# Faculty Coaching and Faculty Needs in Korean Universities

**Kent A. Lee and Hikyoung Lee***

This study examines the various needs of new professors at a Korean university, focusing on professional development issues and English language challenges for those required to teach in English due to English-medium instruction (EMI) policies. Through a qualitative analysis of coaching reports, we explored the specific needs of professors in various academic fields, such as pedagogical methods, course management, and the demands of teaching and research. This investigation highlights the distinctive challenges faced by new professors due to EMI policies. These demands not only add another set of language related challenges, but may compound the other typical professional challenges of new professors. These results can inform those involved in university faculty coaching. The results also show limitations of typical coaching programs at Korean universities, difficulties with EMI policies, and a need for further professional development programs for professors, especially for those in EMI contexts.

**Keywords:** English-medium instruction, faculty coaching, university, teaching and learning center, professors

## 1 Introduction

Pedagogical coaching for university faculty consists of facilitated, guided learning, rather than instructing clients directly; and helping clients to develop a sense of self-awareness, responsibility, and self-efficacy (Cornett & Knight, 2009). The practice has become more common at the tertiary level in recent decades as more focus is placed on faculty and professional development (Cariaga-Lo et al., 2010; McKee & Tew, 2013). This focus on faculty development arises from the recognition that expertise in one's academic discipline does not necessarily translate into expertise in teaching one's discipline, especially at the university level (Kugel, 1993). In the 1960s, colleges and universities in the U.S. began to establish teaching and learning centers to offer support services to faculty, particularly teaching enhancement

* First Author: **Kent A. Lee**, Assistant Professor, Department of English Language and Literature, Pukyong National University; Corresponding Author: **Hikyoung Lee,** Professor, Department of English Language and Literature, Korea University

programs, to improve the quality of teaching and faculty development; over the following decades these programs grew to focus on student-centered instruction, research on tertiary instruction, and organizations and conferences for researching and promoting faculty development (Cruz & Rosemond, 2017; Ouellett, 2010; Singer, 2002). Such centers offer faculty coaching services, especially for newer professors, by coaches who are educational consultants with training and experience in education. Through workshops, classroom observations, and one-on-one coaching, consultants provide help with teaching methods and other practical skills. Coaching for university faculty is individualized, non-evaluative, and supportive in nature (McDowell et al., 2014). Such consulting and professional development work tends to focus on improving professors' sense of self-efficacy, that is, helping professors to improve their own sense of competence as classroom instructors and mentors, and helping professors to perceive themselves as able to improve and develop expertise in their teaching roles (Bandura, 2001; Schunk, 1995; Schunk & Pajares, 2002).

In South Korea, this trend began in the late 1990s and early 2000s with the establishment of centers for teaching and learning (CTLs) at many Korean universities, offering support programs for faculty and students, as well as e-learning programs (Park, 2011). Faculty support services entail pedagogical coaching, micro-teaching workshops, and workshops in pedagogical methods, pedagogical issues, and English medium instruction (EMI), especially for newer professors. Coaching in North American and Korean contexts is often conducted by an educational consultant, usually with a Ph.D. and background in education or educational psychology. At Korean universities, the consultant often works as a research professor at a teaching and learning center, and may also come from a background in language education as well. Coaches in North America, Korea, or other countries, with their background in educational psychology, are often not knowledgeable of the client professors' academic fields. They thus often act as advice givers, not as experts prescribing teaching practices, and as in other countries, tend to focus on promoting professors' teaching skills, professional development, and self-efficacy.

## 1.1 Coaching in the Korean context

New tenure-track professors in Korea are hired for initial contracts (of 3-6 years, depending on the university), which can be renewed for several more years, after which the contracts can be renewed again with tenure status. Contract renewals are based mainly on evaluation of their research and publication output, as measured by quantitative criteria for the number of domestic and international and domestic publications, especially in internationally indexed journals. At the university examined in this study, their first contract renewal also requires completion of instructional development programs offered through the university's Center for Teaching and Learning

(CTL). The criteria for these programs have been decided administratively by the CTL and the academic affairs office. Some of the following are typically required: (1) attending new faculty orientation seminars; (2) receiving instructional coaching from a CTL research professor; (3) participating in mock micro-teaching workshops; and (4) attending several CTL workshops on pedagogy. These workshops include a range of topics such as teaching methods, assessment, EMI skills, and presentation skills. While some of these requirements are typical of Korean universities, the coaching and pedagogical workshops are less common, and the requirements for pedagogical development at this university are more rigorous than at most Korean universities.

For professors at some universities in Korea, their teaching load is increasingly affected by English-medium instruction (EMI) policies, whereby professors are encouraged or required to teach content courses in English, even though it is not the first language of most professors and students. The motivations for EMI in Asian countries include globalization pressures, competition for university rankings, encouraging international research collaboration, and the assumption that such a learning environment will help students acquire the academic English needed for studying and working in their fields (Byun et al., 2011). Since the mid-2000s, most new professors at top universities have been required to teach in English, and they are expected to conduct class sessions entirely in English. The added burden of EMI differentiates the Korean context, as most coaching research and training has been in the North American and similar contexts, where English is the primary language. At East Asian universities with EMI policies, the burden of preparing and conducting classes in English complicates professors' roles as teachers and researchers. As the following literature review shows, little research has been conducted on professional development needs of new professors in Korea, especially their needs in an EMI context.

## 2 Literature Review

Various studies of university faculty coaching indicate significant advantages of coaching for teacher efficacy, teaching practices, reflective thinking skills, job satisfaction, student outcomes, and professional development from particular forms of coaching like cognitive and peer coaching (Cornett & Knight, 2009). Faculty coaching often involves general reflective coaching and cognitive coaching methods, which focus on cultivating teacher efficacy, and their advantages have been shown in qualitative studies (Edwards & Newton, 1995). A good deal of research on coaching and faculty professional development has focused on fields with specific needs such as medicine (e.g., Steinert et al., 2016), business (e.g., Dillon et al., 2020), and engineering (e.g., Mayled, 2020).

Studies of North American universities show that those institutions use several methods for faculty development, generally through their teaching and learning centers (Geis et al., 1981; Graham, 2017; Gullatt & Weaver, 1997) (or hereafter, CTLs, for centers for teaching and learning). Workshops and other CTL activities often address topics such as the use of technology, new theories and methods for teaching and learning, grant applications, teaching portfolios, faculty evaluation procedures, test design, student evaluation, lesson planning, advice for publishing research, and research methods. Classroom observation and feedback from colleagues or instructional coaches can also be effective, and professors generally rate such experiences positively (Atkinson & Bolt, 2010). However, in the Korean context this is usually not feasible and not typically done, as Korean professors would regard a classroom observer uncomfortably (e.g., due to a perceived challenge to one's sense of "face," a strong sociocultural factor in Korea).

