

How to Better Serve EFL College Learners in CBI Courses*

AeJin Kang

(Sookmyung Women's University)

Kang, AeJin. (2007). How to better serve EFL college learners in CBI courses. *English Teaching*, 62(3), 69-100.

This study investigated Korean college learners' attitudes toward and perception of Content-Based Instruction (CBI) for the purpose of making suggestions for how to offer CBI courses more effectively fulfilling the CBI promises. Based on the analyses of data obtained from questionnaire, interview, and discussion with CBI instructors, the study found that the English as a Foreign Language (EFL) learners were highly interested and motivated in taking CBI courses. At the same time, they had difficulties in comprehending and expressing themselves in the CBI course while finding it a rewarding experience. The study also found different attitudes and perception toward CBI courses in terms of anticipated difficulties and benefits between the current CBI course-takers and prospective CBI course-takers, and between more motivated CBI participants and more general CBI participants while it indicated that most of them seemed to be in need of systematic assistance in overcoming challenges brought out by lack of language skills and academic skills, and/or emotional distress.

I. INTRODUCTION

This study was an attempt to investigate Korean EFL college learners' attitudes toward and perception of the CBI courses for the purpose of making suggestions for how to provide CBI courses in an effective way. It was currently observed that increasing number of universities in Korea have been trying to offer CBI courses "to assist English language learners with their disciplinary and professional aspirations" (Crandall & Kaufman, 2002, p.1). Being able to offer CBI courses is also expected to help Korean colleges meet the global standards in the era of borderless education.

* This study was supported by the Faculty Research Grant of Sookmyung Women's University in 2006.

Especially, in terms of university trade, “for every foreign student who comes to Korea, there are 18 Koreans leaving the country to study abroad. This is the worst ratio of any OECD country” (Hussain, 2007). That is, “the ratio of foreigners to Korean nationals enrolled remains a mere 0.2 percent. This is the lowest average for OECD member countries, which have on average 6.4 percent” (Choong-yong Ahn, 2006). As an effort to increase education competitiveness to attract foreign students as well as accommodate domestic students’ needs and expectation, Korean colleges are struggling to provide academic content courses in English. In this context of educational milieu, studies need to be conducted on how a particular group of Korean EFL college learners might perceive of CBI courses and what kind of attitude they have developed toward CBI courses.

As Wesche and Skehan (2002) noted that “CBI can be very effective for both language and content learning. However, ensuring the necessary conditions to achieve this presents an ongoing challenge” (p. 220), one of the ways to meet such a challenge is to earn information on who is taking and would like to take CBI courses. Being informed of the learners’ attitudes toward and perception of the CBI courses, the CBI instructors will be able to respond to the learners’ needs and concern in a more systematic way, which would help lead to successful instruction as a “sound educational program should be based on an analysis of learners’ needs” (Richards, 2001, p. 51). In the current study, the term ‘attitudes’ toward CBI courses might be understood as prevailing feeling about CBI courses, action readiness for CBI courses, and evaluative beliefs about CBI courses on the analogy of Mathewson’s (1994) reading attitude. The term ‘needs’ is “not as straightforward as it might appear, and hence the term is sometimes used to refer to wants, desires, demands, expectation, motivation, lacks, constraints and requirements” (Brindley, 1984, p. 28).

The study, in addition to data collected from interviews and questionnaire filled out by the participants either from CBI courses or Korean-medium courses, included the data obtained from the instructors who were currently teaching CBI courses in order to share their experience and insights with other CBI instructors as well as offer practical tips. What the CBI instructors discussed and suggested would serve as a more comprehensive view of the CBI course-takers’ needs. As an attempt to inquire into the Korean college learners’ needs, perception and attitude toward CBI courses in order to make suggestions concerning how to offer CBI courses in a best way, the study was guided by the following two research questions:

1. What would bring Korean EFL college learners to CBI courses? What are their attitudes toward and perception of the CBI courses?
2. What kind of efforts should be made in order to offer effective CBI courses?

II. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

1. Content-Based Instruction (CBI)

CBI or content-based learning is “an approach to second language instruction in which the L2 is used as the medium of instruction to teach and learn curricular content” (Lotherington, 2004, p. 707). Theoretically based on communicative competence which stresses “the socially appropriate and meaningful use of language,” CBI is to be concerned with “knowing how to effectively use language rather than knowing about the language” (ibid.). According to Wesche and Skehan (2002), CBI promises that “learners in some sense receive ‘two for one,’ that is, content knowledge and increased language proficiency” (p. 221). As Snow (2005) asserted, “while discussion of the parameters of CBI is clearly ongoing, the viability of CBI as an approach to second and foreign language teaching is generally unquestioned” (p. 694).

Jarvinen (2005, p. 439) discussed the nature of CBI in its relationship among the language, content and the learner as follows:

In the majority of content-based models, language learning is a by-product to content learning and the language syllabus is derived from the content syllabus. In this sense content-based language learning is “meaning-based” and probably more motivating to learners as it combines the two goals of academic subject learning and language learning. Language is a tool of learning relevant academic content; and as such its use in the classroom is real and thus potentially more challenging, more motivating and more pushing.

Brinton, Snow, and Wesche (1989) classified the CBI into “three prototype models – theme-based, sheltered, and adjunct – provided useful exemplars for program development in the early days of CBI” (Snow, 2005, pp. 694-695). In the theme-based models, the instructor builds the teaching language skills around selected topics or themes. Gianelli (1997) and Rosser (1995) reported successful learning outcome through the theme-based models. But concerns about the need to improve coherence in content-based curricular have been expressed; In the sheltered model, the instructor (usually a content specialist) teaches a content-area course using special strategies aimed at making subject matter more comprehensible. In the original sheltered experiment at the University of Ottawa, L2 learners were observed to improve their language skills significantly while mastering the course content. However, Kinsella (1997) pointed out that sheltered instruction can become too teacher-driven and curriculum-centered. Her solution was for instructors to shift the focus to the learner by designing ‘learning to learn’ activities; The adjunct model

where a language course and a content course are linked for purpose of instruction reported many positive findings (Benesch, 1988; Brinton et al., 1989, 2003; Snow & Brinton, 1988). Meanwhile, Goldstein, Campell and Cummings (1997) described how issues of authority led ESL adjunct writing instructors to compare themselves to ‘flight attendants’ at the service of the content professors ‘in the cockpit’ and how issues of trust led students to question the language instructors’ control of the content (Snow, 2005, p. 695).

Currently, “CBI has increasingly grounded language teaching in academic content across disciplines and has changed the focus from teaching language in isolation to its integration with disciplinary content” (Kaufman & Crandall, 2005, p. 2). CBI can have two forms: a ‘strong’ form of CBI in which content alone determines what language is used in teaching content; a ‘weaker’ version would imply a stronger emphasis on content (Wesche & Skehan, 2002). CBI encompasses a wide range of models and implementations, such as immersion, language-enhanced content learning, mainstream bilingual education, plurilingual education, two-way bilingual education, and content-based language teaching (Jarvinen, 2005).

The emergence of CBI as a paradigm in language education (Brinton, Snow, & Wesche, 1989; Chamot & O’Malley, 1994; Crandall, 1987, 1993; Mohan, 1986; Short, 1993; Snow, Met, & Genesee, 1989; Stoller, 2004) and its implementation across educational contexts (Crandall & Kaufman, 2002; Mohan, Leung, & Davison, 2001; Snow & Brinton, 1997) have changed the role of language teachers and curriculum in primary, secondary and postsecondary school settings (Kaufman & Crandall, 2005). In Korean contexts, while CBI course-takers were found more motivated than their counterparts in the Korean-medium courses (Eun-ju Kim, 2003), several studies pointed out that there should be systematic arrangement and support from the instructors and the school administration in order to implement CBI in a successful way (AeJin Kang, 2004, 2005; Duk-Ki Kim, 2005; Young-Sook Shim, 2006).

