International Journal of

Teaching, Education and Language Learning (IJTELL)

'Methods Matter: Teacher-Trainee Perspectives on Language Teaching Methods in a South Korean TESOL Certificate Program'

Todd Jobbitt

August 2014
Volume 1, Number 1
Pages 38-60

ISSN: 2373-7921 (print)
2373-793X (online)

SAPIENTPRESS

Methods Matter: Teacher-Trainee Perspectives on Language Teaching Methods in a South Korean TESOL Certificate Program

Todd Jobbitt*

Abstract

The purpose of this survey was to ascertain Korean teacher-trainees' perspectives on the awareness, likability, perceived usefulness and prospective application of varied language teaching methods that they had been taught in a sixteen-week language teaching methodology course. What did the students think about these methods? Will students actually try out new methods, or techniques from these methods, in their present or future teaching contexts? Qualitative and quantitative results show that although students overwhelmingly had limited prior exposure to a variety of teaching methods and shared a heavy reliance on a select few methods, there was a strong propensity for future learning using the methods and techniques presented in the course.

Keywords teaching methods, TESOL, teacher-trainee, techniques, perceptions

Acknowledgements: This work was supported by Hankuk University of Foreign Studies Research Fund of 2014.

* Assistant Professor, Hankuk University of Foreign Studies, Seoul, South Korea, Email: todd.jobbitt@gmail.com

Introduction

The number of non-native English-speaking teachers of English (NNESTs) is constantly growing worldwide (Edwards, 2007), and this is extremely true in in the more localized context of South Korean TESOL programs. The journey for teacher-trainees is not without its own challenges - students entering TESOL certificate programs in South Korea invariably display vast differences in teaching experience - from none at all to being seasoned public school teachers. Regardless of their teaching background, most of these students have experienced a very top-down style of classroom learning, generally based on Grammar Translation Method, with an emphasis on cramming for the 순눙 (su-noong), the equivalent of the American SAT.

Also, due to constant test preparation, English is mostly studied more than spoken, and conversation skills resultantly suffer. Conversely, GTM and other methods aside, Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) still appears to "have the highest rate in familiarity, preference and use" (Lui, 1999: p. 1), and has progressively advanced over the past two decades, in both Korean and global ESL teaching contexts, with continued evolution of second language learning processes (Richards, 2006). So much so, that Bax (as cited in Karakis, 2013) noted that a country not using CLT is a country that is not progressing. This survey, though being more local in scope, broadly meets these proclamations. Additional research in other contexts (Liao and Zhao, 2012) and applications or processes (Zainuddin, et. al, 2011; Ohata, 2007) underpins these survey results. The concerns in this survey examined how familiar students were with methods and techniques presented in a TESOL training program methodology class, how useful trainees found the method sand techniques to be, and the likelihood of the students to use the methods and techniques in future teaching contexts.

Literature Review

Most TESOL program attendees in Korea are primarily exposed to Communicative Language Teaching (CLT), albeit superficially. The point is that, although a strong lip service of CLT popularity has been proclaimed, there is still actually a highly limited exposure to CLT and a variety of other teaching methods in general teaching contexts. This may create teaching challenges for these students upon enrollment in a TESOL program and after graduation. How can a student trust or believe in newer methods when the exposure is entirely new?

One major obstacle that new students in a teacher-training program face is how to exploit their own past learning experiences. In 1975, to help students understand how their own past learning experiences enabled a pre-service context, Dan Lortie (as cited in Borg, 2004) first introduced the term "apprenticeship of observation" in reference to how student teachers have already amassed thousands of hours in school observing and assessing teachers prior to joining a training program. That past experience had offered broad support for how prior learning could affect teacher-trainees and has been heralded as an important and formative aspect (Larsen-Freeman & Anderson, 2011, p. *xi*) that can help support student teachers in their learning processes. According to Pajares (as cited by Sanches, 2013), this school learning can further present challenges when transitioning to teacher training.

Although Lortie's "apprenticeship of observation" was significant in its time, newer research suggests that it is a term now become malleable, especially in terms of student beliefs prior to entering into a teacher-training program. Sanches (2013, p. 2) crisply summarizes a major challenge to pre-training beliefs by declaring "…it is not surprising that teacher education courses have been observed to exert little or no impact on the development of such beliefs." Mewborn and Tyminski (2006) note the pratfalls of this viewpoint but assert that micro

analyzing specific incidents from past schooling can help trainees break away from a reliance on only past teaching exposure.

