

How EFL College Learners Perceive CBI Experience

AeJin Kang

(Sookmyung Women's University)

Kang, AeJin. (2018). How EFL college learners perceive CBI experience. *English Teaching*, 73(4), 73-106.

This study examined EFL college-level learners' perception toward the content-based instruction (CBI) by focusing on their participation in and expectation on the courses practiced in a strong form of CBI. Having analyzed the data collected from a questionnaire, observation and interview, the study found that the participants, 39 students who enrolled in two different CBI courses at a university in South Korea, put top priority on the enhancement of content-knowledge considering their CBI course as a content-course, not as a language-course. Second, the participants seemed to prefer participation opportunities induced by a required and prepared speaking task such as presentation through which they can practice a formal speech appropriate for their education experience and cognitive maturity. They also seemed to favor instructor-initiated interaction rather than being put into pair- or group-discussion between and among themselves. Third, the lack of participation was mainly attributed to the lack of understanding contents rather than lack of language skills. Based on the research findings, the study made suggestions on how to offer CBI courses more effectively for a particular group of EFL college-level learners who already earned basic interpersonal communication skills (BICS), yet to reach cognitive academic language proficiency (CALP).

Key words: content-based instruction (CBI), EFL college learners, participation, cognitive challenge, cognitive academic language proficiency (CALP)

1. INTRODUCTION

The current study was an attempt to investigate how the EFL college-level learners would perceive CBI courses as well as what kind of expectation they may bring about into the CBI course. With this purpose, the study focused on what would help them participate

or prevent them from speaking in their CBI courses practiced in a strong form in which authentic materials and tasks are used without having to address concerns related to language skills. Having observed how actively they participated or what prevented them from participating in the classroom, the study tried to find out what should be taken care of in order for the EFL college-level learners to be able to participate in their respective CBI course and make more competent L2 users as the output hypothesis has suggested (Swain, 1985, 2005). In principle, CBI, content-based language teaching (CBLT) or its European counterpart, content language integrated learning (CLIL), refers to the approach in which “learners acquire a second or foreign language as they study subject matter taught in that language” (Lightbown & Spada, 2013, p. 171). CBI assumes that subject contents are a good resource for positive evidence or meaningful input for comprehension, production and internalization of an L2 (Harley, 1989, 1993; Pica, 2002; Swain, 1985, 1991).

From the language acquisition models such as Krashen’s Input Hypothesis (1985), or interactionist models like Long (1996) and Sanz (2014), it was suggested that “meaning-oriented classrooms offer high-quality input and opportunities for output practice and negotiation of meaning, a requisite for linguistic development to occur” (Roquet & Pérez-Vidal, 2017, p. 491). As the CBI, along with the task-based instruction (TBI), has been considered one of the two most convincingly suggested instructional methodologies to practice communicative language teaching approach (CLT) since the 1970s, it has been widely accepted in many parts of the world especially when the L2 is English reflecting the need to increase the learners’ English communication abilities appropriate for their age, education and social experience (Bradford & Brown, 2017; Dearden, 2014; Hultgren, Jensen, & Dimova, 2015; Macaro, 2017; Wächter & Maiworm, 2014).

However, having acknowledged that “teaching content through the medium of a second or additional language is challenging” (Lyster, 2017, p. 103), it was required for the effects of CBI to be examined through research “based on a variety of theoretical approaches and from different angles” (Cenoz & de Zarobe, 2015, p. 2). That is, “one of the main focuses of research has been to look at the results of CBI/CLIL” (Lyster, 2017, p. 103). For example, a great number of studies in North America are product oriented and indicate that majority of language students achieve higher levels of proficiency in the second language at no cost to proficiency in the L1 or academic knowledge (Genesee & Lindholm-Leary, 2013; Tedick & Wesely, 2015).

Meanwhile, “research in Europe has tried to find out whether findings so far concerning the beneficial impact of CLIL contexts are comparable with those reported in the literature on the results of Canadian immersion programs of different sorts” (Roquet & Pérez-Vidal, 2017, p. 490). The findings “related to L1 development and academic achievement in the L2 have been replicated, for the most part, in other regions of the world where similar programs with majority language students have been implemented” (Genesee, 2004, p.

551) along with the examples such as English immersion program at Katoh Gakuen in Japan (Bostwick, 2001) and the Swedish immersion program in Finland (Björklund, Mård-Miettinen, & Savijärvi, 2013).