Research on coaching and faculty development programs in Western nations has shown numerous benefits (McKee & Tew, 2013). New professors may first focus on their teaching role in the classroom and the content area knowledge, before shifting to a more student-centered focus on how effectively students are able to learn the course contents (Kugel, 1993). Faculty programs can help newer professors to articulate and reflect on their teaching goals, practices and beliefs to improve their teaching (McDowell et al., 2014; Sandretto et al., 2002; Sorcinelli, 1994, 2007). Such self-examination and training in reflective practice are needed because teachers' explicitly stated beliefs about teaching may not correspond to actual teaching practice, due to conflicting tacit or unexamined beliefs; for example, though teachers may assent to modern teaching methods, they may however follow teacher-centered and information transfer models of teaching (Kane et al., 2002). Professors may also need time to reflect on and modify these implicitly held views and practices, or mental models (Brancato, 2003).

Peer coaching has received some attention, which involves expert coaching from teachers trained in particular methods or content areas, such as more senior professors, or reciprocal coaching with colleagues who are equals or near-equals (Ackland, 1991; Huston & Weaver, 2008). Qualitative survey studies report advantages in cultivating a collaborative environment, and developing teaching skills and professional skills, e.g., via formal or informal programs that involve peer classroom observations, planning sessions, informally sharing advice, collaborative development of curricula and materials (Showers & Joyce, 1996; Swafford, 1998). This can provide not only less experienced professors with practical, specific career advice, intellectual guidance, but also emotional support (Sands et al., 1991).

Research on coaching has generally examined its benefits and effectiveness, or issues specific to pedagogy in particular fields such as medicine. However, very few studies have examined the issues typically discussed in coaching. One survey study of professors reports somewhat more

specific information, as clients reported that coaching helped them improve in areas such as course design, engaging students more effectively, improving teaching styles and methods, formulating course objectives, lecture and discussion techniques, syllabus design, managing student feedback, and understanding students, with teaching practices being the most beneficial area (Jacobson et al., 2009). Otherwise, specific information on needs and issues dealt with in university faculty coaching seems lacking, and no known research has dealt with this in the Korean context.

EMI is a growing phenomenon in university settings where English is not the native language, yet it presents challenges to those involved, especially for faculty (Macaro et al., 2018; Pecorari & Malmstrom, 2018). Limited research exists regarding the impact of EMI on professors' teaching in such contexts, and no known research has dealt with coaching in an Asian EMI contexts. A small body of research on EMI and professors in Korea has examined in-class teaching issues. For example, survey studies of professors report that they encounter difficulties with explaining course contents, covering all the necessary course and lecture contents in time, and dealing with students' English limitations in doing their coursework (Byun et al., 2011; Choi, 2013; Kim, 2011). Professors reportedly compensate for these difficulties by speaking more slowly, using repetition, and using simplified vocabulary, and thus, they find EMI less useful for explaining important concepts (Hwang, 2013). The only known systematic study of EMI challenges and perceptions from the perspective of Korean professors in Korea (Park et al., 2022) reported that professors at top universities in the Seoul area with EMI policies generally saw benefits of EMI for helping students with English abilities, attracting international students, and developing cross-cultural benefits. Yet a majority of them felt a need for more flexibility in EMI policies (e.g., in the number of EMI courses, or how strictly English usage should be followed for class sessions). Many held negative feelings toward required professional development programs (such as CTL programs) for EMI certification, or had not had sufficient opportunities or experience with EMI professional development programs.

The above literature review indicates some gaps in the research, namely, specific types of coaching issues that coaches should be ready for, i.e., the specific needs that clients would have, especially newer professors; coaching issues at East Asian universities; and the English needs of professors in an EMI setting and the English skills for publishing and conference presentations. Information on specific needs and issues of clients (professors) would be useful for novice coaches and university administrators, especially in similar contexts. CTLs and coaches would benefit from information on types of issues that will likely arise in typical coaching sessions. Thus, the following research questions are proposed.

(1) What are the particular needs of newly hired professors at Korean universities?

(2) What English-related needs do newly hired professors have in an EMI context?

To examine these questions, coaching reports from a Korean university's CTL were examined and particular issues were categorized.


## 3 Method

A qualitative content analysis and needs analysis was conducted by examining coaching reports from coaching sessions with professors, and classifying the issues that arose in the discussions. This constitutes a case study of EMI at a single university, for a more contextualized, in-depth and holistic study of new professors.

Our literature review mainly found research on the benefits of coaching, but the literature contained little practical information or guidance on specific coaching issues, or studies of coaching in the Korean context, or in EMI contexts. Thus, this study also attempts to fill this gap by identifying a number of specific needs of newer professors, to inform other pedagogical coaches and CTLs about issues to anticipate and address in their programs.

At the university examined (hereafter, S University), newly hired professors in most departments are required to see an educational consultant at the CTL for at least one coaching session as part of a faculty development program to be completed before contract renewal. The consultant has served as a research professor at the CTL, holds a Ph.D. in educational psychology, and also has a background in applied linguistics. The clients are newly hired professors on an initial three-year contract as tenure-track assistant or associate professors. They are required to attend coaching sessions, lasting 40-60 minutes each, and participate in a micro-teaching workshop in their first two years at the university in order to renew their contracts.

The coaching sessions were semi-structured, as the coach probed their self-perceived strengths and needs, and offered suggestions. Each session consisted of general open-ended questions raised by the coach that were designed as prompts to elicit freestyle responses from the clients on whichever topics they felt a need to discuss (e.g., how teaching and work are going, challenges encountered in teaching, strengths and weaknesses as a teacher, and any questions s/he might have about teaching). The coach's role was to enhance the client's sense of pedagogical efficacy as a classroom instructor, by eliciting ideas from the client, suggesting ideas, or strategizing means of improving their teaching and professional development. Some clients came for follow-up sessions, where the second session included similar open-ended follow-up questions. Thus, specific topics and issues were mostly raised by the

clients rather than the coach. The coach wrote up a detailed summary of topics discussed for in-house administrative purposes. These coaching reports comprise the materials used for the content and needs analysis (with the consent of the professors, of course). Permission was obtained from all clients for use of their coaching reports for this study.

Issues that regularly arose often involved the language of instruction. Most new professors at S University are required to teach courses in English, at least during their initial contract period. This policy supports the university's EMI policy, which was implemented in 2005 to boost international university rankings and attract more international students. Unlike other universities in Korea, the CTL at S University was initially established to support faculty teaching subject matter in English in 2003. These language issues thus form a significant portion of the coaching topics discussed below.

For each coaching session, a detailed coaching report was written (immediately after each session, from the coach's detailed notes), which carefully recorded all the questions and issues that arose during the session. Our content analysis began by identifying general themes and topics in the coaching reports. All these issues were collected, summarized, and compared via open coding, which naturally fell into the general areas of pedagogical and classroom issues, student related issues, professional development issues, and language related issues. Repeated constant comparison led to refinement of these categories and classifying all the issues and themes into more specific categories, as shown in the Results section below.