An additional trial for trainees is that of determining how teacher actions support teacher thinking and how the act of teaching is carried out in the language classroom via select methods and techniques, as lately the terminology has morphed into being less about methods and more of how the methods are conceptualized (Liu, 2004). This dynamic is further evidenced by the term *teacher cognition*, research that "has helped capture the complexities of who teachers are, what they know and believe, how they learn to teach, and how they carry out their work in diverse contexts throughout their careers" (Johnson, 2012, p. 236), this a loosened layering of her broader definition to this more-limited survey population. Further, a deeper look into what background knowledge these future language teachers bring to the program and how this knowledge is influenced by various social, cultural, historic and political contexts (Cross, 2006) needs to be researched. If this were done at even an individual student level, this could be a key step to helping teacher trainees understand what they themselves bring to the learning classroom and how it can impact their learning and teaching practices in future contexts.

Methodology and Result

Setting and Participants

The student sample in this study was drawn from two language teaching methodology courses in a TESOL Certificate Program, hosted at a major Seoul university campus. The sample comprised a total of 10 out of 27 students solicited, for a response rate of 37%. The survey was given at the end of the term after all course requirements were fulfilled. This low sample rate was not unexpected, as trainees had additional course obligations such as final lesson planning and

microteaching responsibilities. The amount of submissions was deemed adequate for this survey. Nine questions were asked:

Questions asked in the survey
1. How much prior ESL teaching experience do you have?
2. Prior to this course, I had heard about (methods):
3. Prior to this course, my experience with each method was:
4. List the five methods you like most from this course:
5. Will you try any of these methods in your future teaching?
6. Why are you more likely to use the above methods?
7. Which techniques will you try in your present or future teaching context?
8. Why (or why not) will you try these techniques in your future teaching?
9. How will you find out more information about teaching methods after this class?

Table 1: Survey questions

The majority of the students were female (nine), with one male response. The ages of the trainees varied from the mid-twenties to mid-thirties. All trainees had at minimum an undergraduate degree.

Prior ESL teaching experience

There were three main categories related to prior ESL teaching experience: zero experience, some experience, and solid experience. Overall, the participants fell mainly into two of three categories: zero experience, and solid experience with the methods. Five students had from zero-to-six months teaching experience, while two students had from between six to twelve months teaching experience; three students had taught ESL for over three years. These results mirror an

observable teaching experience pattern in this TESOL program over the past five years, but this is the first time this data has been verified.

Awareness of each method prior to the course

Awareness of each teaching method prior to the course varied greatly. The question "Prior to this methods course, I had heard (not studied) about the following:" was used, with variable results. The outcome varied among the eleven methods from which students were able to choose. Two of the ten students had heard about Grammar Translation Method (GTM), Silent Way (SW), Suggestopedia (SUG), Content-based Instruction (CBI) and Task-based Language Teaching (TBLT). Three of the ten students had heard about Audio-lingual Method (ALM), Community Language Learning (CLL), and Communicative Language Teaching (CLT). Four of the ten students had heard about The Direct Method (DM) and Total Physical Response (TPR), while none of the students had heard about the Participatory Approach.

Experience with each method prior to the course

The range of experience as a classroom student or teacher varied from no experience, to limited experience, to solid experience with the method. Table 2 (below) illustrates these findings. The first category dealt with a lack of experience in the methods; thus, results were mixed. Six teacher-trainees had zero experience using SUG and CLL; five had no experience teaching with TBLT and PA; four had a lack of experience with TPR and CBI, and three had no practice whatsoever with CLT. It is interesting to note here that CLT is therefore contrariwise among the most well-known of the methods, which may indicate an increased likelihood to implement CLT in future classroom teaching contexts, a loosely ascribed assentation of Karakis's (2013) CLT study with Turkish students and teachers.