However, even with the promising proposal and positive results drawn from the CBI studies, there is still a fundamental but critical question: how teachers can most effectively implement CBI in ways that scaffold content learning while ensuring continued development of the target language (Lyster, 2017). Especially, when the L2 is English and thus practiced in a form of English medium instruction (EMI) in higher education (HE), “a systematic review of research” is “urgently required” (Macaro, Curle, Pun, An, & Dearden, 2018, p. 36). Through an in-depth review of 83 studies in HE conducted in different geographical areas, Macaro et al. (2018) found that “the research evidence to date is insufficient to assert that EMI benefits language learning nor that it is clearly detrimental to content learning”, and was concerned that “there are also insufficient studies demonstrating, through the classroom discourse, the kind of practice which may lead to beneficial outcomes. This insufficiency, we argue, is partly due to research methodology problems both at the micro and macro level” (ibid.) while it should be reminded that “there is no such thing as a prototypical EMI environment” since EMI is implemented with “variables related to the socio-geographical-political context and the linguistic repertoire of individual participants” (Coleman, Hultgren, Li, Tsui, & Shaw, 2018, p. 703).

In this milieu, the current study was an endeavor to add one more case of CBI practice trying to answer such a question for a particular group of the EFL college-level learners who are growing in number in most parts of the world and began to receive due attention in the Korean context as well (Bang, 2013; Hwang, 2002; Jung, 2010; D. Kang, 2008; Oh & Lee, 2010; Pak, 2005; Park 2006). But while CBI is “becoming popular in Korea, their effectiveness or benefit remains to be established” (I. Kym & M. Kym, 2014, p. 37). Having recognized that no doubts more research should be done in order to observe and listen to the EFL college-level learners’ voices while comprehensive studies investigating how English-medium instruction (EMI) is being implemented, what challenges are being addressed and what the impacts of EMI may be in a typical EFL environment like, for example, Japan (Bradford & Brown, 2017) have provided professional tips, the study purposed to make suggestions on how to serve the young adult EFL learners in a most effective way, “whose needs are anchored in language, but whose goals extend to mastery of academic, professional and technical content and skills” (Pica, 2009, p. 76).

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Content-Based Instruction (CBI)

In the current study, the term 'CBI' was used interchangeably with content-based language teaching (CBLT), or content-language integrated learning (CLIL) even though the three terms were not always interpreted in a same way in the literature. For example, CBI is usually associated with Canadian immersion programs, which is the best-known example of CBI whereas CLIL was launched in Europe in the 1990s and is often associated with teaching through the medium of English (Dalton-Puffer, Nikula, & Smit, 2010). But more practically, "the preference for one term over the other is associated with contextual and accidental characteristics" (Cenoz, 2015, p. 8) since the use of both CBI and CLIL refers to programs where academic content is taught through a second or an additional language (Cenoz, 2015). As Stoller (2008) argues, overall, CBI is considered as "an umbrella term referring to instructional approaches that make a dual, though not necessarily equal, commitment to language and content-learning objectives" (p. 59).

It is supposed that the rationale behind CBI is that natural language acquisition takes place in contexts and CBI provides a context in which meaningful language can be acquired (Met, 1991). Thus, students learn best when there is an emphasis on relevant, meaningful content rather than on language itself (Met, 1991). As a whole, CBI, CBLT, or CLIL refers to "an instructional approach in which non-linguistic curricular content such as geography or science is taught to students through the medium of a language that they are learning as an additional language" (Lyster, 2017, p. 87). When the additional language is English, CBI is understood as "an approach in which the learners focus on the learning content knowledge and skills (e.g. geography, playing a sport, cultivating crops) while gaining experience of using English" (Tomlinson & Masuhara, 2018, p. 36). Hence, CBI is practiced "within the overall context of English for specific purposes (ESP)" (Miller, 2017, p. 304), and English for academic purposes (EAP) in particular.

Concerning the most significant aspects of the CBI approach, most of the research in this field reported that L2 learners' motivation was enhanced when they dealt with real and relevant contents and materials and they found their L2 learning more enjoyable and satisfying (Lightbown & Spada, 2013; Stryker & Leaver, 1997; Wesche, 1993). In such a typical EFL environment of Korean context, for instance, the learners' response to the CBI courses was in large positive enough as well since they came to find their motivation to improve the L2 skills getting stronger and content knowledge contributing to increasing their interest in English at CBI courses while the learners of low proficiency in English are challenged especially due to the lack of speaking and listening comprehension skills (Bang, 2013; Jung, 2010; D. Kang, 2008; S. Kang & H. Park, 2005).