This process helped to identify and summarize the needs of our clients. We also considered the clients' desired goals and outcomes, and how well the sessions and other CTL programs could help clients with teaching effectiveness and professional development. For a coaching program involving one or two consultation sessions and no other follow-up required for clients, this evaluation can be fairly cursory. Thus, the needs analysis of the clients is the main focus of the study, which includes not only pedagogical issues, but English language related issues as well. In evaluating clients' needs, since we consider cultivating efficacy as one of the primary roles of educational coaches, we particularly focus on the clients' sense of self-efficacy or needs for improved efficacy, particularly in regard to their efficacy as classroom educators, and as professors required to teach courses in English.

The data set consists of 92 regular coaching sessions with 85 unique clients, as some came for follow-up sessions, plus another 44 medical professors who do not regularly hold lectures, for a total of 129 clients. The clients represent many departments, which are grouped by general academic fields: social sciences, humanities, business, STEM (science, technology, engineering, math), health sciences, law, and medical faculty. The last medical faculty group is separated from other health sciences and not included in most of the analyses below, as most medical faculty do not regularly teach courses.

## 4 Results

To understand the clients and their needs, some demographic information is summarized from the coaching sessions. Many had degrees from universities in English-speaking (Anglophone) countries, and some had doctoral degrees from Korean universities or from other countries. Some had previously done post-doctoral work or had previous teaching jobs, or non-academic jobs before coming to this university. Table 1 presents basic demographic data about the clients.

Table 1. Demographic Data

| Academic area | | Ph.D. conferral | Teaching experience | | | Other experience |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Prior | Current | Total | |
| Business | 2 | En (2) | 2.5 | 2.3 | 4.8 | prof. (1) |
| Health sciences | 22 | En (15), Korea (6), Japan (1) | 1.9 | 1.9 | 3.7 | post-doc (14) |
| Humanities | 12 | En (3), Korea (8), Germany (1) | 6.3 | 2.8 | 8.3 | prof. (2), post-doc (1), non-ac. (1) |
| Law | 8 | En (1), Korea (4), Hong Kong (1), Germany (2) | 3.3 | 2.1 | 5.3 | post-doc (1), non-ac. (3) |
| Social sciences | 25 | En (15), Korea (7), Germany (3) | 3.7 | 2.0 | 5.8 | prof. (1), post-doc (1), non-ac. (2) |
| STEM | 16 | En (10), Korea (5), Spain (1) | 2.3 | 2.0 | 4.2 | post-doc (5), non-ac. (1) |
| Subtotal, non-medical | 85 | | | | | |
| Medicine | 44 | En (1), Korea (41) | 0.7 | 2.4 | 3.0 | prof. (1), post-doc (6) |
| Total | 129 | | | | | |

*Note.* 'Ph.D. conferral' indicates doctoral degrees received in Korea, in English-speaking countries (En), or elsewhere. Average teaching experience (in years): at previous institutions (prior), at current institution, and total. Other experience, average, in years: previous professorship elsewhere (prof.) post-doctoral work (post-doc.), or work in non-academic jobs (non-ac.).

Many of the clients were relatively new professors, with this being their first job since obtaining their doctoral degrees, though a few had prior experience in non-academic jobs, or as professors elsewhere. The humanities professors had the most experience prior to coming to this university, followed by the social science professors, as graduates in both fields usually start professorships immediately. In the coaching sessions, when asked, they

generally indicated a preference for a particular teaching style, such as pure lecture format, lecture-discussion, or a variation thereof, such as lecture-discussion plus group work, or lecture plus lab or studio work (particularly in STEM and health fields). Teacher-centered styles were the most preferred along with lecture-discussion styles, and interactive group activities or generally interactive and student-centered teaching styles were less often preferred.

The types of issues raised and advice provided, as detailed in the coaching reports were listed and organized into categories that naturally emerged from the data. These can be broadly classified into (1) pedagogical and classroom issues, (2) other professional development issues, and (3) English-related issues.

The pedagogical issues generally fell into the following categories: lecture and presentation skills, instructional design, general teaching style, class activities, use of instructional media, explaining concepts, assessment and assignments, student-teacher interaction, and student difficulties in class. In addition, some clients raised other professional and job-related issues. A statistical analysis (by means of Poisson regression for uneven count data (Agresti, 2002)) found no reliable trends or correlations for the types of issues raised and clients' backgrounds, academic areas, or teaching experience. These various issues are summarized and categorized in Table 2.

Table 2. Pedagogical Issues

| Area | Topics & sessions | Issues |
|---|---|---|
| Lecture and presentation skills | 62 topics, 46 sessions | Lecture introductions and transitions<br>Lecture structure, lecture organization and flow<br>Vocal delivery<br>Making lectures more interesting<br>Using / asking questions, getting students to respond to questions |
| Teaching style | 26 topics, 26 sessions | General teaching style, e.g., teacher-centered or lecture-centered style<br>Interactive and student-centered teaching<br>Alternative or more interactive teaching methods<br>Teaching philosophy; Teaching style inventories |
| Instructional and materials design | 31 topics, 31 sessions | Lesson design; Syllabus design<br>Covering course contents<br>Lesson preparation time<br>Class time management<br>Teaching courses outside one's expertise<br>Teaching large classes<br>Course and lesson objectives |

| Instructional media and technology | 31 topics, 24 sessions | Using media and technology<br>General PPT use; PPT design; Using PPT as notes for students<br>Graphics (e.g., in PPTs)<br>Using formulas and equations (e.g., in PPT, Latex)<br>PPT alternatives (e.g., Prezi, Latex Beamer)<br>Using Google Forms for projects |
|---|---|---|
| Conveying concepts & information | 29 topics, 26 sessions | Focus on main ideas<br>Explaining new or difficult concepts<br>Using examples<br>Students' comprehension of materials<br>Explaining equations, formulas<br>Explaining or using terminology<br>Use of textbooks |
| Class activities | 67 topics, 52 sessions | Posing / using questions<br>Using group activities<br>Student participation (general)<br>Student participation (posing or answering questions)<br>Traditional vs. interactive teaching (including group activities)<br>Student participation in group activities |
| Teacher / student interaction | 15 topics, 9 sessions | Persona / Personality style<br>Sense of humor<br>Rapport / interacting with students<br>Communication skills and difficulties |
| Assessment | 39 topics, 37 sessions | Assessment methods<br>Assessing group activities<br>Assessing student presentations<br>Grading load<br>Grading in large classes – grading methods and grading load<br>Using rubrics<br>Giving feedback<br>Exam and test item design<br>Students not completing assignments<br>Homework load<br>Gauging students' comprehension in class |
| Students (general) | 59 topics, 44 sessions | Student background knowledge<br>Student background / class heterogeneity<br>Student's participation and attention<br>Student motivation<br>Students (not) doing reading / assignments<br>Foreign students (e.g., their interaction with Korean classmates)<br>Student behavior |

| Other professional issues | 17 topics, 14 sessions | Academic life and professional development: Workload; Work-life balance Preparation time Demands of research Setting up a new research lab Writing and publishing articles Professional development Competing research and teaching demands Teaching effectiveness Connecting research to teaching |
| --- | --- | --- |

*Note*. Counts shown for the number of sessions in which such topics arose, and the number of instances that such topics arose.