The second category dealt with use or experience as an ESL student. In terms of the ten teacher-trainees using these methods in a student capacity, most had limited experience with the majority of methods presented: five of the ten had used GTM; four students overall had some experience with ALM, and DM, while three students had experienced using CBI, CLT, PA and TPR; two students had limited exposure to CLL, SUG, and TBLT, respectively, as a student.

The third category dealt with trainees having used these methods *in a classroom teaching capacity;* these were the least represented in overall experience, not an unusual finding given the lack of general experience the majority of trainees have with teaching methods prior to joining a TESOL program. Three trainees had used CLT and TBLT; two trainees had practiced using CBI, DM and TPR in the classroom, while one trainee had direct experience teaching in ALM, CLL and GTM. None of the trainees had any classroom teaching experience using the Participatory Approach, the Silent Way or Suggestopedia.

Previous experience with each method prior to taking the course:			
Method	1. Trainees with zero use with method as a student or teacher	2. Trainees with limited use with method as a student	3. Trainees with solid use with method in a teacher capacity
ALM	3	4	1
CBI	4	3	2
CLL	6	2	1
CLT	3	3	3
DM	3	4	2
GTM	3	5	1

PA	5	3	0
SUG	6	2	0
SW	4	0	0
TBLT	5	2	3
TPR	4	3	2

Table 2: Previous experience with each method prior to course

Most-liked methods at course-end

Teacher-trainees were asked to choose and rank the five methods that they most liked out of the eleven methods. In this methodology course, the choices were not wholly unsurprising; students primarily favored CLT and TBLT over other select methods. As Table 3a (below) illustrates, four students selected CLT as a top choice; three chose DM, while two picked TPR, and one took CBI. As a second choice, there was a three-way tie among CLT, ALM and SUG, with two trainees each preferring these methods, respectively. TBLT, CBI and DM were each ranked as second, individually for the remaining slots. Third-ranked choices stood at two each for TBLT, TPR and CLT, with one selection each for DM, SW, PA and CLL. The fourth individual rankings were four for CBI, two for ALM, and one each for PA, TBLT, CLT and CLL. Fifth and final selections among trainees favored TBLT four times, DM twice, while TPR, GTM, TBLT, PA and CLL were each ranked fifth individually amongst the trainees.

Five most-liked methods by teacher-trainees (TT) at course end									
TT 1	**TT 2**	**TT 3**	**TT 4**	**TT 5**	**TT 6**	**TT 7**	**TT 8**	**TT 9**	**TT 10**
CLT	TPR	CLT	CLT	CLL	DM	CLT	ALM	TPR	DM
TBLT	CLT	CBI	DM	CLT	ALM	TBLT	SUG	SUG	ALM

DM	TBLT	TPR	TBLT	TPR	SW	PA	CLL	CLT	CLT
CBI	PA	ALM	CBI	CBI	TBLT	ALM	CLT	CBI	TPR
TPR	DM	DM	GTM	TBLT	PA	CLL	TBLT	TBLT	TBLT

Table 3a: Most-liked methods by trainees at course end

Overall results of the five most-liked methods by TT's at course end										
CLT	TBLT	TPR	DM	CBI	ALM	PA	CLL	SUG	SW	GTM
9	9	6	6	4	4	3	3	2	1	1

Table 3b: Results of Table 3a

Of all the methods in the chart, the most-represented methods were overwhelmingly CLT and TBLT, with each being represented nine times, respectively. Intriguingly, these two methods are very nearly split in terms of likability, with CLT garnering the top position four times, and TBLT garnering the fifth (last) position four times; CLT is represented eight times in the top-three positions, with TBLT represented eight times in the lower-three positions, a near equal split. The Direct Method was a chummy third. Given the popularity of CLT in Korean teaching contexts, this positive likability is not unexpected, a result mirrored in Liu and Shi's (2007) analysis of four common methods. Additionally, although TBLT ranks lower on trainees' likability meter, its prevalence in the charts is perhaps indicative that TBLT may rival the popularity of CLT in future Korean contexts. Future research in which to participate in this regard could reveal interesting findings.