2. Interdependence Hypothesis

Interdependence hypothesis is concerned with the influence of schooling in the L1 on the acquisition of the L2. Having attempted to understand and explained the positive effects of specific knowledge and skills learned in L1 on L2 attainment, Cummins (1981, 1988) proposed “interdependency principle” (1981) or “common underlying proficiency generalization” (1988). What Cummins called cognitive and academic language proficiency (CALP) which should be obtained from academic and professional experience is “common across languages and once acquired in one language can be transferred to another” (Siegel, 2003, p. 197). Accordingly, the interdependence hypothesis predicts that “older L2 learners whose L1 CALP is better developed, will acquire cognitive/academic

L2 skills more rapidly than younger learners” (Baker & Hornberger, 2001, p. 120).

While the studies on the age issue showed no advantage for older learners in acquiring basic interpersonal communication skills (BICS), the research findings strongly suggested that level of L1 CALP is a major determinant in relation to L2 CALP acquisition (Cummins, 1980c, 1980d; Ekstrand, 1978; Genesee, 1978; Krashen, Long & Scarcella, 1979). An adult learner, especially college level EFL learner, with “his or her great number of schemata and limited time on task, may actually be the more efficient language learner” (Leaver & Shekhtman, 2002, p. 18) in terms of acquiring high level of proficiency with which they can function utilizing their cognitive and academic experience. In this view, college level CBI is to provide the language learners with the linguistic means required for their current and future performance as professionals. Without having to spend time and energy to master the BICS level, the educated adult learners can directly attain CALP taking advantage of previous learning experience and letting their CALP abilities subsume BICS abilities. This way of learning L2 suggested by the interdependence hypothesis can be a more efficient model for adult learners to aim for the L2 proficiency with which they will be empowered in the L2 as well.

III. METHOD

1. Participants

The main body of the participants of the current study was 181 students who were taking courses offered by the English department at a university in Seoul in Fall, 2005. Of the 181 participating students, 122 participants were from across 11 CBI courses while another 59 participants were recruited from four Korean-medium courses (KMC). There were 148 students in the four KMCs. But only the 59 participants who said that they had not taken a CBI course by the moment of data collection were included for the current study. The reason why the KMC students were included as the participants was that they were considered as the prospective CBI students. Thus, the study wanted to include what kind of concerns and expectation they would have toward CBI courses.

All those courses were offered by the English department as the subjects of the discipline. The department has offered such CBI courses as *Introduction to English language*, *History of English literature*, *Introduction to translation*, *Introduction to English drama*, *Poets, poetry, and the postmodern self*, *Language acquisition*, *Applied linguistics*, *Leadership and readership*, *English for international communication*, *English in the era of globalization*, and *Multimedia translation*.

Additional four participants who were considered as effective CBI course-takers were

invited to provide their opinions and comments on the CBI courses through interview. There were also two professors who were currently offering CBI courses. Their teaching experience with CBI courses was discussed in addition to the data collected from the questionnaire and the interviews. Table 1 shows the students' self-assessed proficiency level of English and Table 2 their self-assessed weakest language skill.

TABLE 1
Participants' Self-Assessed English Language Proficiency

Proficiency level	N of CBI participants (%)	N of KMC participants (%)
Beginning	12 (9.8)	19 (32.8)
Intermediate-Mid	55 (45.1)	33 (56.9)
Intermediate-High	42 (34.4)	5 (8.6)
Advanced	10 (8.22)	0 (0)
No answer	3 (2.5)	1 (1.7)
Total	122 (100)	58 (100)*

* One participant (K68) indicated her proficiency level between ① and ② so that hers was not included.

TABLE 2
Participants' Weakest Language Skill

Language skills	N of CBI participants (%)	N of KMC participants (%)
Reading	22 (17.5)	1 (1.6)
Listening	8 (6.3)	5 (8.2)
Speaking	49 (38.9)	39 (64)
Writing	44 (34.9)	15 (24.6)
No answer	3 (2.4)	1 (1.67)
Total	126 (100) *	61 (100) **

* One participant (C55) marked all the skills and another participant (C105) picked up *Speaking* and *Writing*; ** One participant (K123) marked two skills, *Listening* and *Writing* while the other participant (K29) answered with *Speaking* and *Writing*.

While both groups of participants rated their speaking abilities as the weakest skill, they evaluated each skill with different order and ratio. Table 2 indicated how each group of participants considered which language skill was weakest one. Relatively, more percentage of participants in the CBI courses seemed to be concerned with literacy skills such as reading and writing compared with the KMC students' apparent lack of confidence in speaking abilities. Such a self-assessment could be partly due to their different experience and expectation that CBI students might find reading skills more critical as well as indispensable element while the KMC students would assume that speaking skills should be more demanded in CBI courses. Their different perception appeared consistent with Saville-Troike's (2006, p. 136) observation that "reading is typically much more important for academic" needs.

2. Sources of Data

1) Questionnaire

For a survey of the participants' perception of and attitude toward the CBI courses, a questionnaire was developed by the Center for Teaching and Learning at the university. The questionnaire contained both closed and open-ended questions. Since the center held the first CBI workshop in August, 2005 for the instructors who were currently and for the future trying to offer CBI courses at the school, it provided the English department with a customized workshop on December 12, 2005 focusing on how to effectively offer CBI courses with the subjects of the field. For the instructors to be able to achieve course objectives as well as appropriately respond to the students' concerns and needs, it was necessary that they should be informed of what makes the students take CBI courses, how they might think of the courses, and how they should be supported by the instructors. As an attempt to provide the current and prospective CBI instructors with a clear understanding of what their students perceive and want in the CBI classrooms, the survey was administered to the participants taking CBI courses and those who were likely to take a CBI course in a near future with a questionnaire. The questionnaire was developed in Korean and the participants were invited to provide their opinions and comments either in Korean or in English. To secure the participants' anonymity, each copy of the questionnaire was numbered with an indication of C if they were from the CBI courses or an indication of K as they took only Korean-medium courses. The survey was conducted between November 30 and December 7, 2005. For the sake of the data analysis, they were translated into English for the current study. See Appendix for the questionnaire.

2) Interview

The current study included interview data solicited at the 3rd CBI workshop held by the center on December 22, 2005. Four interviewees were invited, who were all taking more than one CBI course and recommended by their instructors, respectively. The interviewees, by their instructors, were found active participants rather than fluent speakers in English. They might represent effective CBI course-takers so that what they did and felt in the courses would provide clues concerning how the CBI courses can be fully taken advantage of. The interviews were semistructured one in which "the researcher uses a written list of questions as a guide, while still having the freedom to digress and probe for more information" (Mackey & Gass, 2005, p. 173). The interviews were conducted in Korean with one-to-one format and videotaped for later analysis. Each interviewee was given a pseudonym and referred to as Kayoung (Junior, Law), Nayoung (Junior, Business

Administration), Dayoung (Senior, Korean) and Rayoung (Senior, English) in the data analysis and its discussion.

3) Discussion with the CBI Instructors

Two CBI instructors were invited to present their experience and insight they earned from their teaching career at the workshop. A main purpose of their presentations was to share their teaching tips for the CBI courses and make suggestions for improving teaching practice of CBI instructors as well as provoke discussion on how to offer effective CBI courses. The two instructors were indicated as Instructor A (Assistant Professor of English) and Instructor B (Assistant Professor of Design).

IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

1. Results of Questionnaire Analyses

1) Purposes of Taking CBI Courses

For Question 3-1, *What did you take CBI courses for?* and Question 2-3, *If you were to take CBI courses, what do you want to take them for?* developed for CBI participants and KMC participants, respectively, the majority of the participants responded with option, *To improve English proficiency* (87 out of 122 CBI participants or 71%; 41 out of 54 KMC participants or 76%). Secondly indicated purpose was *To understand original texts more clearly* (18 CBI participants or 15%; 13 KMC participants or 24%). For the detailed responses for each question, see Appendix.