Having been implemented in various types of programs with respect to who the learners are in terms of their native language, their proficiency level in the L2, the goals and purpose of the program as well as on the educational resources and social supports, CBI has taken different forms as naturally reflected in the fact that "many students all over the world learn

through the medium of a second or additional language” (Cenoz & de Zarobe, 2015, p. 1). Accordingly, CBI is practiced in a number of different ways depending on the specifications and objectives of each program, but mainly divided into four basic types: immersion programs, sheltered instruction (SI), adjunct programs, and theme-based instruction along with various hybrids of these prototypes. It is also spread out on the continuum from a strong form at the one end and a weak one at the other of it (Kasper, 2000).

The CBI courses observed by the current study were practiced as an SI in a strong form. A typical SI course is considered as “a content course taught by a ‘language sensitive’ content specialist to a segregated group of learners, thereby ‘sheltering’ the second language learners from native speaking students” (Flowerdew & Peacock, 2001, p. 211). It is assumed that the SI instructors do not attempt to make the contents comprehensible by reducing the readability demands of reading materials and text. They only adapt the text and other materials to the point where the contents and concepts are left intact (Short, 1991). In a strong form of CBI, contents are to dictate language without having to take care of language problems as in the courses observed by the current study. Thus, it would appear that EMI and CBI practiced in a strong form are identical to each other. That is, the two terms can be interchangeably used when the L2 is English.

But the current study used the term ‘CBI’ rather than ‘EMI’ since it seems inevitable that the EFL college-learners are supposed to deal with or struggle with the L2 even though the instructor does not attend language problems except for the speech techniques popularly practiced by SI instructors. As a result, the learners can improve the target language skills incidentally as the participants of the current study confessed despite the fact that language concerns are not addressed at all especially in an explicit way. Nevertheless, even with language aspects, EMI is also supposed to help the course-takers improve English language skills by having the learners immersed in English language during the class hour, which should be one of the twofold purposes of EMI. Hence, the CBI conducted in English especially in a strong form may share fundamental similarities with EMI in terms of their rationale, language use, and the purpose so that the two terms are referring to almost same instructional methodology.

2.2. Output Hypothesis

The output hypothesis was motivated by the observation on the learners in Canadian immersion programs, who “still demonstrated significant divergence from natives after years of study” (VanPatten & Benati, 2010, pp. 119-120), and in the mid of 1980s, Swain (1985) launched her “Comprehensible Output Hypothesis by which she claimed that learner production was required for successful language acquisition” (VanPatten & Benati, 2010, p. 37) since “having to speak requires students to notice aspects of the L2 that are not

necessary for comprehension” (Derwing, 2017, p. 254). Another point of basic premise of the hypothesis is that in interacting with other L2 speakers, L2 learners would, in some circumstances, respond to their interlocutors’ apparent non-comprehension using a modification of their original utterance which was more precise, coherent, and appropriate (Swain, 2005).

In a case study with a Chinese biology international teaching assistant (ITA) who was engaged in a team-teaching practicum with a native speaker TA in an undergraduate lab, Gorsuch (2005) found that the ITA engaged in self-vocalization and self-repair while lecturing on content, and during interactions with undergraduates and argued for a broader application of the Output Hypothesis beyond learners’ immediate responses to interlocutors’ non-comprehension in that the act of teaching might ... push ITAs into communicating their ideas with greater than ordinary care in order to be comprehensible (Gorsuch, 2016).

Therefore, the output hypothesis states that “language production is necessary because it forces learners to move beyond semantic processing of language during comprehension and focuses their attention toward syntactic use of language” (Kim, 2017, p. 127), as well as making themselves more comprehensible to their interlocutors as observed in Gorsuch (2016). Thus, output tasks and opportunities should be given and the learners need to be pushed to use the L2 in a productive mode, for example, speaking (Wen, 2018). As “research has found interaction to be effective in promoting L2 development; however, there are numerous factors that impact its efficacy” (Loewen & Sato, 2018, p. 285), the effects of output tasks and opportunities would depend on how the participation is structured as well as what kind of tasks the learners are to perform especially for a CBI course to be contributing enough to increasing speaking capacities. Moreover, in order to improve speaking skills, Nation and Newton (2009) proposed that “learners be required to practice formal speaking, which entails longer turns, demanding greater fluency” (Derwing, 2017, p. 254).