The most frequent questions involved lecture skills, class activities, and students' difficulties in class. Many clients were relatively inexperienced as teachers, having received their Ph.D. degrees a few years prior in many cases, so they often had questions regarding these issues. The next most frequent areas were assignments and assessment, using media and technology, and explaining concepts, followed by teaching style, teacher-student interaction, and general teaching style. Some questions regarding in-class issues were addressed by discussing interactive teaching methods (e.g., pair and group activities, breaking up long lectures with activities, and improving explanations). Also, some professors may be unaware of the difficulty experienced by new learners in learning what seems intuitive and clear to an expert; this so-called expert's paradox is not an unusual problem for new teachers (Bransford et al., 1999).

When questions arose regarding assessment, grading methods, homework load, or providing feedback to students, explanations of rubrics (Stevens & Levi, 2013) were provided, including various types and uses of rubrics and other feedback techniques. For these questions, and problems of student engagement with course materials, formative assessment techniques and activities were explained (Nicol & Macfarlane-Dick, 2006), such as post-lecture activities (e.g., where at the end of class students discuss a question in groups about the lecture), or pre-lecture quizzes or tasks, in which students do short online quizzes after reading a textbook chapter and before hearing the lecture on the topic (Simkins & Maier, 2010).

In-class time management was problematic for some, for whom prioritizing and simplifying some contents was a new skill to learn. For some, this led to speaking too quickly in class to cover their lecture contents. Some clients had difficulty covering the necessary course contents or textbook contents, which can be a source of pressure when those course contents are required for later courses. This problem was most common and most acute for those in STEM (science, technology, engineering, math), medical, and health science departments, where professors have large amounts of information to cover, and the contents coverage is often shaped or dictated by the students'

voluminous textbooks, where maximal coverage of textbook contents in one course is often a prerequisite to later courses. The natural temptation is to lecture and transfer as much information as possible, which is actually inefficient for deeper learning, as is well known among educational researchers (Bransford et al., 1999). These time constraints were sometimes magnified by the challenge of lecturing in English as a second language. Somewhat counter-intuitively, then, active learning methods were suggested. Though these take more time and force professors to reduce lecture materials, their advantage is in helping students understand key concepts more deeply, so that they can then use the textbook or other materials for other necessary information (Michael & Modell, 2003).

When clients asked about lecture style, problems of students not paying attention in class, and problems of student dynamics, interactive teaching methods were suggested to make classes more engaging, and to break up long chunks of continuous lectures, which taxes students' attention spans. In some classes, some students had more background knowledge of the materials while others had none; in some classes, international and Korean students were mixed, with differing English abilities—an issue commonly found in universities in non-English speaking, EMI contexts. Class group activities with heterogeneous student groups were often suggested. In fact, whenever appropriate, the use of interactive teaching methods were explained in response to various issues raised, such as providing effective explanations, coverage of contents, and classroom dynamics. Generally, many of the clients had no personal experience with interactive methods or any format other than lecture or lecture discussion formats. As a teaching support center, one of the goals is promoting modern, research based teaching methods. Thus, various interactive teaching techniques in coaching such as communicative and task based teaching (Ellis, 2009), problem based learning (Irby, 1996; Vernon & Blake, 1993), interactive learning and discussion activities (Boud et al., 2014; Michael & Modell, 2003), inductive and discovery learning (Thomas, 2003), and invention activities (Taylor et al., 2010) were promoted.

Clients sometimes asked about the use of presentation media and multimedia, be it general principles of use, or questions about the design of their particular PowerPoint (PPT) slides. Common tendencies were for the clients to depend too much on PPTs as the basis of their entire class sessions, and thus, long PPT lectures, as well as slides with too much text, excessive information, or poor graphic design. Principles of PPT design and visual presentation of information were explained. Clients also asked questions about using PPTs as lecture notes for students, embedding formulas and equations into slides, and other presentation media such as Prezi and Latex.

Some clients mentioned out-of-class issues, such as their heavy workload due to research obligations, setting up new labs, and work-life balance. The tension between teaching and research can be turned to an advantage if the clients can bring their research into their courses, but in some

cases this was not possible, especially for those in the difficult position of having to teach courses outside of their research areas. Nonetheless, the newer professors encountered noticeable amounts of stress, as they must produce and publish research in international journals within the first three years of their initial hiring in order to renew their contracts on their path toward tenure. Many face an extra burden of preparing new course materials, especially in their first year of teaching. Some clients also reported stress from having to teach in English, and while our coaching sessions attempted to provide some help with academic English and lecture skills, the professors' busy schedules impose severe limitations on the time and effort that they can spend on language skills.

A coaching session can probably not address these job stresses very well, beyond an opportunity to express their feelings to someone outside their departments. Most academic coaches are not trained to counsel clients in such issues, and the best option may be for a new professor to be assigned a senior faculty mentor in the department for longer-term personal and professional support. Professors are also known to be prone to more serious issues, such as maladaptive perfectionism and related issues of anxiety and depression (Dunn et al., 2006). Obviously an educational consultant cannot handle such issues should they arise, and may not detect them in one or two coaching sessions. But if such problems become apparent, a coach should recognize them, and the client should be encouraged to turn to colleagues and appropriate counseling for help.

When asked to identify their own strengths as professors, many clients mentioned their teaching skills and experience, particularly in their in-class execution and explanations. More specifically, they identified as strengths their background knowledge, including knowledge from working previously outside academia; diligent lesson preparation; attempting to provide effective explanations and materials; attempts to make classes interactive or to make lectures practical and interesting; and reasonable coverage of contents. Asking clients to identify their strengths can be an effective self-awareness exercise, and doing so at the start of the coaching session can make them more open to sharing about difficulties.

A majority of the clients raised issues related to EMI and English skills, either their own or their students' abilities. They described their difficulties in teaching in English and their own English limitations, particularly in pronunciation, speaking and communication skills. As a result, they realize they may be speaking in "broken English" and that they have difficulty not only in lecturing, but in answering students' questions in class. Speaking in a second language can be mentally demanding, especially if one does not feel fluent or highly proficient.

Sometimes our clients described their English limitations in general terms, without knowing how to improve their language skills. This indicates a low sense of self-efficacy for high-level English skills, in that they generally lack confidence in their English ability, especially for lecturing and teaching,

but they are less aware of specific problems to work on, or of how to improve their English. In fact, in general, most lack the time to improve their English skills, as they are busy with research (and as new professors, new course content preparation). Most also lack the resources and language learning strategies to effectively improve on their own. Finally, some clients reported feeling psychological discomfort or stress about having to teach in English, and a few even reported a significant amount of anxiety or depression as a result. This is not unlike second language anxiety, a well-known phenomenon in language education (e.g., MacIntyre & Gardner, 1994), but this becomes more serious as it can impact a new professor's job performance.