Likelihood to try methods in future teaching contexts

Most of the trainees in this course stated a preference for trying out the methods that were presented. The written responses to the question "Will you try any of these methods in your

future teaching?" was generally positive, with a few minor detractors, and results varied from favorable to less-than-favorable, method to method. Most of the respondents expressed a strong familiarity with certain methods, for example:

> I get (sic) used to CLT (more) than TPR. My professors including foreign professors would use authentic materials such as newspaper (sic)), journal in the USA and in CLT, the role-play was the common way of teaching students in my university. So, I was accustomed to it. (TT2)

> This is definitely the best methods (sic) I know. The reason is it gives the most chance of speaking to Ss. I believe that the best method to learn real language is using it repeatedly and the method follow it well. Furthermore, because of the features of the method, target languages have to be very authentic, which is vital for real language. (TT4)

Another student summarily expressed her fondness for CLT's practicality, as well as its capacity for building rapport among ESL classroom students:

> Class activities (tasks) are authentic. By using authentic materials students can be exposed to the real world language and they may use (it) right away. And also, there are lots of group works (sic) that help students to integrate to each other. (TT1)

Additionally, TT4 asserts that CLT may indirectly help with student motivation: "in the classroom CLT often takes the form of pair and group work requiring negotiation and cooperation between learners, fluency-based activities that encourage learners to develop their self confidence." TT7 echoes this opinion by stating that "the activities in CLT resemble that of the real world. So students can learn how to speak English, not the knowledge about the language" while TT9 proclaims a broader focus that reflects the present CLT paradigm of English as a Global Language, saying, "English is a tool of communication. Communication is

the aim of learning English. For this reason, I think English class should focus on communicative competence."

This weightier awareness of communicative competence by the above respondents, coupled with a lighter awareness of how motivation may influence classroom learning offers support to Nunan (as cited in Abassies, 2011, p. 2) in his argument that:

> The teachers need to be aware that motivation is a consideration in determining whether or not learners are willing to communicate. Clearly the more meaningful the materials and the tasks are for the learners involved the better the outcome will be.

Other methods were favored among the respondents, like TBLT:

> Students are encouraged to complete tasks on their own by communicating (with) each other. I believe it also boosts students' motivation. Therefore, using this method to a proper class (based on students' age/level) will be very helpful. (TT1)

Lastly, The Direct Method was chosen by some for its perceived compatibility with more traditional and present teaching techniques found in Korean classroom teaching:

> The Direct Method is also close to the English education in Korea. Each task in DM includes writing, conversation practice, fill-in-the-blanks, dictation and so on. Korean (sic) have done this task for a long time. It seems that they are able to accept DM. (TT2)

This perspective also includes CLT, although the application of The Direct Method may have less to do with familiarity and more to do with the teaching context; the context lines appear to be somewhat ambiguous, however:

> The reason I chose this method for second is because it resembles CLT most. If I need to choose one between CLT and DM, it will be tough because those seem complementary to each other to me. I think teachers can select one by the context. (TT4)

Reasons for methods choices to be used in future teaching contexts

A multiple-choice response was presented for the question, "Why are you more likely to use the above methods as a result of taking this course?" The options offered:

- π because of how the teacher role is defined
- π because of how the learner role is defined
- π because of how the syllabus is defined
- π because of how the instructional materials are defined
- π because of how the techniques operate within the teaching method

The main results fell into two categories, the first: *because of how the teacher role is defined,* and last: *because of how the techniques operate within the teaching method* reasons. These results are not unsurprising because the majority of teacher-trainees (1) have no ESL classroom teaching experience (see section 3.2) and, (2) show an awfully limited awareness of learner roles based on the top-down Korean learning context (heavily GTM-influenced), which is compounded by a lack of variety in syllabi (evidenced by the cramming for exams), and finally, (3) are exposed to lack of variety in instructional or supplementary material, due to heavy exam preparation. An important note here is that this cramming is the predominant pattern at the middle school and secondary level; it is less so for the elementary school level context (Jobbitt, 2012).