In the CBI courses observed by the current study, the participants were given presentation opportunity at least once, which was a required task for which they had to prepare and present themselves as a public speaker. In addition, they were expected to make questions and/or comments at the end of their classmates’ presentations and answer the instructor’s questions individually without having to be measured for the final grade. Thus, the participants were observed on how the output tasks would contribute to helping them produce the L2 differently as the output hypothesis suggested that L2 learners should be supported by effective tasks which can induce language production.

2.3. Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency

Cummins (1984) proposed the two-tier model of language proficiency consisting of

basic interpersonal communication skills (BICS) and cognitive academic language proficiency (CALP); “BICS refers to conversational fluency in a language while CALP refers to students’ ability to understand and express, in both oral and written modes, concepts and ideas that are relevant to success in school” (Cummins, 2008, p. 108). Cummins indicated about the number of years it takes for an immigrant student to develop the two types of proficiency: 2 years for BICS and 5 to 7 years for CALP. Thus, it seems that children acquire BICS first and, building up on this communicative language proficiency, they are able to develop CALP (Halbach, 2012). But the sequentiality involved in the acquisition of the two kinds of proficiency would “only apply in certain, exceptional cases, and not be typical of the language acquisition by students entering an educational system that operates through what for them is a second language” (Halbach, 2012, p. 609) as Cummins points out.

Cummins (2016) argued that the CALP can be empirically distinguished from BICS “such as accent, oral fluency, and sociolinguistic competence in both first and second languages” and that “cognitive/academic proficiencies in both L1 and L2 are interdependent, that is, manifestations of a common underlying proficiency”, and continued that “the common underlying proficiency makes possible transfer of concepts, skills, and learning strategies across languages” (p. 940). Similarly, the common underlying proficiency can be practiced with the ‘translingual orientation’ (Canagarajah, 2013) observed in the ways of using “multiple languages and codes in completing work tasks and building their professional identities” McPherron (2016, p. 505) found, for example, among college graduates of China Southern University (CSU). The adequacy of the common underlying proficiency construct is also partly supported by “the cross-language transfer of reading comprehension ability in bilinguals” (Dressler & Kamil, 2006, p. 222) proven by hundreds of studies carried out over the past 35 years (Cummins, 2016).

As Cummins (2016) suggested that “older school-age students make faster progress in absolute terms than younger students in acquiring L2 academic proficiency because they can apply their better developed CALP to L2 learning” (p. 940), college-level EFL learners are expected to increase CALP in the L2 more efficiently while taking advantage of knowledge and experience they earned in their L1. In particular, for the college-level EFL learners such as the participants of the current study majoring in TESL and applied linguistics who are not supposed to use the L2 for their everyday life communication outside the classroom or school campus in their local contexts, but anticipated to function with a highest level of competence in the L2 for their current study and future career, their target level is assumed to be the CALP. The current study attempted to investigate how the CBI experience would assist the young adult learners in terms of acquiring professional level of proficiency in the L2, first of all, by attaining the L2 skills necessary for their academic achievement. The study was guided by the following two research questions:

1. What kind of perception would the EFL college-learners reveal toward the CBI course? Would it be contents or L2 skills that they perceive as more compelling one to be earned at the CBI course?
2. What would help the EFL college-level learners speak/participate or prevent them from speaking in their CBI courses practiced in a strong form?

3. METHOD

The current study was conducted as a classroom-based research in order to better understand the relationship between what is going on “in authentic contexts like instructed settings” (Mackey, 2017, p. 541) of classroom and what the learners actually experience and learn there within the tradition of action research which is seen “as a means towards creating meaning and understanding in problematic social situations and improving the quality of human interactions and practices within those situations” (Buns, 2005, p. 57). The study was an attempt to investigate how the EFL college-level learners perceived their CBI course-taking experience and make suggestions for providing better learning opportunities and participation structure in CBI courses for the future cohort group. The study was, by its nature, reflective as it looked into the two CBI courses aiming to find out what would make CBI experience fulfilling enough and what should be done to solve the problems faced by the CBI course-takers in achieving their learning goals. It was also practiced as a case study in which “the general philosophy is that much can be learned by looking both holistically and in close detail at the behaviors, performance, knowledge, or perspectives of just a few rather than many research subjects at one time” (Duff, 2012, p. 98).