At least twenty clients mentioned the students' English difficulties, which included Korean students and international students from non-Western nations. Students with language limitations reportedly were unable or unwilling to participate in class, as they showed difficulty in understanding and paying attention to lectures, engaging in class discussions in English, asking or answering questions, understanding assigned readings, and doing assignments and exams in English. The number of clients reporting such EMI-related issues is shown in Table 3.

Table 3. Language and EMI Issues

| Area | Instances | Issues |
|---|---|---|
| Students' English abilities | 20 | Students' English comprehension<br>Students' English general ability<br>Foreign students' English abilities<br>Participation in EMI classes<br>Scaffolding lecture contents<br>Students' willingness to use English<br>Students' ability to do exams or assignments in English |
| Professors' English abilities | 48 | Professor's general English abilities<br>Self-perceptions for English abilities<br>English pronunciation<br>Expressing oneself in English naturally in class<br>English classroom expressions<br>Research writing; proofreading services for research manuscripts<br>Confidence in English<br>Stress due to EMI |

For those who noted that Korean or international students had difficulty understanding them, a number of clients stated that they felt that they had to speak more slowly while lecturing, which makes it more difficult to cover all the contents that need to be covered in lectures, or even in an entire course syllabus. This parallels other studies of EMI (e.g., Choi, 2013; Kim, 2011) in Korea reporting that students have difficulty following English lectures, and that professors compensate by slowing down. Furthermore, several clients in

our study (especially in science fields) reported that they lecture mostly in English, but then have to take time at the start or end of class or outside of class to summarize lectures or to answer questions in Korean. Some clients reported other classroom practices for dealing with students' English limitations, such as repeating some English explanations in a lecture; letting students ask questions in Korean, which the professors then translate and answer in English; and relying on PPT lectures in class with PPT slides provided as notes for students who had difficulty following their English lectures (one workaround suggested by the coach was including Korean explanations or translations of English terms in the slides while lecturing in English).

Because of their own English limitations and their students' limitations, some clients reported that they had to lecture more slowly, noticeably more so than in their native language, making it difficult to cover all their lecture contents in a given class session, or even all their required course contents over a semester. Some clients reported that they provided short summaries (lasting several minutes) in Korean at the end of their lectures so students could grasp the main points, or that they provided extra explanations in Korean to students during office hours.

## 5 Discussion

In regard to the research questions about new professors' various needs and EMI challenges, a number of pedagogical and English language needs and challenges were found. First, this study has identified a number of pedagogical and career development needs that newer professors in Korea face, which are needs that coaches and CTLs need to address. The number of needs can be significant, and suggest that more is needed beyond the normal coaching programs that are typically offered at Korean universities. In addition, the faculty's EMI demands and English needs are unique issues that set Korean universities apart from countries where English is the main language. These language challenges add an extra dimension of difficulty on top of their normal teaching and research challenges and the workload that they face as new professors.

The clients in this study generally demonstrated a sense of efficacy toward their field and their research. For teaching, their efficacy naturally depended on their years of teaching experience (so newly minted Ph.D.s would naturally have less teaching efficacy). Since many of them tended to use traditional teaching methods, their teaching efficacy seems to correspond to their experience in delivering classroom lectures. Thus, many clients in various departments, including more experienced professors, preferred pure lecture formats, and were unfamiliar with modern, interactive teaching methods, such as active learning, group learning methods, problem based learning, task based learning, or discovery learning. Most were also not familiar with more modern

assessment and assignment techniques like group assignments, project based work, flipped learning, grading rubrics, and formative assessment. One or two coaching sessions or workshops are unlikely to persuade professors to alter their teaching styles (especially in the Korean cultural context, where teacher-centered instruction is still the norm), and a few sessions are not sufficient to provide them the training to do so. The CTL at this university has offered some workshops on interactive teaching techniques, but more focused, regular, and effective programs are needed to promote newer pedagogical methods.

A wide variety of needs among these newer professors can be observed, and their needs were not unique to their department, academic area, years of experience, or where they had done their doctoral studies; all had fairly similar questions or needs. These include course preparation, course management, class activities, class management, lecture skills, multimedia use, balancing teaching and research demands, assessment methods, dealing with students, work-life balance, and EMI. Also, professors need to learn from colleagues in their fields about adapting to the demands of their new jobs, and about how to implement modern pedagogical methods in their teaching. Yet few of our clients mentioned receiving mentoring from older professors in their departments. The benefits of peer mentoring are well attested, not only for general professional development, but also due to the empathy and confidentiality that such programs afford (e.g., Sargent & Rientes, 2022). Peer mentoring and coaching can also be helpful for more senior professors who need to improve in such areas (Huston & Weaver, 2008), and can be especially helpful to newer female and minority faculty (e.g., Thomas et al., 2015). Thus, Korean universities need to implement more systematic peer mentoring programs, especially for newer faculty members, and especially for those struggling with work culture, pedagogy, and language issues.

Before coming to this university, most of the professors had not had the benefit of participating in teacher training workshops, professional development programs, or preparing future faculty programs, which would have prepared them better as novice professors. For most, this university's CTL programs were the first such training programs. However, one or two coaching sessions is clearly not enough to address all their needs. Specific workshops on specific issues, such as some of the issues that arose from the coaching sessions were offered. These included presentation techniques, use of multimedia, teaching philosophy, interactive teaching methods, formative assessment methods, rubrics and assessment techniques, lecture strategies, motivational issues, teaching research methods to STEM students, and academic English skills. However, these workshops are mostly optional, and most of the newer professors only attended one or a few such workshops, often due to the obvious time constraints of newer professors who are busy with research and course preparation. Developing pedagogical self-awareness can also be a helpful skill for instructors, for example, by offering workshops on teaching methods or

teaching philosophy, to develop conscious self-awareness of teaching beliefs and style.

The need for improving professors' English skills was a common concern among our clients, and many professors realize their limitations (especially in STEM fields). However, due to the obligations and pressures of research and other duties, they have no time or little motivation to focus on English, and had little chance for interaction with English speakers (though a few clients were able to find time to listen to English media materials). Our clients have generally had little or no previous experience conducting courses in English, so their limited experience is at odds with the EMI requirements of their jobs. A number of clients raised the issues of their English limitations themselves in the coaching sessions, such as their difficulty in expressing themselves naturally in lectures or in answering students' questions. This parallels the findings from survey based studies, which reported that Korean professors face similar difficulties with expressing themselves and delivering course contents in English, and that students encounter difficulty understanding lectures and participating in class activities due to their English limitations (Cho, 2012; Choi, 2013; Kim, 2011). A CTL might be able to offer special workshops on language and speaking skills, if it has access to a language specialist. However, language improvement is a long, arduous process, and CTL workshops in an EMI context would be most effective if they can teach language learning strategies, so that professors can improve their language skills on their own, for example, by using authentic English materials (print media, audiovisual materials, and Internet materials, including materials related to their teaching and research). Consultants can also help clients to improve their sense of second language efficacy by advising them on more specific language learning strategies, and helpful metacognitive strategies, e.g., self-regulation, realistic goal setting, realistic self-evaluation, mindfulness techniques.