In addition, 14 CBI participants provided their own reasons why they took the CBI courses: five participants mentioned that they took the course since they were interested in the course regardless of what language was used as the medium of the course (C9, C10, C22, C63, C68); three students confessed that they were more comfortable with English than with Korean (C3, C21, C76); for the four students, it was for maintaining and improving English proficiency (C36, C43, C62, C66); one participant expressed her expectation that the CBI course would be more suitable for conveying the contents since all the texts and terms were presented in English (C67). Meanwhile, three KMC participants (.06%) supplied their own rationale: *“It will get me new experience –*

translated”¹ (K1); “*Since other students are all taking CBI courses, then I cannot but take them - translated*” (K73); “*Since the CBI courses employ criterion-referenced evaluation, (I would like to take them due to a better chance to earn a higher grade) –translated*” (K121). The participants’ responses concerning purposes of taking or intending to take CBI courses were summarized in Table 3.

TABLE 3
Purposes of Taking and Intending to Take CBI Courses

Purposes	N of CBI participants (%)	N of KMC participants (%)
To improve English proficiency	87 (71)	41 (76)
To understand original texts more clearly	18 (15)	13 (24)
To take same course with close friends	2 (1.6)	0 (0)
Due to time conflict	4 (3.3)	0 (0)
No answer	10 (8.2)	1 (1.9)
Other reasons	14 (11.5)	3 (6)
Total	135 (110.7)*	58 (107) *

* Some participants responded with more than one option so that the total number of the participants was calculated with more than 100%, respectively. For the KMC, only 54 participants who answered Question 2-2 positively with option ① *Yes* were counted for this question.

To the KMC group who had not taken a CBI course, Question 2 was developed with 4 sub-questions being included: Especially for Question 2-2 *If you have not taken a CBI course yet, are you interested in taking any in a near future?* 54 KMC participants (91.5%) answered positively with option ① *Yes* while five participants (8.5%) responded negatively with option ② *No*. Their answers showed that the majority of KMC participants were interested in taking CBI courses, and could be considered prospective CBI students.

The participants’ answers to Question 3-1 and 2-1, 2, and 3 revealed that the majority of the participants (71% of the CBI participants and 76% of the KMC participants) were currently taking and/or trying to take a CBI course in expectation of improving English language proficiency. For the CBI students to be able to realize the improvement of proficiency within one-semester period, it will be highly recommended that the instructor create a context in which the students are encouraged not only to comprehend what they are reading and listening, but also to produce the language through active participation, that is, through output activities.

As Saville-Troike (2006) stated that “the importance of output for successful L2 learning has been most fully expounded by Merrill Swain (e.g., Swain & Lapkin, 1995)” (p. 75), “the production of language pushes learners to process language more deeply” (Lightbown

¹ The participants’ feedback and comments were cited as they were without any correction. When they provided them in Korean, they were translated into English and indicated by ‘-translated’ next to the quoted remarks. The quotations are in italics.

& Spada, 2006, p. 48) so that “learning is evident in output, a display of the learner’s ability in the language” (Barkhuizen, 2004, p. 555). That is, for the CBI course-takers to improve their language skills, they should be given as many opportunities to speak and write out so that they can manipulate the language in a more rigorous way and thus develop necessary expressive language skills. Like the French immersion classes mentioned in Swain and Lapkin (1995), it is possible that the CBI students lack the opportunities to produce the language unless the instructor carefully organizes each lesson to ensure the time and opportunities for participation in productive modes.

One of the ways to induce the students’ participation may be stimulated by interaction as the scaffolding hypothesis argues that “social interaction provides the substantive means by which learning occurs” (Littlewood, 2004, p. 519). Especially, using “scaffolded interaction” (McCormick & Donato, 2000), the instructor can guide the students in how to get used to interaction gradually. At the same time, interaction between the students, and among the students through frequent pair- and small-group discussions need to be employed in order to increase the amount of language actually produced by the students.

2) Benefits of CBI Courses

The participants’ response to Question 3-2 *What do you think is the most beneficial thing by taking a CBI course?* might indicate how far their expectation was met: Overall, the students appeared to have their expectation met as 61% of the participants answered that they improved English proficiency or became more interested and confident in English. Including another 21 participants (17%) who indicated that they were able to understand the contents more accurately in the CBI course than in the possible corresponding Korean-medium course, 78% of the participants’ responses seemed to support the assumption that CBI courses would benefit the students in terms of increasing their language abilities and/or content comprehension.

Even among the 18 participants (15%) who responded with option ④ *It did not help much*, 72% of them (13 out of the 18) showed their intention to try a CBI course again. Such a response can suggest that one time trial and its disappointment would not lead to giving up the CBI courses. Meanwhile, two participants provided their own comments: “*It was good to keep current with English – translated*” (C43); “*I was stimulated by the fact that my classmates were very good at English – translated*” (C62). That the CBI participants showed relatively a high level of satisfaction with the CBI courses seemed consistent with the research findings and suggestions of CBI studies in the literature, thus could be used to justify and encourage further implementation of CBI courses at college level EFL environment.

3) Difficulties the Students Would Face in CBI Classrooms

Concerning Question 3-3 *When taking the CBI course, what was the most difficult thing to cope with?* the participants' responses revealed that it was after all linguistic hardship. That is, 100 participants (83%) answered with ④ *It was hard to write up report or paper in English* (29 participants or 24%), ③ *It was hard to comprehend due to a lot of unfamiliar vocabularies or terms since we used texts written in English only* (28 participants or 23%), ② *I found my English proficiency far below that of my classmates so that my fear of being compared with them prevented me from participating in the class* (26 participants or 21%), or ① *I were often left without comprehension due to low listening comprehension skills* (17 participants or 14%), respectively.

However, among the 100 participants, those who chose option ④ or ② seemed to address not only difficulties caused by language itself, but also lack of cognitive skills such as study skills or affective problems. In particular, the 29 participants responding with option ④ seemed to require assistance for cognitive strategies of how to produce academic report or paper through step-by-step guidance and/or modeling from the instructor or more experienced classmates.

In the meantime, 17 participants (14%) provided their own comments: five participants (C7, C24, C36, C63, C65) mentioned that they had difficulties in comprehending the instructor or the textbook, participating in the class, and making questions or summary due to lack of language skills; four participants (C3, C69, C101, C107) complained about the way the instructor delivered or prepared for the course saying that *"I was able to understand the contents. But it seems that we could not deal with the contents as deeply as we would do in a Korean-medium course – translated"* (C69); *"It sometimes happened that the contents were not delivered clearly – translated"* (C101). Two participants pointed out proficiency level discrepancies among the students stating that *"communication problems used to arise as the students' English proficiency levels are different – translated"* (C9); *"Tracking should be employed since the students' levels are different from one another – translated"* (C118).

As to Question 3-4 *Do you intend to take another CBI course?* the majority of the participants (108 out of 122 or 89%) answered this question positively with option ① *Yes*, while only three participants (2.5%) answered with option ② *No*. The students' responses to Questions 3-3 and 3-4 can be interpreted that the participants were willing to take CBI courses even though it might be sometimes challenging enough posing several problems attributable to linguistic difficulties, academic aspects of their study and/or affective causes.

4) How the Participants Want to Be Assisted

Questions 2-4 and 3-5 *How should you be assisted by your instructor or school when taking a CBI course?* were developed for KMC participants and CBI participants respectively, especially to see what kind of help the participants wanted from their instructor or school when making efforts to survive and succeed in the CBI course. Each group’s suggestions were summarized in Table 4.