3.1. Background of the Study

The two CBI courses, *Introduction to TESL (TESL)* and *Theories in Language Acquisition (LA)*, observed by the current study were offered by the TESL department at a university in a typical EFL environment of Seoul, Korea, in which the instructors are encouraged to provide as many CBI courses as possible. In particular, the department set the language policy of using English only for its content courses and other official events such as the beginning/end of the semester meeting held by its students' council in order to provide authentic environment in which the students are to use English reflecting their educational and social experience.

The *TESL* was a required course for the TESL students and mainly taken by freshmen (19: 76%) followed by 2 sophomores, 2 juniors and 2 seniors, and the *LA* was an elective one usually chosen by seniors (7: 50%) and juniors (5: 35.7%), and only 2 freshmen

(14.3%). Most of the participants were Korean speakers by their native language except for one in the *TESL* who was from Kazakhstan, and two participants in the *LA* (one came from China and the other from Indonesia), respectively. A course-pack consisting of Baker (2001), Crooks (2009), Crystal (2003), and Kohlberg and Mayer (1988) was developed for the *TESL* while VanPatten and Williams (2015) was used as a main text for the *LA*. Meanwhile, the instructor and researcher of the two courses was a bilingual of Korean and English with the 19 years of teaching experience with CBI by the moment of data collection for the current study.

3.2. Participants

Twenty-five students from the *TESL* and fourteen of the *LA* participated in the current study by filling out a questionnaire. The participants from the *LA* were assumed to have previous experience with CBI courses due to the language policy of the department while those from the *TESL* were the freshmen, thus for whom it was the first college-level CBI course. They were also observed for their classroom participation throughout the semester. In particular, three from each course were invited to interview session, respectively, after the courses were completed. Table 1 indicates the self-assessed English proficiency level of the participants. It seemed that the participants of both groups were more confident in general proficiency (*TESL*: $M=3.20$, $SD=1.000$; *LA*: $M=3.64$, $SD=.633$) rather than in spoken proficiency of English (*TESL*: $M=2.88$, $SD=1.130$; *LA*: $M=3.29$, $SD=.825$). Thus, both groups rated their general proficiency between *Intermediate-Mid* and *Intermediate-High* while the two groups appeared different in their self-assessment of spoken proficiency with the *TESL* group rating it between *Intermediate-Low* and *Intermediate-Mid* while the *LA* group showed higher confidence belonging to the level between *Intermediate-Mid* and *Intermediate-High*. But both groups revealed a same tendency that the higher they rated general proficiency level, the higher they did with the spoken proficiency level (*TESL*: $r=.799$, $p<.05$; *LA*: $r=.833$, $p<.05$).

It also indicated that the *TESL* group showed higher individual differences among themselves than the *LA* group did both in general and in spoken proficiency. However, the two groups did not show statistically significant difference either in general ($t=1.493$, $p=.144$) or in spoken proficiency of English ($t=1.176$, $p=.247$), thus they were considered homogeneous groups at least in terms of English language using abilities. Meanwhile, it was reported that Korean college learners tended to be stricter in rating their English language proficiency than actually measured by a proficiency test (A. Kang, 2013). S. Kang and H. Park (2005) also found that there is “strong positive correlations of self-assessed English proficiency to textbook comprehension, lecture understanding, and self-assessed learning outcome” (p. 167) at college CBI courses in the Korean context. Table 1

shows how the participants evaluated their general proficiency and spoken proficiency in English language, respectively.