These findings, along with various studies of EMI from the perspectives of students and faculty, indicate problems with how EMI has been implemented at Korean universities, and changes that are warranted. A number of studies have reported dissatisfaction among students and professors due to students' comprehension problems in EMI lectures, and the professors' abilities to deliver materials in English (Cho, 2012; Kim et al., 2014). Students with better English skills prefer or benefit more from a strictly English-only EMI classroom, while those with weaker English abilities can benefit from some supplementary Korean contents (Kim et al., 2009). Students may be more receptive to EMI if the focus is more on elective courses, culture studies courses, and major elective courses, rather than required courses in their major (Kim et al., 2009). The required use of English for courses in most departments seems to hinder the professors' ability to teach and deliver lecture contents, as well as the students' ability to comprehend class contents. This poses not only a psychological threat to professors' psychosocial sense of face (which

depends partly on success and competence), but a threat to their sense of efficacy.

The coaching data above also indicate that the demands of EMI also exacerbate the normal challenges of new professors. The language limitations of the professors in this study, and of their students, led to slower, less efficient coverage of course contents, or greater reliance on PowerPoint based lectures. Other class management and participation issues arose from the language challenges faced by Korean and international students and their English limitations. Some professors must then spend extra time spent on mitigation strategies. Our clients resorted to mitigation strategies to compensate for students' limited abilities to understand English lectures, such as providing extra Korean summaries or explanations at the start or end of class sessions, or outside of class (even though they were required to each classes entirely in English), speaking more slowly, covering lecture and course contents more slowly or superficially, and as a result, having to omit some course contents. Thus, EMI not only affects the effectiveness of in-class teaching, and not only requires extra time for class preparation, but also affects professors' overall course management and teaching workload, and potentially, how they perceive and balance their teaching and research work. For universities with EMI policies, rather than requiring professors to teach entirely in English, some flexibility must be allowed, so that professors can more freely use some language mitigation strategies, such as allowing more mixing of English and Korean in class.

If professors feel serious limitations in their English abilities, and are busy with research, they not only like the time and resources to improve English, but also the sense of efficacy toward improving their personal and high-level academic English skills, and a sense of efficacy is particularly important for improving second-language skills. This relates to a deeper intrapersonal issue for professors in such a context. Efficacy relates to intrinsic motivation, and many of our clients indicated little intrinsic motivation toward English. Intrinsic motivation derives from meeting three core psychological needs, according to Self-Determination Theory, a popular theory of motivation in educational psychology (Deci & Ryan, 2009). People require a sense of autonomy, or free will and desire in learning; a sense of growth as one learns, which in turn relates to efficacy; and a sense of social connection or relatedness with others. If new professors were too busy as postgraduate students with research to learn English, though many of our clients studied in Anglophone countries, most are certainly too busy as new professors to improve their academic English skills. Thus, they cannot attain a sense of growth or efficacy in English. Teaching in English is an externally imposed requirement for them, and hence, little or no sense of genuine desire or autonomy toward English is the case for many of these professors. Without time, resources, or means of cultivating motivation and efficacy, EMI instruction will continue to be a significant burden for new professors.

Another relevant factor is the teaching methodology, as Korean professors tend to use teacher-centered and lecture centered approaches. Yet more student-centered classrooms would be more effective for EMI (Lee & Prinsloo, 2018). While Korean students, especially with lower English abilities, might prefer more lecture-based EMI classrooms, those with stronger English skills and international students seem to prefer more interactive classrooms (e.g., more discussion rather than pure lecture) and reportedly have fewer difficulties with EMI (Kim et al., 2009; Kim et al., 2014). In fact, one motivation for EMI is to attract international students, who can benefit greatly from such programs at East Asian universities. For students with sufficient English skills (binational Koreans, Koreans proficient in English, and many international students), having students engage in group discussions in class can promote critical thinking skills (DeWaelsche, 2015). However, some students may lack the English skills or confidence to do so, so it may be necessary for students to engage in group activities in their preferred language. Korean students also reportedly prefer native English speaking professors, and have fewer comprehension difficulties with them than with Korean professors (Kym & Kym, 2014). Past studies along with our coaching data suggest that it would be more effective to alleviate the burdens on Korean professors by focusing EMI on courses taught by foreign professors, especially native English speakers, and Koreans with high English proficiency (such as Koreans who have lived or who have been raised overseas). EMI should also be implemented with a greater focus on lecture-discussion formats and more interactive, student-centered teaching methods. If professors find it difficult to lecture continuously in English, then less reliance on class time for lectures in English would seem logical. Thus, more interactive, blended, or flipped learning and teaching methods would be appropriate. For many students, it may be more preferable and more sensible to view video lectures outside of class in their preferred language, and to use the class time for more interactive discussion, interactive learning tasks, some explanations from professors delivered, say, bilingually, and other activities that do not require lengthy English lectures.

One limitation of such coaching programs is that one or two coaching sessions within the first contract period is not sufficient to delve into each client's teaching issues, and clients may not be able to reflect deeply, or they may not be willing to raise potentially face-threatening issues with a coach who may be seen as a junior (especially so at CTLs in an Asian setting). Another drawback is the timing of the sessions. Many of them waited until their second or third contract year, and this delay can lead to an unusual coaching situation, as coaching depends on regular and repeated contacts. More coaching is needed, starting from their first semester. Korean CTLs should also work with various departments to ensure that all new professors also receive some form of peer coaching or mentoring from older professors, and to provide support for peer coaching. A more coordinated combination of peer coaching,

instructional coaching from the CTL, and pedagogical workshops would be in order. For EMI contexts, more CTL workshops can be offered for the following: English pronunciation and speaking skills (as that was a commonly identified issue in the coaching session data); methods of learning English via authentic materials related to professors' own research areas (using materials in their fields that they would read or listen to anyway); bolstering their self-efficacy and confidence in English as a second language; and more modern and suitable EMI-compatible teaching methods, including interactive class activities, blended learning, and flipped learning.

Finally, for universities implementing EMI programs, more careful consideration is needed of EMI policies. The EMI policies at top Korean universities are often implemented top-down by university administrations out of internationalization and globalization pressures (Cho, 2012; Lee & Lee, 2013). EMI policies have been implemented without regard for their appropriateness and without a proper educational needs analysis of different departments and programs (Williams, 2023). EMI policies are also driven by a desire to boost universities' international rankings (Cho, 2012; Lee & Lee, 2013). These policies are thus driven by neoliberal educational policies that promote competition and reward-oriented achievement among universities and professors; this includes pressure put on faculty to publish in English in international journals (Lee & Lee, 2013). EMI would be very suitable for departments like English, international studies, or business, but less so for other departments, at least so in its current form. The needs of faculty and students in different majors needs to be considered, in order to alleviate the burdens that EMI imposes on some professors and students. The same EMI requirements for most or all departments at a university not only lack a pedagogical rationale, but can lead to problems for professors who lack confidence and efficacy in English. EMI should be implemented with a greater focus on more interactive and student-centered instructional methods, to better realize its potential. For professors with EMI requirements, more support programs are needed to help them cope with these requirements.