Likeliness to try method techniques in future teaching

Sixty-eight techniques from the ten given methods (ALM, CLL, CLT, DM, GTM, PA, SW, SUG, TBLT, TPR) were presented for the question: "Will you try any of these techniques in your future teaching?" Resultantly, the results covered a broad spectrum. The techniques most favored fell under three main methods: CLT, TBLT, and DM, a confirmation of the results in

Table 3b. The CLT techniques most likely to be used by teacher-trainees in future contexts were ranked as follows: authentic materials (7 TTs), picture-strip story (6 TTs), role-play (6 TTs); five students each chose scrambled sentences and language games, respectively. For TBLT, the techniques most likely to used in future teaching contexts were: information-gap tasks (7 TTs), opinion-gap tasks (5 TTs) and reasoning-gap tasks (4 TTs). DM techniques that are likely to be practiced were: fill-in-the-blanks exercises (7), dictation (7), conversation practice (5), question-and-answer exercises (4), 'reading aloud', 'getting students to self correct' and 'paragraph writing' (3 apiece), followed by 'map drawing' (2).

Other techniques favored by the students fell under a range of different methods. The top three favored techniques from other individual methods included: ALM, with multiple-slot-substitution drills (4), 'chain' and 'transformation' drills (3 each), and 'dialogue memorization' (3). For CBI, the choices were dictogloss (6), graphic organizers (4), and process writing (3) while for CLL, small group tasks (4), reflective listening (2), and transcription (1) were the favorites. For SUG, peripheral learning (5) and role-play (5) and new identity (1) were chosen. Lastly, peer correction (3), self-correction (2), and the use of rods (1) were most likely to be tried from the Silent Way.

Reasons why TT is likely to try a technique in future teaching

Trainees chose techniques for a variety of reasons, from agreeable past learning experience, to strong projection. This latter point is understandable given the results of sections 3.2 and 3.3 (above). For example, TT1 asserts a hopeful opinion concerning the Direct Method by arguing that she can successfully apply it in her ESL classroom: "Learning target language in (the) target language will be very effective way. Because students can think and talk by using TL without translation." Further, she comments on Content-based Instruction: "Students can be

exposed by English and contents as well. This enable (sic) student to improve language skills and broaden their knowledge too." These prognostications will hopefully be reinforced with solid classroom experience. TT3, furthermore, offers a blend of viewpoints (past teaching experience coupled with a projected analysis) for using authentic materials (CLT), saying:

> When I prepare authentic material students do speaking activity (sic) effectively. Especially English summer camp will be fun and exciting topic such as ordering food in the restaurant, shopping day, hotel reservation, like more authentic situation. (TT3)

A majority of student comments mirrored TT3's comments. For instance, TT10 replied, "I'm entirely sure that bring the authentic materials to the class helps (students) learn the language more strongly and effectively," while another student contributed a more thorough explanation:

> Using authentic materials are (sic) helpful to get (students) to be involved in the class actively and motivate them to learn. When I actually did some activities during the class that I was really interested and I wanted to know, I found that I really enjoyed them and felt (that a lot was learned) after the activities. I might choose and adopt (sic) newspapers, books, or any other materials that are just issued and appropriate to the levels and ages of the (students). (TT8)

It would be remiss to not include trainee comments about role-play, from CLT and Suggestopedia. Role-play is a favored activity/technique among Korean ESL teacher and student populations, an observation supported by Tompkins (1998), when she stated that role playing and simulation unquestionably promote personal relationships and help foster social communication, a point well reinforced in Korean ESL contexts. Based on this author's past ESL teaching experience, role-play allows Korean ESL students to step outside bound cultural and societal roles, allowing for stronger language production in that specific ESL context. Likewise,

classroom dynamics may be enabled further through role-play. TT8 offers a powerful opinion in support, stating:

> This is the technique that I think (is) the most powerful and interesting way for all the Ss to be active and make them have their own part in the class. A lot of productive skills like speaking and listening will go around while doing the role-play and Ss can learn from each other. Learning by doing a game is really useful and comfortable way to do in the class. (TT8)

TT4 proffers curt support, arguing that "the more practice (with role play) guarantees the better language ability," and that the results can be more beneficial "when everyone participates and plays their own role."

Although a few of the techniques chosen were less represented in the survey, student comments on the techniques were compelling both for and against classroom use. For instance, from the Silent Way, peer correction was chosen only three times by the ten trainees, with TT4 stating, "The best way of learning is to teaching (sic) in every study. This is one of the most powerful techniques, and students can even use this techniques (sic) outside of class without a teacher." The last sentence from this comment can show students what they have actually retained, a point reinforced by Doff (as cited in Tomkova, 2013) when he asserted that student's errors help by showing what students have and have not absorbed, and that therefore, those errors can be seen in a positive manner, lighting the way for what still needs to be taught to the students by the teacher.