TABLE 1
Self-Assessed English Proficiency of the Participants

Proficiency Level	General Proficiency (%)		Spoken Proficiency (%)	
	TESL	LA	TESL	LA
Beginning	2 (8%)	0 (0%)	3 (12%)	0 (0%)
Intermediate-Low	3 (12%)	0 (0%)	7 (28%)	2 (14.3%)
Intermediate-Mid	9 (36%)	6 (42.9%)	6 (24%)	7 (50%)
Intermediate-High	10 (40%)	7 (50%)	8 (32%)	4 (28.6%)
Total	25 (100%)	14(100%)	25 (100%)	4 (100%)

3.3. Data

3.3.1. Questionnaire

A questionnaire was developed to see how the participants perceive their experience in the CBI courses as well as tap into their background information such as their grade (Item 1), L2 proficiency, strong or weak language skills (Items 2~6), most or least improved language skills (Items 25~26), expectation on and satisfaction with the course (Items 7~9, 28), and the amount of preparation for and the level of involvement in classroom participation (Items 14~24). The questionnaire was based on A. Kang (2018) with a few revisions to accommodate the research themes and questions for the current study. In order to measure the reliability of the questionnaire items, the value of *Cronbach's alpha* was calculated and turned out to be strong enough for each group (TESL: $\alpha=.882$; LA: $\alpha=.894$). Each copy of the questionnaire was coded as TESL1, TESL2 through TESL25 if the participant took the *TESL*, and LA1, LA2 up to LA14 as she was from the *LA* course. Table 2 shows the category of each item in terms of what they intended to figure out. See Appendix A for the questionnaire.

TABLE 2
Category of Each Item

Category	Questionnaire Items
Bio-data/Grade	1
Language Skills	2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 16, 25, 26, 27
Course Expectation & Satisfaction	7, 8, 9, 28
Participation Factors	11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24
Instruction format	10
Suggestion for Improving the Course	29

3.3.2. Observation

The participants were observed by the instructor focusing on how many questions were made at the end of individual presentations at each course. For the *Individual Presentation* task in the *TESL*, the participants had to turn in a survey report individually for which they chose one country and did research about it with the three themes: 1. General information of the country such as location, population, language(s), political system, brief history and culture; 2. Education system in general; 3. English education. On the other hand, the participants at the LA were required to develop a summary paper as an individual work with a research article published by a renowned journal in the field of second language acquisition. They delivered the *Individual Presentation* with the summary paper as its contents. At the end of each individual presentation, the other participants were supposed to make questions or comments.

3.3.3. Interview

In addition to the quantitative type of data collected by the questionnaire and observation, the current study included interview data which can be “revealing but are more helpful when triangulated with other types of data” (Mackey & Gass, 2012, p. 141). Three of the participants from each group were individually invited to “semi-structured interview” which would provide “guidance and directions” (Dörnyei, 2007, p. 136) through the interview questions, but ensuring “an open, non-threatening atmosphere and to create a relaxed atmosphere for discussion rather than that usually associated with more formal ‘question and answer’ interview sessions” (O’Donoghue, 2007, p. 134).

The interviewees were chosen as a focal group of the participants, who can represent each level of classroom participation from *Low* to *Very active* participation. The interviews were conducted at the researcher’s office after the semester was completed from August 8 through August 20, 2018. Each interview was audio-recorded with the interviewee’s consent and conducted in their L1, Korean, which was transcribed in English later for the sake of report for the current study. It took about 40 minutes for one interview to be done. The interviewees were coded as *Int.* 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6. Table 3 provided information of the interviewees. See Appendix B for the interview questions.

3.4. Methods of Data Analysis

As the current study collected both types of data, they were analyzed quantitatively and qualitatively, respectively. The participants’ responses to the multiple-choice items of the questionnaire and the observation data were examined through the descriptive statistics.

TABLE 3**Interviewees' Information**

<i>Int</i>	Grade	The Course Taken	Spoken English Proficiency	Classroom Participation	CBI Experience at the college
1	Senior	LA	Intermediate Mid	Active	4 years
2	Senior	LA	Intermediate Mid	Moderate	4 years
3	Senior	LA	Intermediate High	Low	3 & half years
4	Freshman	TESL	Advanced	Very Active	1 semester
5	Freshman	TESL	Intermediate Mid	Moderate	1 semester
6	Freshmen	TESL	Advanced	Moderate	1 semester

In addition, reliability was measured to tell how reliable the participants' responses to the questionnaire items were. Correlation coefficients including linear regression analysis as well as cross tabulation analysis were also calculated between the participants' responses to each item of the questionnaire. T-test was conducted as well to see the group difference. For such statistical analyses, the statistical package for the social science (SPSS) 23 was employed. Meanwhile, the interview data were analyzed through content analysis which "involves coding data in a systematic way in order to discover patterns and develop well-grounded interpretations" (Mackey & Gass, 2012, p. 191). The coding of the qualitative data was based on the emerging themes being focused such as the participants' expectation, challenges and benefits of CBI courses, and suggestions concerning how to improve the CBI courses.