TABLE 4
How KMC and CBI Participants Wanted to Be Assisted

Major suggestions from the KMC group (N: %)	Major suggestions from the CBI group (N: %)
1. Easy to understand lecture (13: 22%)	1. Instructor’s care about linguistic hardship the students experienced (14: 11.5%)
2. Instructor’s care about the students’ different proficiency levels especially between those who had been abroad and those who had not (8: 13.6%)	2. More structured lessons; guidance for content comprehension and performing various tasks (11: 9%)
3. School administration’s support such as reducing class-size, orientation for CBI courses, placement test for tracking (3: 5.1%)	3. Smaller class-size; more number of CBI courses (6: 5%)
4. Students’ own efforts such as preparation and review of the lessons (2: 3%)	4. More opportunities to use the language through presentations, small-group and classroom discussions (5: 4%)
	5. Instructor’s thorough preparation for each lesson (4: 3%)

The suggestions made by the 26 KMC participants (43.3%) might reflect the fact that the students were most concerned about whether they can comprehend the lecture. Not only did the participants want their instructor to deliver his or her lecture as comprehensibly as possible using “*familiar word*” (K55), “*slow speech*” (K103) as well as checking “*whether each student is following*” (K126), they also wished the instructor to consider the different levels of English proficiency observed among the students. That is, the KMC participants appeared to be in need of assistance to process contents. In addition, the instructors should acknowledge that “less adept students may also avoid speaking out for fear of making mistakes and losing face” (Farrell, 2006, p. 173) especially in front of more proficient classmates, they need to care about the students’ affective well-being as well.

From the CBI group, 67 out of 122 participants (54.9%) provided their suggestions. First of all, fourteen participants directly mentioned that the instructor should be able to take care of linguistic hardship that especially low proficiency level students might experience by monitoring how fast the lesson proceeds (C43), articulating slowly (C114, C119) with clear pronunciation (C64, C84), presenting them with an easier explanation for difficult terms and vocabularies (C11) for those who are not accustomed to CBI courses (C90),

paraphrasing with familiar expressions (C113) suggesting that CBI instructors “make such “foreigner talk” modifications in the language they use in teaching, in order to make the content they are focusing on more comprehensible to their students” (Richards & Rodgers, 2001, p. 209). In particular, they wanted their instructor to consider the level discrepancy between high proficient students and low proficient ones, as well as between the students who had studied abroad or those who did not have overseas experience (C10, C43, C60, C72, C83). Another participant stressed the importance of pre-CBI courses in which the students can be trained to make themselves ready for taking CBI courses (C47).

Second, 11 participants said that it was necessary for them to need more guidance from their instructor in terms of increasing content comprehension as well as performing various tasks demanded by the course: “*I wish the instructor to guide us in reading the textbooks providing the focus points rather than letting us read them on our own – translated*” (C29); “*There should be explanation about the objectives and structure of the course, information such as related materials for preparation, tips and advice for the writing and presentation skills – translated*”(C39); “*I wish the instructor to show us the examples or ready-made format (for the tasks such as presentation and writing up a report) – translated*” (C73); “*(The instructor should make) comfortable environment so that the students can make questions whenever they cannot figure out clearly – translated*” (C75); “*I wish (the instructor) to provide hints as to unfamiliar vocabularies in advance – translated*” (C102). They also asked the instructor to provide comments (C98) as well as (timely) feedback (C9, C100) on their homework or other activities. They seemed to be in need of scaffolding to tackle each task successfully. The participants’ comments would reflect Schleppegrell’s (2004) that “scaffolding requires a visible pedagogy (Bernstein, 1996; Martin, 1999) that provides teachers with expertise and makes the criteria for success explicit to students” (p. 156).

Third, six participants made suggestions that the school administration should help offer the CBI courses more effectively by reducing the number of the students in a class (C87, C92) as well as increasing the number of CBI courses with various subjects (C50). Especially for English department, “*All the courses should be offered as the CBI courses – translated*” (C14). They also wanted extra-support systems such as writing, reading, and translation clinics (C10). Meanwhile, one participant suggested that “*for those who are not accustomed with Korean culture or language, please make some special classes*” (C3) reflecting the fact that Korean universities have admitted foreign students who in a sense contributed to adding one more flavor of authenticity to the CBI courses.

Fourth, five participants wished that they had more opportunities to discuss (C13), present (C15), and speak with the classmates (C82) through more group activities as well as wanted their instructor to “*assign time to work together to practice such activities (as presentation and writing up a report) – translated*” (C73). The participants seemed to feel

that they did lack the time and opportunities to produce the language in the classroom, which was similarly observed in French immersion program that “the learners engaged in too little language production” (Lightbown & Spada, 2006, p. 156) leading to “the students’ failure to achieve high levels of performance in some aspects of French grammar” (ibid.). In an effort to increase the number of opportunities to use the language in productive modes, group and pair work need to be actively employed. As “most CBI courses anticipate that students will support each other in collaborative modes of learning” (Richards & Rodgers, 2001, p. 213), the CBI participants appeared to appreciate the collaborative work and its unthreatening nature as they are allowed to speak through pair or group activities, “*everyone does not have to feel shy speaking out – translated*” (C53).

Fifth, four participants pointed out that the instructor needs to thoroughly prepare for each lecture (C76, C77) with complimentary materials and summary (C79) which should be integrated into well-organized lessons (C101). In addition, one participant suggested frequent quizzes to check how well they understood the contents at each session (C49) while another three participants complained that the CBI course was too demanding due to a lot of homework (C2, C31) and reading for exam (C114). On the other hand, two participants suggested native language (L1) use for important concepts (C48) or the directions for certain tasks such as exams (C111) in a complimentary way, but one participant wanted to keep English-only policy for CBI courses (C26). These apparently contrastive suggestions seemed to reflect the level discrepancies among the participants.

For Question 4-3, *What kind of efforts do you or are you going to make to improve your English proficiency?* 98 CBI participants (79%) and 41 KMC participants (69%) provided their responses. Table 5 summarized how each CBI and KMC participants made/would make for improving English proficiency.

TABLE 5
Kinds of Effort Made by CBI and KMC Participants

Efforts made by the CBI Participants (N: %)	Efforts made by the KMC Participants (N: %)
1. Studying for myself with TOEFL exercise books and writing (37: 30)	1. Taking language courses at a private institute (25: 42)
2. Taking language courses such as composition courses in school or in private institutes (21: 17)	2. Listening to English a lot, writing English diary, studying with TOEFL exercise books (17: 29)
3. Listening to English channels or reading in English (16: 13)	3. Planning to go abroad (9: 15)
4. Planning to study abroad (11: 9)	
5. Taking CBI courses (10: 8.2)	
6. Making myself exposed to English more than to Korean (8: 6.6)	
7. Joining in conversation clubs to practice speaking (3: 2.5)	

Majority of the CBI participants, in order to improve English language proficiency, seemed to make individual efforts by themselves without getting professional help from others. It could be partly due to the fact that they were already independent learners. That more than 80% of the 122 CBI participants mentioned concrete ways of improving their proficiency levels might suggest that the CBI participants were strongly motivated language learners.

Compared with the ways of improving English proficiency reported by the CBI participants, the KMC participants appeared to use relatively smaller number of strategies. One interesting difference was also found in the number of participants in each group who wanted to take course(s) at a private institute: 21 (17%) out of the 122 CBI participants intended to attend a private institute while 17 (29%) of the 59 KMC participants stated this way. Likewise, less percentage of the KMC participants seemed to make individual efforts by themselves, which might reflect that they were in need of professional help before they would turn out to be independent language learners.

With respect to Question 5-1, *What do you think is the reason if you cannot comprehend English materials in the CBI course?* each group answered differently. Table 6 shows their responses, respectively.

TABLE 6

Reasons Why the Participants (Would) Have Difficulties Comprehending Materials

Reasons	CBI participants' responses N (%)	KMC Participants' responses N (%)
④ <i>Due to lack of background information</i>	56 (45.9)	16 (27.1)
① <i>Due to lack of vocabulary power</i>	52 (42.6)	30 (50.8)
③ <i>Due to the lack of reading experience in English</i>	18 (14.8)	10 (16.9)
② <i>Due to the lack of grammar knowledge</i>	8 (6.6)	4 (6.8)

* For this question, the participants were allowed to answer with more than one option if applied.

For the CBI participants, it was content-related information that they seemed to find necessary in order to comprehend the English texts clearly while the KMC participants appeared to be more afraid of linguistic causes. It suggested that CBI instructors have to keep “context and comprehensibility foremost in their planning and presentations” (Richards & Rodgers, 2001, p. 214) to maximize the CBI students’ reading comprehension which should be one of the critical conditions for successful CBI implementation.