This perspective may be underscored by the trainee's desire to see this technique used in fulfillment of authentic CLT processes, given the preference for CLT in the survey, and Korean teaching contexts in general. TT9, on the other hand, expressed a more practical observation

concerning why peer correction may not always be suitable: "Some students don't want to get correction in front of other students. It could make them embarrassed."

Embarrassment can indeed be troublesome for students, especially in a strongly Confucian-led country like South Korea, and TT9's perspective is reinforced by Sultana (2009) as a potential problem: "In speaking, when one student corrects his/her friend's errors, the issue becomes one of embarrassment" and … additionally, peers may not want to correct a friend's errors because it may negatively impact their relationship," (p. 3) although Sultana well illustrates the positive effects of peer correction. Rollinson's principles behind peer feedback (as cited in Sultana, 2009), explain that peer feedback is "less threatening than teacher feedback" (p. 2) and "makes the classroom atmosphere more supportive and friendlier," (p. 2) all of which may hold true depending on the classroom context and other variables.

Lastly, ALM techniques were quite well liked. Slot, backward build-up, and transformation drills were most favored, along with question-and-answer drills. TT8 gives her opinion:

> Single/multiple-slot Substitution Drill: This technique is (sic) excellent way for the Ss to understand the structure of sentences naturally by making them practice (sic) same patterns a lot. It is even adoptable for the middle and high school (students) of nowadays in Korea where teachers usually focus on grammatical rules during the class, I think. (TT8)

TT2 suggested how drilling may lessen interference between first and second grammar production, declaring "Drill(s) can stop students from doing grammatical errors while they are saying the target language. It seems to be so clear."

Techniques most favored by teacher-trainees			
Method	Techniques most-favored		
CLT	authentic materials	picture strip story	role-play
TBLT	info-gap tasks	opinion-gap tasks	reasoning-gap tasks
DM	fill-in-the-blanks	dictation	conversation practice
ALM	multiple-slot substitution drills	chain drills, transformation drills	dialog memorization
CBI	Dictogloss	graphic organizers	process writing
CLL	small-group tasks	reflective listening	transcription
SUG	peripheral learning	role-play	new identity
SW	peer correction	self-correction	rods

Table 4: Techniques most favored by teacher-trainees

Pursuit of additional knowledge regarding methods

Teacher-trainees entering a TESOL course are usually highly motivated and genuinely want to expand their classroom teaching capabilities. This outlook can serve them well both during the program and after graduation, hence the survey question, "How will you find out more information about teaching methods after finishing this class?" The responses generally validated this observation. The options trainees could choose from were: attend conferences, read ESL books, read ESL journals, read ESL forums, read ESL blogs and "other." The overwhelming number one reason chosen was books (selected nine times), followed by blogs (six times) and conferences (selected twice). "Other" suggestions ranged from the hopeful "try to keep in touch with teachers in education" (TT 2), to the practical, "review the textbook or watch teaching demo video" (TT 10), to the optimistic: "attend graduate school" (TT8). Hopefully, these trainees will be able to embrace new methods and techniques in their future learning contexts as they further develop in the field of English language teaching (ELT) and let go of outdated practices. A strong first step in this direction offered by Williams (2013, p. 12) would be to first help trainees clarify their beliefs concerning

> teaching and learning – beliefs that were set long before they entered their first methodology class – and to encourage them to elaborate a principled set of techniques to replace the intuitive sense of what teaching techniques work that so many teachers developed long ago largely based on their own "apprenticeship of observation,"

which may help balance the trainees' former knowledge, supported with a clear rationale behind the teaching paradigm. This is important, Mewborn and Tyminski (2006) assert, because students are not necessarily "in a position to be reflective and analytical about what they see, nor do they necessarily have cause to do so," (p. 1) even in a teacher-trainee program.