4. RESEARCH FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The research findings were reported and discussed in a comprehensive way presenting the analyses of both quantitative and qualitative data obtained from the questionnaire, observation and interview collectively through the mixed method research (MMR) tradition (Hays & Singh, 2012; Riazi & Candlin, 2014) rather than in a separate fashion. It was expected for the current study to earn insights as well as factual information concerning how the college-level EFL learners perceive CBI courses and what kind of learning experience they want to have by taking a CBI course in the process of making themselves more competent and confident users in the L2 as well as achieving academic goals in their chosen field.

4.1. The Participants' Expectation on the CBI Course

Since the participants in each group were considered different from each other in terms of how much CBI experience they had especially at a college setting, it would be worthy to see whether they might have different expectation when taking the CBI course. In the

TESL, most of the participants were freshmen while the participants in the *LA* were largely seniors and juniors. Due to the language policy of the TESL department of the university by which the two courses were offered, the TESL majors are supposed to have more CBI experience as they move up to a higher grade. Thus, most of the participants from the *TESL* were assumed to take the first CBI course at least at a tertiary education environment while majority of the participants in the *LA* did have two or three years of CBI experience at the college by the moment of data-collection for the current study.

However, as reported already in the above-mentioned participants' information in Section 3.2, the two groups' participants did not show any significant difference by their self-assessed level of English language proficiency. Thus, it can be said that the two groups were homogeneous in terms of linguistic confidence, but heterogeneous in the amount of CBI experience. With such characteristics, the two groups were not significantly different at the significance level at .05 ($p < .05$) from each other in their response to Item 7 (expectation to increase English language skills by taking the CBI course), Item 8 (expectation to enhance content-knowledge by taking the CBI course) even though there was a tendency that the TESL participants showed a little bit higher expectation for improving language skills ($M=3.80$, $SD=.577$) and increasing academic knowledge ($M=4.16$, $SD=.473$) than those of the LA participants ($M=3.36$, $SD=.842$ for Item 7; $M=3.93$, $SD=.616$ for Item 8). The scores were spread out from 1 representing *Strongly Disagree*; 2 *Disagree*; 3 *Neutral*; 4 *Agree*; 5 *Strongly Agree*.

In particular, when the significance level was set at .10 ($p < .10$), the *TESL* group showed significantly higher expectation with the possibility to strengthen language skills by taking the CBI course than the *LA* group did ($t=-1.945$, $p=.059$). Thus, it can be inferred that the first-year college learners had relatively stronger expectation on the CBI course through which they would be able to make more competent language users. See Table 4 below for the two groups' responses to the questionnaire items with their mean scores (M) and standard deviation (SD) being reported. It also includes the t -score and p -value to see whether there was group difference.

On the other hand, it seemed that the participants of the *LA* who were higher graders and had more CBI experience were rather realistic in setting up their expectation from the linguistic point of view. Such tendency appeared consistent with what the interviewees discussed:

Having taken the course, I didn't have much expectation in terms of improving language skills since it was not a language-course. In such a course like *Theories in Language Acquisition*, my expectation was rather on enhancing the content-knowledge delving into the field deeply. (LA Int. 1)

