)	0.0920
12	The in-service TE programs that I participated satisfied the teachers' needs.	2.95 (0.62) 3.21 (0.41) / 2.89 (0.63)	0.0049*
13	I tried to avoid the in-service TE programs because I thought they did not help me.	2.57 (0.92) 2.34 (0.71) / 2.70 (0.95)	0.0529
14	I tried to apply what I learned in the in-service TE programs in my own classes.	3.46 (0.77) 3.82 (0.69) / 3.27 (0.74)	0.0003*
15	I did not have difficulty in applying what I learned in the in-service TE program in my own classes.	2.52 (0.72) 2.47 (0.83) / 2.56 (0.81)	0.6132
16	I agree on the English-only policy in the English classes.	2.19 (0.75) 2.31 (0.66) / 2.13 (0.80)	0.2198
17	I don't think we have to employ the English-only policy in the English classes.	3.92 (0.70) 4.0 (0.62) / 3.87 (0.74)	0.3636
18	The English-only policy helps the students develop listening/speaking ability.	3.16 (0.81) 3.26 (0.72) / 3.10 (0.85)	0.3202
19	My students are able to cope with the English-only policy.	2.19 (0.74) 2.0 (0.77) / 2.28 (0.64)	0.0543
20	The English-only policy has more negative effects than positive effects.	3.43 (0.82) 3.32 (0.84) / 3.49 (0.81)	0.3075
21	I try to use as much English as possible in my classes.	3.43 (0.82) 3.87 (0.47) / 3.19 (0.87)	0.0000*

22	I use more English than Korean in my classes.	2.76 (0.88) 2.89 (0.73) / 2.70 (0.95)	0.2752
23	I am familiar with various teacher techniques to teach my classes communicatively.	2.95 (0.68) 3.11 (0.65) / 2.87 (0.68)	0.0856
24	My English is good enough to employ the English-only policy in my classes.	3.11 (0.69) 3.29 (0.61) / 3.01 (0.71)	0.0467*
25	Teacher cooperation is crucial for a systematic and effective English education.	4.04 (0.64) 4.26 (0.60) / 3.91 (0.63)	0.5179
26	In my school the English teachers are cooperative with each other.	3.18 (0.83) 3.55 (0.83) / 2.97 (0.76)	0.0004*
27	The administrators in my school are helpful in improving the quality of English education.	2.66 (0.82) 2.71 (0.84) / 2.63 (0.82)	0.6231
28	My school provides the students with the most effective English education in the current situation.	3.28 (0.80) 3.34 (0.71) / 3.24 (0.84)	0.0538

APPENDIX B

Academic Backgrounds and Study Areas of the Faculty Members

	U1 AB (SA)	U2 AB (SA)	U3 AB (SA)	U4 AB (SA)	U5 AB (SA)	U6 AB (SA)
F1	BEE MEL (EL) PEL	BEE MLS (EE) PEE	BEE MEL (EL) PEL	BEL MEL (LS) PLS	BEE MEE (EE) PEE	BEL MEL (EL) PEL
F2	BEE MEE (EE) PEE	BEE MEE (EE) PEE	BEE MEE (EL) PEL	BEE MEL (LS) PEL	BEL MEL (EL) PEL	BEL MEL (EL) PEL
F3	BEE MEL (EL) PEL	BEE MEE (EE) PEE	BEE MLS (LS) PLS	BEL MEL (EL) PEL	BEL MEL (EL) PEL	BEL MEL (EL) PEL
F4	BEE MEE (LS) PLS	BEL MLS (LS) PLS	BEE MLS (LS) PLS	BEE MEL (EL) PEL	BEE MEE (EE) PEE	BEE MLS (EE) PLS
F5	BEE MEE (EE) PEE	BEL MLS (LS) PLS		BOA MEE (EE) PEE	BEL MEE (EE) PEE	BEL MLS (LS) PLS
F6	BEE MEE (LS) PLS	BEL MEL (EL) PEL		BEL MEE (EE) PEE	BEL MEL (EL) PEL	BEE MEE (EE) PEE
F7	BLS MLS (EE) PEE	BEL MEL (EL) PEL				BEE MLS (LS) PLS
F8	BEE MLS (LS) PLS	BEL MEL (EL) PEL				
F9		BEE MEL (EL) PEL				

U: University, F: Faculty member, AB: Academic Background, SA: Study Area
B: BA degree, M: MA degree, P: Ph.D. degree
EE: English Education, LS: Linguistics, EL: English Literature OA: Other Area
(e.g. BEE: BA degree in English Education, PEL: Ph.D. degree in English Literature)

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

Sung-Ae Kim
Dept. of English Language Education
College of Education, Pusan National University
Jangjeon-dong, Geumjeong-gu
Busan, 609-735, Korea
Tel: (051) 510-2611
Fax: (051) 510-2611
Email: sngkm@pusan.ac.kr

Received in July, 2008
Reviewed in August, 2008
Revised version received in September, 2008