For the question 5-2, *What are the ways of increasing your comprehension of reading materials in the CBI course? How do you want your instructor to assist you to comprehend them?* 86 CBI participants (70%) provided their opinions and suggestions.

Table 7 presents what kinds of suggestion were made by the participants.

TABLE 7
Participants' Suggestions to Increase Comprehension of Reading Materials

N of participants (%)	Suggestions
34 (27.9)*	Provide background information.
34 (27.9)	Provide summary, overview, main points of the lessons, the course and the texts.
16 (13.1)	Use simple and various examples, familiar words, frequently used expressions, paraphrasing, exact definition of the terms, repeated explanations.
10 (8.2)	Provide preview and review of the lessons as well as help the students to do for themselves through homework.
6 (5)	Use additional supporting materials such as visual and/or audio aids, acting out activities, filling out exercises.
3 (2.5)	L1 use for providing background information, explanation of professional terms or main points
2 (1.6)	Use quizzes for encouraging the students to prepare for the lessons as well as check their comprehension.
1 (.8)	Provide corrective feedback on the students' language use.
1 (.8)	Help the students form study groups in the beginning of the semester.
1 (.8)	Push the students harder (to study hard).
1 (.8)	Pronounce clearly.

* Some participants made more than one suggestion.

Since it should be critical to ensure high level of reading comprehension with the texts in the academic CBI course, it appeared that the participants wanted to grip the overall contents in a deeper way as 27.9% of the CBI participants asked background information along with another 27.9% of them asking the summary and overview. While only a few number of participants mentioned linguistic help such as corrective feedback and clear pronunciation, more than 13% of the CBI participants called for supporting materials such as audio and visual aids to enhance their comprehension. Thus, 84 (68.8%) of the CBI participants seemed to be aware of the importance of background knowledge as well as overall grasp of the contents when trying to increase content-comprehension.

As schema theory holds that “the meaning of any text is not contained within the text itself bur rather is retrieved or constructed through interaction with a reader’ background knowledge” (Carrell, 1984, cited in Farrell, 2006, p. 174), the CBI participants appeared to notice the significance of background knowledge and overview in order to function effectively as CBI course-takers. Especially, it will be even more critical to provide adequate background information when considering that “the schema theory is not only applied to the receptive skills and used to explain the accuracy or quality of comprehension” (Farrell, 2006, p. 174). Perhaps it could also “be applied to the productive skills and used to explain the quantity of language produced” (ibid.). This hypothesis was

confirmed by Zuengler (1993) in which she found that when interlocutors were unequally knowledgeable about the topic, the relative expert produced more words. That is, content-comprehension seems to be a key factor explaining the level of participation in productive modes.

2. Results of Interview Analyses

The interview analysis centered around four themes guided by the interview questions: 1. the purposes and expectations of taking CBI courses, 2. the difficulties they would face in taking CBI courses, 3. how to cope with such difficulties, 4. benefits and advantages of taking CBI courses.

1) Purposes and Expectations of Taking CBI Courses

One thing that all the four interviewees mentioned as a reason why they took CBI courses was to improve and refine their English language proficiency. In particular, Dayoung said that *“it is good to have an environment in which I have to use English – translated”* while Rayoung who had taken four CBI courses and six general English program (GEP) courses by the moment of the interview pointed out that *“GEP helped us learn something basic in English. But I wanted to improve my (English) proficiency level up to a highest level so that I chose to take CBI courses – translated.”* They voluntarily placed themselves in the CBI course so that they could be classified as L2 learners whose “choice motivation” (Dornyei, 2001) was strong enough to place themselves in a challenging situation to pursue a higher goal. That is, they were not satisfied with the current level of proficiency, but actively pursued for opportunities to make themselves function reflecting their age and educational experience.

Nayoung also revealed such a motivation to acquire highly professional level of proficiency: *“I wanted to deal with texts and materials in English that my counterparts in an English-speaking country would use for their study - translated.”* Moreover, they seemed to go further being aware of future career and its required level of performance skills: *“I wished to learn how to teach in English by looking at CBI instructors’ way of teaching - translated”* (Dayoung). Meanwhile, they were also encouraged to take CBI courses by practical benefits: *“I can get a better grade without having to be compared with other students’ performance since CBI courses employ criterion-referenced evaluation – translated”* (Rayoung). The interviewees’ discussion on why they took CBI courses could be summarized that they wanted to acquire English language using abilities with which they can express age and grade-level appropriate ideas and thoughts. Their discussion seemed to support the argument that CBI “better reflects learners’ needs for learning a

second language” (Richards & Rodgers, 2001, p. 207).

2) Difficulties in CBI Courses

Concerning the difficulties they would face in taking CBI courses, the four interviewees attributed the causes to the lack of language skills: “*I was not able to express what I wanted to. My instructor interpreted what I said differently from my intension. I can understand pretty well. But it is still difficult to speak out before the class – translated*” (Kayoung); “*It was hard to comprehend so that my understanding of the contents was superficial. Some of my classmates also complained about the CBI course with the same reason – translated*” (Nayoung); “*I wanted to make questions in the class. But I was not able to do since my speaking skills were not high enough to make questions spontaneously. I wish I had been allowed to use Korean during the break so that I could make questions even in Korean – translated*” (Dayoung); “*Anyway, it is not my language. We have to study real academic stuff in another language, which basically makes it hard to study in the CBI courses. While struggling with unfamiliar vocabularies, we are supposed to cover same amount of contents we would do in a corresponding Korean-medium course – translated*” (Rayoung).

Even the interviewees who showed high level of speaking abilities (Rayoung) and studied abroad (Kayoung) appealed for help due to the burden of English language use: “*The CBI course should reduce the amount of contents so that the students can manage what they have to deal with in English – translated*” (Rayoung). It appeared that the interviewees were under the constant stress mainly due to the linguistic challenge since they were dealing with academic language which was “characterized as language that stands in contrast to the everyday informal speech that students use outside the classroom environment” (Bailey & Butler, 2002, p. 7). That is, the language that the interviewees strived for was not BICS but CALP whose mastery would require rigorous practice in academic and/or professional settings.

While the interviewees complained of the linguistic challenge, however, no interviewee seemed to suffer from the level discrepancy among the classmates. They appeared to focus on themselves. That is, as far as they worked hard to comprehend the lecture and actively participate in classroom activities, be it individual participation or group work, they did not seem to mind whether the other classmates were better speaker or not. The interviewees’ different attitude toward the level discrepancy was contrasted with that of the CBI and KMC participants in the current study, many of whom showed concern that they might be at a disadvantage due to the comparison with more fluent classmates.

3) How to Cope with the Difficulties in CBI Courses

When asked about how to cope with difficulties they faced in the CBI courses, all the four interviewees pointed out the necessity and importance of preparation by reading the chapters and other materials in advance: *“Preparation is not an option, but a must – translated”* (Kayoung); *“It was not easy to prepare for each lesson. But it was necessary – translated”* (Nayoung); *“If I had not read in advance, then it could have been very hard to comprehend the lecture – translated”* (Dayoung, Rayoung). For them to effectively prepare for each lesson, they wished the instructor to give them *“homework and quizzes to check their preparation as well as set up buddy system through which more proficient students can help less proficient ones – translated”* (Kayoung), *“focal points so that they are able to prepare more efficiently – translated”* (Kayoung, Dayoung, Rayoung), and *“quizzes, and their results should be reflected on the final grade– translated”* (Rayoung).

While the interviewees were well aware of how critically important it was to prepare for the class in order to overcome insufficient linguistic resources, they also experienced that it was not easy to do this job for themselves so that they suggested that there be something imposed by the instructor such as homework or quizzes. For the CBI class to work effectively fulfilling its objectives, the instructors need to invent systematic ways to encourage the students' preparation by presenting clear guideline of how to prepare for each lesson not only for all the students in general, but also individual students who are especially weak at language skills and require more involvement from the instructor. In addition, the students should be encouraged to participate through *“group work, problem-solving activities and games – translated”* (Nayoung) to practice the language as well as enhance content-knowledge in a cooperating way. At the same time, as Rayoung said that *“when I became more familiar with the instructor, I got more confident in the CBI class,”* the instructor needs to take care of affective aspects of students' classroom life by building up a good rapport with the students through *“individual or group conferences, or even one time casual meeting with the instructor – translated”* (Rayoung), for example.