## 6 Conclusion

Our study has reported on specific questions and issues that newer professors encounter and raise in CTL coaching sessions at a Korean university. Their issues and needs are manifold, with similar issues arising regardless of their academic background, department, or experience. The clients tended to prefer teacher-centered teaching styles while interactive teaching styles were less preferred. As for pedagogical issues, lectures skills, class activities, and student difficulties were discussed the most. The clients also faced significant challenges from EMI requirements, which affected their teaching effectiveness. Furthermore, the EMI requirements seem to compound the challenges faced

by newly hired professors. To address these issues, EMI requirements for professors need to be modified, and more support services are needed to help them with the challenges of academic English as a second language, English pedagogy, and implementing modern teaching methods that might work more effectively in an EMI context.

As a qualitative study of coaching sessions and professors' introspections and self-reports, this study is limited in its generalizability. It is also limited by the number of coaching sessions per client, and the reliance on clients' self-reports. More comprehensive research is needed of faculty at various Korean universities with EMI policies, including qualitative and quantitative study of professors' needs and challenges, their perceptions of EMI instruction, and their classroom practices. Observational studies and quantitative comparisons of professors' teaching practices in EMI and non-EMI courses, and the effects on students' learning and classroom interaction are also needed, especially since no known studies have undertaken such comparisons.

Finally, the results of this study point to the need for further professional development programs. These are issues that pedagogical coaches can prepare for, and that CTLs can address. The issues identified here can be addressed partly in continuing programs and workshops offered by CTLs and university departments, as well as in continued mentoring by senior faculty in each department.

## References

Ackland, R. (1991). A review of the peer coaching literature. *Journal of Staff Development, 12*(1), 22-27.

Agresti, A. (2002). *Categorical data analysis.* John Wiley & Sons.

Atkinson, D. J., & Bolt, S. (2010). Using teaching observations to reflect upon and improve teaching practice in higher education. *Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning, 10*(3), 1-19.

Bandura, A. (2001). Social cognitive theory: An agentic perspective. *Annual Review of Psychology, 52*(1), 1-26.

Boud, D., Cohen, R., & Sampson, J. (2014). *Peer learning in higher education: Learning from and with each other*. Stylus Publishing.

Brancato, V. C. (2003). Professional development in higher education. *New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education, 98*, 59-66. doi:10.1002/ace.100

Bransford, J. D., Brown, A. L., & Cocking, R. R. (1999*). How people learn: Brain, mind, experience, and school.* National Academy Press.

Byun, K., Chu, H., Kim, M., Park, I., Kim, S., & Jung, J. (2011). English-medium teaching in Korean higher education: Policy debates and reality. *Higher Education, 62*(4), 431-449. doi:10.1007/s10734-010-9397-4

Cariaga-Lo, L., Dawkins, P. W., Enger, R., Schotter, A., & Spence, C. (2010). Supporting the development of the professoriate. *Peer Review, 12*(3), 19-22.

Cho, D. W. (2012). English-medium instruction in the university context of Korea: Tradeoff between teaching outcomes and media-initiated university ranking. *Journal of Asia TEFL, 9*(4), 135-163.

Choi, S. (2013). Issues and challenges in offering English-medium instruction: A close examination of the classroom experiences of professors. *Studies in English Language & Literature, 39*(2), 275-306.

Cornett, J., & Knight, J. (2009). Research on coaching. In J. Knight (Ed.), *Coaching: Approaches and perspectives* (pp. 192-216). Corwin Press.

Cruz, L., & Rosemond, L. (2017). Coaching academia: The integration of coaching, educational development, and the culture of higher education. *Journal on Excellence in College Teaching, 28*(4), 83-108.

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2009). Self-determination theory: A consideration of human motivational universals. In P. J. Corr & G. Matthews (Eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of personality psychology* (pp. 441–456). Cambridge University Press.

DeWaelsche, S. A. (2015). Critical thinking, questioning and student engagement in Korean university English courses. *Linguistics and Education, 32*, 131–147.

Dillon, H., Mayled, L. H., Nagurka, M. L., Carnasciali, M. I., & Melton, D. E. (2020, June 22-26). *Intercollegiate coaching in a faculty professional development program that integrates pedagogical best practices and the entrepreneurial mindset.* [Conference presentation]. ASEE Annual Conference and Exposition, Online.

Dunn, J. C., Whelton, W. J., & Sharpe, D. (2006). Maladaptive perfectionism, hassles, coping, and psychological distress in university professors. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 53*(4), 511-523.

Edwards, J. L., & Newton, R. R. (1995, April 18-22). *The effects of cognitive coaching on teacher efficacy and empowerment.* [Conference presentation]. Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA.

Ellis, R. (2009). Task-based language teaching: Sorting out the misunderstandings. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics, 19*(3), 221-246. doi:10.1111/j.1473-4192.2009.00231.x

Geis, G. L., Wilburn, M., & Mellor, G. (1981). Preparing for teaching in colleges and universities: In-service support in Canada and the United States. *Studies in Higher Education, 6*(1), 47-57. doi:10.1080/03075078112331379519

Graham, R. D. (2017). Professional development for student success. *Peer Review, 19*(3), 26-30.

Gullatt, D. E., & Weaver, S. W. (1997, October 16-19). *Use of faculty development activities to improve the effectiveness of US institutions of higher education*. [Conference presentation]. Professional and Organizational Development Network in Higher Education, Hines City, FL.

Huston, T., & Weaver, C. L. (2008). Peer coaching: Professional development for experienced faculty. *Innovative Higher Education, 33*(1), 5-20. doi:10.1007/s10755-007-9061-9

Hwang, S. (2013). Engineering majors' perceptions of EMI courses. *Modern English Education, 14*(3), 209-235.

Irby, D. M. (1996). Models of faculty development for problem-based learning. *Advances in Health Sciences Education, 1*(1), 69-81. doi:10.1007/BF00596230

Jacobson, W., Wulff, D. H., Grooters, S., Edwards, P. M., & Freisem, K. (2009). Reported long-term value and effects of teaching center consultations. *To Improve the Academy, 27*, 223-246. doi:10.1002/j.2334-4822.2009.tb00557.x

Kane, R., Sandretto, S., & Heath, C. (2002). Telling half the story: A critical review of research on the teaching beliefs and practices of university academics. *Review of Educational Research, 72*(2), 177-228. doi:10.3102/00346543072002177

Kim, A., Son, Y. D., & Sohn, S. Y. (2009). Conjoint analysis of enhanced English medium instruction for college students. *Expert Systems with Applications, 36*(6), 10197-10203.

Kim, J., Tatar, B., & Choi, J. (2014). Emerging culture of English-medium instruction in Korea: Experiences of Korean and international students. *Language and Intercultural Communication, 14*(4), 441-459.

Kim, K.-R. (2011). Korean professor and student perceptions of the efficacy of English-mediated instruction. *Journal of Linguistic Research, 28*(3), 711-741.