Final observations for additional study

There are several revealing observations that have arisen as a result of this study. First, the fact that only two students (20%) mentioned having heard about GTM as a teaching method prior to joining the class may reveal that Korean students are simply overly-involved in the learning process, i.e., cramming for exams, to care much about how they are being taught English. However, this seeming lack of awareness is belied by the fact that among the teacher-trainees' favorite methods as presented in the course, CLT, the most proactive and popular method in ESL classroom use, was chosen four times as a top choice, while TPR and The Direct Method were each chosen twice as a top choice; this is s 2:1 ratio (see *Table 2a*). For second-favorite, CLT matched ALM, SUG and TBLT, each having been chosen twice. These results clearly show the popularity of and preference for CLT by trainees in this course. In the top three choices, CLT was preferred over DM by an eight to three ration, a likability finding matched in a survey by Lui (2004), albeit with native speakers.

A second observation involves CBI and TBLT. These were among the least favored methods, (ranking majorly fourth and fifth) with the teacher-trainees. Additional follow-up on

why these two language-teaching methods were the least-liked could reveal certain interesting teacher-trainee perspectives. It may be that the genuine lack of teaching experience that most trainees enter the course without could be a reason, as these two methods are student-centered after initial teacher introduction. It may also be that using authentic materials, or even choosing authentic materials, along with the seemingly intense preparation that these two methods require, are reasons why they are viewed in such a negative light. Materials selection and preparation are areas for further study.

A third observation regards the representation of CLT and TBLT. Although at very nearly opposite ends of the chart, the data may suggest that the trainees could choose both of these methods as their classroom experience expands. This can be an area of further study, the *how* and *when* a newly graduated trainees develop the wherewithal to work with alternative methods to meet student needs in the ESL classroom. One possible effort to support this point would be to consider helping new trainees find ways to exploit their past learning experiences in a more focused manner, as they are now in a program that is helping to guide and shape their teaching practices. Bailey's observation (2001, p. 24) regarding Luft and Ingram's Johari Window framework that "awareness involves both a moment (the act of becoming aware) and a state (being aware)," could dovetail nicely as this past learning experience is exposed.

Fourth, given Korean public school students' strong feelings against public school methods like GTM versus well-liked private-school methods like CLT, it is suitable to note an observation by Abassi (2011) from his study of public versus private sector teaching in India. He says "the ELT teachers of the public sector are more inclined to apply the teaching strategies of GTM (Grammar Translation Method) while Private sector teachers are interested in

Communicative Teaching Approach Strategies" (p. 1). This is perchance an item for future research limited in scope to this privately funded teacher-trainee population in Korea.

Conclusion

With demand for English teachers still impressively high in South Korea, it is unlikely that the typical TESOL certificate program enrollee will change, as most students have zero-to-limited exposure to teaching methods and hardly any teaching experience, hence the reason for joining a TESOL program in the first place. This is perhaps unfortunate, but it is a reflection of reality, albeit one that is slowly changing as private academy teachers and public school teachers continue to upgrade their classroom teaching skills and certifications.

This study is a step toward understanding how much awareness and exposure former public and private university students have to alternative teaching methodology in basic English as a Second Language (ESL) classrooms prior to joining a TESOL training program, and how those perceptions were impacted by not only how well the trainees liked each method, but also by how useful the varied language teaching methods were thought to be by each trainee in their future teaching contexts.

References

Abassies, A.M. (2011). A survey of teaching strategies in the ESL classroom. *Language in India*, *11*, 313-329. Retrieved from: http://www.languageinindia.com/nov2011/abbasieslsurveyfinal.html

Bailey, K., Curtis, A., & Nunan, D. (2001) *Pursuing professional development: The self as source*. Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle

Borg, M. (2004). The apprenticeship of observation. *ELT Journal, Volume 58(3) July*, 274. Oxford University Press

Cross, R. (2006). Identity and language teacher education: The potential for sociocultural perspectives in researching language teacher identity. Paper presented at the symposium *Languages, Teaching and Education: Issues, challenges, and perspective in languages teaching and language teacher education*, Adelaide, Australia, 27-30. Retrieved from http://www.finchpark.com/courses/grad-dissert/articles/identity/Identity-language-teacher-education.pdf

Edwards, S. (2007). *Experiences and perceptions of non-native-speaker teacher trainees on a TESOL program in New Zealand*. Waikato Institute of Technology, New Zealand. Retrieved from: http://researcharchive.wintec.ac.nz/1353/

Jobbitt, T. (2012, December). Teachers' self-perceptions on the teaching of English in English (TEE): Ability versus usefulness. In conference *Issues in Foreign Language Education.* Conference conducted at Hankuk University of Foreign Studies, Seoul, Korea. Retrieved from conference proceedings.