4) Benefits and Advantages of Taking CBI Courses

With respect to the benefits or advantages of taking CBI courses, the three interviewees pointed out that it was the environment created by the CBI course in which they had to use English only: *“I cannot but use English in the classroom so that I feel my English using abilities being improved – translated”* (Nayoung, Dayoung, Rayoung). In an EFL context like Korea, it is not easy for the English language learners to put themselves under the circumstance in which they are to communicate authentically in English especially with academic and professional terms and expressions. Thus, CBI can be an exclusive

opportunity to provide authentic environment where the learners are able to use the language for the real purposes.

Another benefits mentioned were “*more comfortable atmosphere*” (Kayoung), “*concentration-induced environment*” (Nayoung), “*learning and help from classmates*” (Dayoung), and “*individual care and more effective group activities*” (Rayoung). As Kayoung said that “*there were only eight students in the CBI course so that we were able to establish a good rapport with the instructor who also had a caring attitude. It was very comfortable to say something in the classroom – translated.*” Rayoung also mentioned that “*if a corresponding Korean-medium course has 70 or 80 students, the CBI course will have only 15 or 16. The small class size allows the instructor to take care of individual students by providing more customized feedback and directions. At the same time, the group work such as group discussion is done in a more rigorous manner since each group can get the attention from the instructor – translated.*”

Kayoung added that she felt “*more comfortable in expressing her opinions and ideas in English rather than in Korean mainly due to the instructor’s encouraging manner observed similarly in the western classrooms, and the fact that English does not require honorific forms which are critical linguistic feature for Korean discourse – translated.*” The different linguistic characteristics between Korean and English along with more liberal attitude of the CBI instructor appeared to put the students into a more egalitarian position in which they were invited to speak out without having to concern the different status between the instructor and themselves.

Meanwhile, Nayoung pictured a unique atmosphere of the CBI course that “*if I do not concentrate, I cannot comprehend at all. Everybody else seemed to focus on what’s going on so that it was very quiet and motivating environment to study in – translated*” Dayoung added one more feature of the CBI course that “*we had exchange students from foreign countries. Getting along with them preparing for group works, I learned a lot from their way of presentation as well as talked to them even outside the classroom – translated.*” It might be a common observation that more motivated students seemed to take CBI courses not only for the content learning but also for improving language skills. They can be classified as risk-taking learners maximizing their learning opportunity achieving the two-fold purpose of taking CBI courses. As a result, they were able to “*refine language skills*” (Dayoung, Rayoung) as well as “*be more confident and comfortable in using the language*” (Kayoung).

3. Tips from the CBI Instructors

Having acknowledged that “opportunities to exchange ideas or discuss with colleagues what they know or believe are rare and valued” (Freeman & Hawkins, 2004, p. 3), two CBI instructors were invited to provide teaching tips as well as share their experience and

insight. They also discussed their view of how to approach CBI courses and assist the students to fulfill CBI promises. Instructor A, a professor of Translation, who taught in an American university for one year after he earned MA and Ph.D. degree in Translation studies from another American university. He was observed to be proficient enough to offer CBI courses. He was currently teaching *Media Translation* and *Translation Theory & Practice* mainly to English majors for two semesters by the moment of this discussion.

He first of all presented his idea of what a CBI should be: “A CBI course should not set up its primary goals in measuring or improving the students’ English language proficiency.” He tried to restrict the contribution of language proficiency itself to the final grade. He actually observed that “the students who make more efforts earned a better grade than those whose English proficiency was higher.” That is, he put more emphasis on “students’ effort attributions” (Dornyei, 2001, p. 120). In a way to emphasize effort attribution, Dornyei (2001) made five suggestions: 1. provide effort feedback (Pintrich & Schunk, 1996); 2. refuse to accept ability attributions; 3. model effort-outcome linkages; 4. encourage learners to offer effort explanations (Ushioda, 1996); 5. make effort and perseverance a class norm (pp. 121-122). Through this approach, not only highly proficient students but also intermediate and beginning level students can encourage themselves to take the CBI course and make it rewarding experience.

Instructor B, a professor of Design, went to junior-high school, college, and graduate school in the United States. Including her professional career, she stayed in the States for 13 years and showed native-like proficiency. She offered *Leadership Workshop* where she put the stress on the students’ participation. Through teamwork and group discussion in each class, she induced the students’ voluntary involvement in the learning process. As Richards and Rodgers (2001) argued that “one goal of CBI is for learners to become autonomous” (p. 213), “CBI is the “learning by doing” school of pedagogy. This assumes an active role by learners in several dimensions” (ibid.). This approach appeared overlapped with the Instructor A’s point of view that “CBI course should be run as learner-centered classroom.” By providing “enough explanation and dialogue between the instructor and the students as well as among the students” (Instructor B) through “various channels such as e-class, bulletin board” (Instructor A), CBI courses will be transformed into an interactive learning site.

Both instructors pointed out the importance of well-planned and organized lesson to urge the students’ participation maximizing their learning opportunities, which will let the students predict what happens at each stage of lesson and be more comfortable in the possibly daunting environment. Instructor B, in particular, oriented the students into the course format, expectation, types of activities, and ways of involvement in a clear and detailed explanation at the first session so that the students might develop a high level of motivation to accomplish their learning goals through the course since they got to know

they were able to realize the goals as far as they sincerely would follow each step as guided by the instructor.

Along with well-structured lessons, the instructors stressed the significance of comprehension. Both instructors seemed to find the issue of how to secure a desirable level of content comprehension a most difficulty part of CBI courses. By giving out “*lecture materials or putting down the summary on the blackboard as well as using repetition, review and visual aides*” (Instructor B), and “*supplementary Korean texts*” (Instructor A), they tried hard to help the students understand the contents. In addition, to get the students confidence and sense of achievement, reasonably challenging activities such as “*key-word activity, one-minute review, and short presentation*” (Instructor A) and “*3-person teaching*” (Instructor B) were recommended, where three students in one team were to teach one another what they understood in the class.

V. CONCLUSION

1. The Answer to Research Question 1

Concerning Research Question 1, *What would bring Korean EFL college learners to CBI courses? What are their attitudes toward and needs in CBI courses?* the data analyses showed that the participating students were opportunity seeking learners highly interested in taking CBI courses mainly for the purpose of improving English language using abilities. They acknowledged that CBI courses create “a genuine need to communicate, motivation students to acquire language in order to understand the content” (Lightbown & Spada, 2006, p. 159). Especially for adult learners liker college students, “there is the advantage of content that is cognitively challenging and interesting in a way that is often missing in foreign language instruction” (ibid.).

As the interdependent hypothesis suggests that older learners are in a better position in terms of acquiring CALP level proficiency in L2, the CBI course might be the right site of learning where the college learners can transfer their L1 CALP and thus obtain higher level of L2 proficiency which can serve their academic and professional needs. Despite high motivation to take CBI courses, however, they showed that their attitude was not always strong enough to support their motivation. That is, while they perceived the CBI courses as a necessary and rewarding experience in order to raise their English proficiency level, it was also true that the CBI participants often faced difficulties due to lack of language skills, lack of academic skills and/or emotional frustration. Accordingly, they seemed to be in need of systematic assistance in those three aspects of CBI classroom from their instructor and school.

2. The Answer to Research Question 2

With respect to Research Question 2, *What kind of efforts should be made in order to offer effective CBI courses?* the study put forward suggestions of how to provide CBI courses successfully and thus serve the college EFL learners to achieve twofold purpose: enhancing content-knowledge, and improving English language using abilities. In a sense, a CBI course can be more fruitful than its corresponding Korean-medium course in carrying out its course objectives since the students are usually observed to be more motivated and devoted to their learning. Taking advantage of such a high level of students' motivation and commitment, the CBI instructors will be able to provide quality instruction if they keep in mind the students' voice and make appropriate efforts to respond to their needs and interest.