Kugel, P. (1993). How professors develop as teachers. *Studies in Higher Education, 18*(3), 315-328. doi:10.1080/03075079312331382241

Kym, I., & Kym, M. H. (2014). Students' perceptions of EMI in higher education in Korea. *Journal of Asia TEFL, 11*(2), 35-61.

Lee, G., & Prinsloo, C. (2018). Pedagogic challenges of English-mediated instruction in the Korean EFL context. *Journal of Asia TEFL, 15*(1), 217.

Lee, H., & Lee, K. (2013). Publish (in international indexed journals) or perish: Neoliberal ideology in a Korean university. *Language Policy, 12*, 215–230.

Macaro, E., Curle, S., Pun, J., An, J., & Dearden, J. (2018). A systematic review of English medium instruction in higher education. *Language Teaching, 51*(1), 36-76. doi:10.1017/S0261444817000350

MacIntyre, P. D., & Gardner, R. C. (1994). The subtle effects of language anxiety on cognitive processing in the second language. *Language Learning, 44*(2), 283–305.

Mayled, L. H., Ross, L., Collofello, J., Krause, S. J., Hjelmstad, K. D., Sebold, B. J., & Hoyt, S. (2019, June 15-19). *Coaching and feedback in a faculty professional development program that integrates the entrepreneurial mindset and pedagogical best practices into capstone design courses.* [Conference presentation]. ASEE Annual Conference & Exposition 2019, Tampa, FL.

McDowell, M., Bedford, L., & Downs, L.D. (2014). Enhancing faculty performance through coaching: Targeted, individualized support. *Higher Learning Research Communications, 4*(4), 3-10. doi:10.18870/hlrc.v4i4.221

McKee, C. W., & Tew, W. M. (2013). Setting the stage for teaching and learning in American higher education: Making the case for faculty development. *New Directions for Teaching & Learning, 133*, 3-14. https://www.learntechlib.org/p/114188/

Michael, J., & Modell, H. I. (2003). *Active learning in secondary and college science classrooms: A working model for helping the learner to learn.* Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Nicol, D. J., & Macfarlane-Dick, D. (2006). Formative assessment and self-regulated learning: A model and seven principles of good feedback practice. *Studies in Higher Education, 31*(2), 199-218. doi:10.1080/03075070600572090

Ouellett, M. L. (2010). Overview of faculty development: History and choices. In K. J. Gillespie & D. L. Robertson (Eds.), *A guide to faculty development* (2nd ed., pp. 3-20). Jossey-Bass Inc.

Park, S., Kim, S-Y, Lee, H., & Kim, E-G. (2022). Professional development for English-medium instruction professors at Korean universities. *System, 109*(1), 1-11.

Park, S.-H. (2011, December 28). *The role of CTL for excellence in higher education.* [Conference presentation]. Korea Council for University Education: Strengthening of Excellence in Higher Education, Seoul, Korea.

Pecorari, D., & Malmstrom, H. (2018). At the crossroads of TESOL and English medium instruction. *TESOL Quarterly, 52*(3), 497-515. doi:10.1002/tesq.470

Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2002). Overview of self-determination theory: An organismic dialectical perspective. In E. L. Deci & R. M Ryan (Eds.), *Handbook of self-determination research* (pp. 3-33). University of Rochester Press.

Sandretto, S., Kane, R., & Heath, C. (2002). Making the tacit explicit: A teaching intervention programme for early career academics. *The*

    *International Journal for Academic Development, 7*(2), 135-145. doi:10.1080/13601440320000713

Sands, R. G., Parson, L. A., & Duane, J. (1991). Faculty mentoring faculty in a public university. *The Journal of Higher Education, 62*(2), 174-193. doi:10.1080/00221546.1991.11774114

Sargent, J., & Rienties, B. (2022). Unpacking effective mentorship practices for early career academics: A mixed-methods study. *International Journal of Mentoring and Coaching in Education, 11*(2), 232-244.

Schunk, D. H. (1995). Self-efficacy and education and instruction. In J. E. Maddux (Ed.), *Self-efficacy, adaptation, and adjustment* (pp. 281-303). Springer.

Schunk, D. H., & Pajares, F. (2002). The development of academic self-efficacy. In A. Wigfield & J. S. Eccles (Eds.), *Development of achievement motivation* (pp. 15-31). Elsevier.

Showers, B., & Joyce, B. (1996). The evolution of peer coaching. *Educational Leadership, 53*, 12-16.

Simkins, S., & Maier, M. (2010). *Just-in-time teaching: Across the disciplines, across the academy.* Stylus Publishing.

Singer, S. R. (2002). Learning and teaching centers: Hubs of educational reform. *New Directions for Higher Education, 2002*(119), 59-64.

Sorcinelli, M. D. (1994). Effective approaches to new faculty development. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 72*(5), 474-479. doi:10.1002/j.1556-6676.1994.tb00976.x

Sorcinelli, M. D. (2007). Faculty development: The challenge going forward. *Peer Review, 9*(4), 5-8.

Steinert, Y., Mann, K., Anderson, B., Barnett, B. M., Centeno, A., Naismith, L., Dolmans, D. (2016). A systematic review of faculty development initiatives designed to enhance teaching effectiveness: A 10-year update. *Medical Teacher, 38*(8), 769-786. doi:10.1080/0142159X.2016.1181851

Stevens, D. D., & Levi, A. J. (2013). *Introduction to rubrics.* (2nd ed.). Stylus Publishing.

Swafford, J. (1998). Teachers supporting teachers through peer coaching. *Support for Learning, 13*(2), 54-58.

Taylor, J. L., Smith, K. M., van Stolk, A. P., & Spiegelman, G. B. (2010). Using invention to change how students tackle problems. *CBE-Life Sciences Education, 9*(4), 504-512. doi:10.1187/cbe.10-02-0012

Thomas, N., Bystydzienski, J., & Desai, A. (2015). Changing institutional culture through peer mentoring of women STEM faculty. *Innovative Higher Education, 40*(2), 143-157.

Thomas, J. R. (2003). Preparing for faculty roles in discovery, learning, and engagement. *Quest, 55*(1), 4-17. doi:10.1080/00336297.2003.10491784

Kent A. Lee and Hikyoung Lee

Vernon, D. T., & Blake, R. L. (1993). Does problem-based learning work? A meta-analysis of evaluative research. *Academic Medicine, 68*(7), 550-563. doi:10.1097/00001888-199307000-00015

Williams, D. G. (2023). South Korean higher education English-medium instruction (EMI) policy: From 'resentment' to 'remedy'. *English Today*, 1–6.

Kent A. Lee, Assistant Professor
Department of English Language and Literature, Pukyong National University
Humanities Bldg. C25 #1027, Yongso-ro 45, Nam-gu, Busan, Korea
E-mail: kentlee7@gmail.com

Hikyoung Lee, Professor
Department of English Language and Literature, Korea University
Anam-ro 145, Seongbuk-gu, Seoul, Korea
E-mail: hleeku@korea.ac.kr