Johnson, K. E. (2006). The sociocultural turn and its challenges for second language teacher education. *TESOL Quarterly 40*(1), 235-237. doi: 10.2307/40264518

Karakas, A. (2013). Is communicative language teaching a panacea in ELT? Student and teacher perspectives. *Journal of Second and Multiple Language Acquisition 1(1)*, 1-20. Retrieved from: http://journal.science-

res.com/index.php?journal=JSMULA&page=article&op=view&path%5B%5D=2&path%5B%5D=1

Ohata, K. (2007). Teacher development or training?: Recent developments in second/foreign language teacher education. *Language Research Bulletin, 22*. Retrieved from: http://web.icu.ac.jp/lrb/volume-22.html

Larsen-Freeman, D., & Anderson, M. (2011). *Techniques and Principles in Language Teaching*, (*xi*). Oxford University Press

Liao, J., & Zhao, D. (2012). Grounded theory approach to beginning teachers' perspectives of communicative language teaching practice. *Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching 9*(1), 76-90. Retrieved from: http://e-flt.nus.edu.sg/v9n12012/liao.pdf

Liu, J. (2004). Methods in the post-methods era report on an international survey on language teaching methods. *International Journal of English Studies4*(1), 137-152

Liu, Q., & Shi, J. (2007). An Analysis of Language Teaching Approaches and Methods – Effectiveness and Weakness. *US-China Education Review*, *4*(1), 69-71. Retrieved from: http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED497389.pdf

Mewborn, D., & Tyminski, A. (2006). Lortie's apprenticeship of observation revisited. *For the Learning of Mathematics*, *26*, 1. Retrieved from: http://math.coe.uga.edu/olive/EMAT8990FYDS08/Mewborn_Tyminski%20final%20page%20proof.pdf

Sanches, H. S. (2013). A cognitive perspective on pre-service and in-service language teaching. *Babylonia*, 21 (01), 51-56. Retrieved from: http://babylonia.ch/fileadmin/user_upload/documents/2013-1/Baby2013_1Sanchez.pdf

Richards, J. (2006). *Communicative Language Teaching Today*. New York, Cambridge University Press

Rollinson, P. (2005). Using peer feedback in the ESL writing class. *ELT Journal*, *59*(1), 23-30

Sultana, A. (2009). Peer correction in ESL classrooms. *BRAC University Journal*1, 11-19. Retrieved from: http://dspace.bracu.ac.bd/handle/10361/450

Tomkova, G. (2013). Error Correction in Spoken Practice. (Unpublished master's thesis). Masaryk University, Czech Republic. Retrieved from: http://is.muni.cz/th/261663/ff_m/?lang=en;id=221853

Tompkins, P. K. (1998). Role Playing/Simulation. *The Internet TESL Journal*, *Vol. IV*. Retrieved from: http://iteslj.org/Techniques/Tompkins-RolePlaying.html

Williams, T. (2013). The Link Between a New Language Teaching Technique and Learner's Traditional Beliefs. *Porta Linguarum 19*, 41-58. Retrieved from: http://www.ugr.es/~portalin/articulos/PL_numero19/3%20%20Thomas%20A%20%20Williams.pdf

Zainuddin, H., Yahya, N., Morales-Jones, C. A., & Ariza, E. N. W. (2011) *Fundamentals of Teaching English to Speaker of Other Languages in K-12 Mainstream Classrooms*. (3rd ed.), 63-47. Kendall Hunt. Retrieved from: http://www.kendallhunt.com/uploadedfiles/kendall_hunt/content/higher_education/uploads/fm_zainuddin_3e.pdf.

Author Profile

Todd Jobbitt is an assistant professor at Hankuk University of Foreign Studies. He holds a Master of Arts in TESOL from The School for International Training. His principal research interests concern teaching methodology, L2 reading and writing, peer review, learner motivation and Young Learner storytelling methods.