1) GEP as a Preliminary Course

As the questionnaire analysis showed that both CBI and KMC participants appeared to fear the possible discrimination due to the different language abilities, and suggested a tracking system. But considering the fact that it is not easy for Korean colleges to employ a tracking system to offer CBI courses, let alone whether it is desirable for the students, a more realistic solution would be take advantage of GEP. That is, in GEP courses, the students can make themselves ready for CBI courses through the carefully designed curriculum which should directly contributed to improving language and academic skills required by each discipline. By exposing the students to genre and discourse in their respective major areas, GEP can play a role as a preliminary course for the CBI courses, in which students would learn survival academic skills such as how to write up a report, and make a presentation based on academic reading.

2) Motivational Interventions

For those who were more likely to suffer from emotional causes such as comparison with classmates, motivational intervention should be necessary as "researchers and educators have long acknowledged the importance of affective conditions in L2 learning" (Yamashita, 2007, p. 83). Having been reminded of the purposes of taking CBI courses, they can be assured that they had better appreciate more proficient classmates and consider them as linguistic resources while focusing on their own improvement rather than being obsessed with injurious comparison. Being a CBI instructor is in a sense to become "good enough motivator" (Dornyei, 2001) by, for example, providing a sense of achievement through reasonably challenging activities such as short-presentation, pair- and small-group

work, peer teaching, and guided research which should be accompanied with timely and customized feedback and comments. In addition, careful guidance and scaffolding as well as demonstration will ease the tension that the students might feel when conducting challenging academic tasks as the socio-cultural theory suggests that “mental functions that are beyond an individual’s current level must be performed in collaboration with other people before they are achieved independently” (Saville-Troike, 2006, p. 112).

3) Evaluation Based on Efforts Not on Linguistic Skills

One of the ways to motivate the students to do their best in the CBI course will be employing evaluation based not on how well they can speak in English, but on how much efforts they would make for each activity including homework and participation. In the university where the current study was conducted, criterion-referenced evaluation was employed for CBI courses so that the students did not have to compete against their classmates for better grade but earned a possibly best grade based on solely their own performance, which the participants pointed out as one of the incentives of taking CBI courses.

4) Systematic Assistance for Preparation for Each Lesson

As both the participants and instructors emphasized the critical contribution of preparation for each lesson, the instructors should not only prepare well-structured lessons but also help the students read in advance and ready for classroom activities by setting up several apparatus such as quizzes, one-minute review, homework, and buddy system. Reading in advance should be understood as an indispensable condition in CBI courses in a sense that it will compensate the students’ lack of background knowledge or schema of the contents as well as lead to better comprehension which is considered as a primary concern of the CBI courses as mentioned by the participants.

REFERENCES

- Ahn, Choong-yong. (2006, December 19). Korea needs to further globalize education. *The Korea Herald*, p. 4.
- Bailey, A. L., & Butler, F. A. (2002). *An evidentiary framework for operationalizing academic language for broad application to K-12 education: A design document*. (Final deliverable to OERI, Contract No. R305B96002-02). University of California, LA: National Center for Research on Evaluation, Standards, and Student

Testing (CRESST).

- Baker, C., & Hornberger, N. H. (2001). *An introductory reader to the writings of Jim Cummins*. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.
- Barkhuizen, G. (2004). Social influence on language learning. In A. Davies & C. Elder (Eds.), *The handbook of applied linguistics* (pp. 552-575). Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Benesch, S. (Ed.). (1988). *Ending remediation: Linking ESL and content in higher education*. Washington, DC: TESOL.
- Berstein, B. (1996). *Pedagogy, symbolic control and identity: Theory, research, critique*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Brindley, G. (1984). *Needs analysis and objective setting in the adult migrant education program*. Sydney: N. S. W. Adult Migrant Education Service.
- Brinton, D. M., Snow, M. A., & Wesche, M. B. (1989). *Content-based second language instruction*. NY: Newbury House.
- Brinton, D. M., Snow, M. A., & Wesche, M. B. (2003). *Content-based second language instruction – Michigan Classics Edition*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Carrell, P. L. (1984). Schema theory and ESL reading: Classroom implications and applications. *Modern Language Journal*, 68(4), 332-343.
- Chamot, A. U., & O'Malley, J. M. (1994). *The CALLA handbook: Implementing the cognitive academic language learning approach*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Crandall, J. A. (Ed.). (1987). *ESL through content-area instruction: Mathematics, science, and social studies*. McHenry, IL and Washington, DC: Delta systems and Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Crandall, J. A. (1993). Content-centered learning in the United States. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 13, 111-126.
- Crandall, J. A., & Kaufman, D. (2002). *Case studies in content-based instruction in higher education*. Alexandria, VA: TESOL.
- Cummins, J. (1980c). *Age on arrival and immigrant second language learning: A reanalysis of the Ramsey and Wright data*. Unpublished manuscript, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.
- Cummins, J. (1980d). The cross-lingual dimensions of language proficiency: Implications for bilingual education and the optimal age question. *TESOL Quarterly* 14, 175-187.
- Cummins, J. (1981). The role of primary language development in promoting educational success for language minority students. In California State Department of Education (Ed.), *Schooling and language minority students: A theoretical framework* (pp. 3-49). LA: National Evaluation, Dissemination and Assessment Center.
- Cummins, J. (1988). Second language acquisition within bilingual education programs. In M. Beebe (Ed.), *Issues in second language acquisition, Multiple perspectives* (pp.

- 145-166). NY: Newbury House.
- Dornyei, Z. (2001). *Motivational strategies in the language classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Echevarria, J., Vogt, M., & Short, D. (2004). *Making content comprehensible for English learners* (2nd ed.). Boston: Pearson.
- Ekstrand, L. H. (1978). *Bilingual and bicultural adaptation*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Stockholm.
- Farrell, T. (Ed.). (2006). *Language teacher research in Asia*. Alexandria, VA: Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages.
- Freeman, D., & Hawkins, M. (2004). Collaborative reflection as critical practice in teacher education. In M. Hawkins & I. Suzanne (Eds.), *Collaborative conversations among language teacher educators* (pp. 1-14). Alexandria, Virginia: TESOL.
- Genesee, F. (1978). Is there an optimal age for starting second language instruction? *McGuill Journal of Education*, 13, 145-154.
- Gianelli, M. C. (1997). Thematic units: Creating an environment for learning. In M. A. Snow & D. M. Brinton (Eds.), *The content-based classroom: Perspectives on integrating language and content* (pp. 142-148). NY: Longman.
- Goldstein, L., Campell, C., & Cummings, M. C. (1997). Smiling through the turbulence: The flight attendant syndrome and other issues of writing instructor status in the adjunct model. In M. A. Snow & D. M. Brinton (Eds.), *The content-based classroom: Perspectives on integrating language and content* (pp. 331-339). NY: Longman.
- Hussain, T. (2007, March 5). Another look at Korea's education crisis. *The Korea Herald*, p. 12.
- Jarvinen, H. (2005). Language learning in content-based instruction. In A. Housen & M. Pierrard (Eds.), *Investigation in instructed second language acquisition* (pp. 433-456). Berlin; NY: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Kang, AeJin. (2004). Keys to effective CBI courses. *Korean Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 20(2), 151-191.
- Kang, AeJin. (2005). How to promote comprehension and participation in CBI courses: The SIOP model. *English Teaching*, 60(4), 159-196.
- Kaufman, D., & Crandall, J. (2005). *Content-based instruction in primary and secondary school settings*. Alexandria, VA: TESOL.
- Kim, Duk-Ki. (2005). Teaching English-mediated courses at Korea University: Rationale, challenges, and linguistic and teaching tips. *CTL new faculty orientation workshop* (pp. 66-72).
- Kim, Eun-ju. (2003). A comparative study of academic oral interaction in English-medium lectures and Korean-medium lectures. *English Teaching*, 58(3), 3-20.
- Kinsella, K. (1997). Moving from comprehensible input to "learning to learn" in content-based instruction. In M. A. Snow & D. M. Brinton (Eds.), *The content-based*

- classroom: Perspectives on integrating language and content* (pp. 46-68). NY: Longman.
- Krashen, S. D., Long, M.A., & Scarcella, R. C. (1979). Age, rate, and eventual attainment in second language acquisition. *TESOL Quarterly*, 13, 573-582.
- Leaver, B. L., & Shekhtman, B. (Eds.). (2002). *Developing professional-level language proficiency*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lightbown, P. M., & Spada, N. (2006). *How languages are learned* (3rd ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Littlewood, W. (2004). Second language learning. In A. Davies & C. Elder (Eds.), *The handbook of applied linguistics* (pp. 501-525). Malden, MA: Blackwell
- Lotherington, H. (2004). Bilingual education. In A. Davies & C. Elder (Eds.), *The handbook of applied linguistics* (pp. 695-718). Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Mackey, A., & Gass, G. (2005). *Second language research: methodology and design*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Martin, J. R. (1999). Mentoring exogenesis: 'Genre-based' literacy pedagogy. In F. Christie (Ed.), *Pedagogy and the shaping of consciousness: Linguistic and social processes* (pp. 123-155). London: Continuum.
- Mathewson, G.C. (1994). Model of attitude influence upon reading and learning to read. In R. B. Ruddell, M.R Ruddell, & H. Singer (Eds.), *Theoretical models and processes of reading* (4th ed., pp. 1121-1161). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- McCormick, D. E., & Donato, R. (2000). Teacher questions as scaffolded assistance in an ESL classroom. In J. K. Hall & L. Verplaetse (Eds.), *Second and foreign language learning through classroom interaction* (pp. 183-201). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Mohan, B. (1986). *Language and content*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Mohan, B., Leung, C., & Davison, C. (2001). *English as a second language in the mainstream*. Essex, United Kingdom: Pearson.
- Pintrich, P. R., & Schunk, D. H. (1996). *Motivation in education: Theory, research and applications*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Richards, J. C. (2001). *Curriculum development in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (2001). *Approaches and methods in language teaching* (2nd. ed.). NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Rosser, C. (1995). Anne Frank: A content-based research class. *TESOL Journal*, 4(4), 4-6.
- Saville-Troike, M. (2006). *Introducing second language acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schleppegrell, M. J. (2004). *The language of schooling: A functional linguistics perspective*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Shim, Young-Sook. (2006). Voices of students from English-medium courses in Korean

- universities. *KATE Forum*, 30(2), 6-8.
- Short, D. J. (1993). Assessing integrated language and content instruction. *TESOL Quarterly*, 27(4), 627-656.
- Siegel, J. (2003) Social context. In C. J. Doughty & M. H. Long (Eds), *The Handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 178-223). Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Snow, M. A. (2005). A model of academic literacy for integrated language and content instruction. In E. Henkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 693-712). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Snow, M. A., Met, M., & Genesee, F. (1989). A conceptual framework for the integration of language and content in second/foreign language instruction, *TESOL Quarterly* 23(2), 201-217.
- Snow, M. A., & Brinton, D. M. (1988). The adjunct model of language instruction: An ideal EAL framework. In S. Benesch (Ed.), *Ending remediation: Linking ESL and content in higher education* (pp. 33-52). Washington, DC: TESOL.
- Snow, M. A., & Brinton, D. M. (Eds.). (1997). *The content-based classroom: perspectives on integrating language and content*. White Plains, NY: Longman.
- Stoller, F. L. (2004). Content-based instruction: perspectives on curriculum planning. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 24, 261-283.
- Swain, M., & Lapkin, S. (1995). Problems in output and the cognitive processes they generate: a step toward second language learning. *Applied Linguistics*, 16(3), 371-91.
- Ushioda, E. (1996). *Learner autonomy 5: The role of motivation*. Dublin: Authentik.
- Wesche, B., & Skehan, P. (2002). Communicative, task-based, and content-based language instruction. In R. Kaplan (Ed.), *The Oxford handbook of applied linguistics* (pp. 207-228). NY: Oxford University Press.
- Yamashita, J. (2007). The relationship of reading attitudes between L1 and L2: An investigation of adult EFL learners in Japan. *TESOL Quarterly*, 41(1), 81-105.
- Zuengler, J. (1993). Encouraging learners' conversational participation: The effect of content knowledge. *Language Learning*, 43, 403-432.

APPENDIX

Questionnaire

The questionnaire was developed to see English-major students' attitude toward and perception of CBI courses. Your responses and discussion will contribute to improving the CBI courses. Your cooperation will be highly appreciated.

1. Have you ever taken CBI courses? If any, how many CBI courses?

① No course (1: C110)

② One course (19)

- ① I was able to understand the contents more accurately than in the possible corresponding Korean-medium course. (21)
- * One student (C95) marked option ② too.
- ② English proficiency has been improved. (39)
- * Five participants marked other options as well while two participants provided their own comments
- ③ I became interested in and confident in English. (35).
- * Two students also marked option ② (C11, C69).
- ④ It did not help much. (18).
- * Among these 18 students, 13 marked option ① *Yes* for Q 3-4 while 3 students (C104, C107, C122) chose option ②. One student (C3) picked up option ③ and the other student (C101) mentioned that “she was to graduate (so that she did not have any more chance to take courses)” - translated.”
- * Two participants provided their own comments and nine participants did not answer this question (C17, C33, C40, C41, C46, C103, C108, C110, C115).

3-3. When taking the CBI course, what was the most difficult thing to cope with? (You can mark more than one option.)

- ① I was often left without comprehension due to low listening comprehension skills. (17)
- * Six participants picked up other options as well (C15, C39, C43, C62, C73, C83).
- ② I found my English proficiency far below that of my classmates so that my fear of being compared with them prevented me from participating in the class. (26)
- * Four participants marked other options too (C39, C62, C73, C83).
- ③ It was hard to comprehend due to a lot of unfamiliar vocabularies or terms since we used texts written in English only. (28)
- * Five students chose other options or provided comments (C39, C62, C63, C73, C83)
- ④ It was hard to write up report or paper in English. (29).
- * Four students added other options (C39, C62, C73, C83).
- ⑤ Others. (Seventeen participants made their comments.
- * Ten students did not answer this question (C17, C33, C40, C41, C46, C61, C103, C108, C110, C115).

3-4. Do you intend to take another CBI course?

- ① Yes. (108) ② No (3)
- ③ Others (2)
- * Nine students did not answer this question (C17, C33, C40, C41, C46, C103, C108, C110, C115).

3-5. How should you be assisted by your instructor or school when taking a CBI course?

- * Sixty-seven participants (54.9%) made suggestions.

4. For CBI participants only

4-1. How would you assess your English language proficiency?

- ① Beginning (12) ② Intermediate-Mid (55)
- ③ Intermediate-High (42) ④ Advanced (10)
- * Three participants did not answer this question (C3, C90, C115).

4-2. What is your weakest language skill?

- ① Reading (22) ② Listening (8)
- ③ Speaking (49) ④ Writing (44)
- * One participant marked all the options (C55) and another participant picked up option ③ and ④

④ Due to lack of background information (16).

* One participant marked two more options (K79)

⑤ Others

* One participant provided her own reason saying that “I do not have good speaking abilities - translated” (K11).

* One student (K71) did not answer this question.

5-2 What are the ways of increasing your comprehension of reading materials in the CBI courses?

How would you want your instructor to assist you to comprehend them? (For CBI participants only)

* Eighty-six participants (70%) provided their opinions and suggestions.

Applicable levels: College and higher

Key words: Content-Based Instruction (CBI), English as a Foreign Language (EFL), college learner, Interdependence Hypothesis

AeJin Kang

Division of English language and literature

Sookmyung Women's University

Chungpa-dong, Yongsan-gu

Seoul 140-742, Korea

Email: ajkang@sm.ac.kr

Received in May, 2007

Reviewed in June, 2007

Revised version received in August, 2007