TABLE 4
The Participants' Responses to the Questionnaire

Questionnaire Items	Mean/SD		<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
	TESL	LA		
7. Expectation to increase English language skills by taking the CBI course	3.80/.577	3.36/.842	-1.945	.059*
8. Expectation to enhance content knowledge by taking the CBI course	4.16/.473	3.93/.616	-1.315	.197
9. Belief that one of the best ways to improve English language skills is to take CBI courses	3.68/1.145	3.29/.825	-1.132	.265
10. The course was a largely lecture-based one.	2.76/.831	3.57/.756	3.019	.005**
11. Supported by pair-, group-work, presentations, & the instructor-initiated questions to participate	4.12/.666	3.50/.519	-3.004	.005**
12. Given enough opportunities for participation	3.76/.831	3.07/.917	-2.393	.022**
13. Confident in making questions or comments in English due to good English language skills	3.28/1.100	3.00/1.249	-.729	.471
14. Confident in speaking/participating in English due to the preparation for each class	3.36/1.075	2.79/.579	-2.167	.037**
15. Confident in speaking/participating in English due to the review after each class	2.96/.978	3.00/.707	.130	.897
16. Became more confident in speaking/participating at the end of the semester	3.52/.823	2.93/.917	-2.068	.046**
17. Nervous about speaking/participating due to the lack of English language skills	3.28/1.242	3.50/.650	.726	.473
18. Nervous about speaking/participating due to the lack of content-understanding	3.080/1.115	3.357/.6333	.853	.399
19. I can participate more actively if required to do so.	3.20/.913	3.07/.475	-.578	.567
20. Can be nervous If I'm required to speak/participate	3.20/1.041	3.57/.756	1.280	.209
21. I can participate more actively if involved in pair- or group-discussion.	3.160/.746	3.500/.855	1.296	.203
22. The instructor encouraged us to speak/participate enough.	4.28/.614	3.29/.994	-3.872	.000**
23. I prepared for or reviewed each class on my own.	3.08/.954	3.29/.726	.700	.488
24. I prepared for or reviewed each class with my classmates.	2.800/1.225	3.214/.699	1.156	.254
28. Overall satisfaction with the course	4.33/.761	3.83/.577	-2.000	.054*

p*-value was significant at less than .10; *p*-value was set up at less than .05.

But one thing noteworthy was that both groups revealed higher expectation on enhancing content-knowledge than that on improving language skills by taking respective CBI course, which may suggest that the participants recognized the acquisition of discipline-specific information as a more desirable goal they had to achieve by taking the CBI course. Their higher expectation with the contents did sound consistent with what Marsh (2002) argued

that “the non-language content is considerably more important than the language” (p. 72) in CBI or CLIL.

4.2. Different Amount of Participation

What the participants really experienced linguistically and content-wise would tell how CBI courses can contribute to the EFL college-level learners’ growth in terms of L2 using abilities and academic prowess. In the case of *TESL* participants, their expectation on improving language skills seemed to have been partially met as the *TESL* interviewees talked about it:

Having struggled to read the chapters, I earned new vocabularies and improved reading skills a lot. The chapters were different from those I had to read with high-school textbooks. My writing skills improved as well while I prepared for essay-type midterm and final exam. (*TESL Int. 5*)

What Interviewee 5 confessed was echoed by the other two *TESL* interviewees having said that “*such a rigorous experience of using reading and writing skills got me acknowledge that a college-course requires different level of language skills from that for high-school course*” (*TESL Int. 6*). All the three interviewees from the *TESL* highlighted their appreciation of the CBI course for its contribution to enlarging their language using abilities as a college-level learner who may need to acquire the CALP (Cummins, 2016) for their current study and future job, which should be the target-level for CBI course-takers (Leaver & Shekhtman, 2002). Thus, it can be said that the linguistic expectation was mainly fulfilled by improving literacy skills for the *TESL* participants.

Meanwhile, the *LA* participants valued their experience with the *Individual Presentation* for which they had to summarize an academic article with a theme of language acquisition on their own and orally delivered it in front of the class. The *LA* interviewees mentioned: “*I had to prepare the Individual Presentation as a formal speech and I found it to be a good opportunity to practice speaking skills. It was a good chance to use the language in a rigorous way*” (*LA Int. 1*); “*for the Individual Presentation, I had to develop ppt slides and scripts, then practice it as a formal speech, through which I was able to experience high-level of speech skills*” (*Int. 2*); “*For me, it’s not easy to deliver a formal speech like the presentation. But as I add presentation experience, I’m feeling that I can handle it with more confidence*” (*LA Int. 3*).

It appeared that the *LA* interviewees took the *Individual Presentation* as an opportunity through which they had to use the language in an intensive and professional way dealing with authentic contents and information. That is, for the participants of the current study, it

was assumed that they used the L2 “to carry out content, rather than language learning, tasks”, for example, the accurate production of L2 forms, or the expressions of personal meanings with the objective of practicing fluency (Seedhouse, 2004). Such a way of using the L2 was consistently found in Marsh (2008) that “CLIL can develop higher-order language skills and that this is characteristic of CLIL in comparison with other types of language-learning approaches, which are also content-oriented” (Cenoz, Genesee, & Gorter, 2013, p. 251).

On the other hand, the different language skills were highlighted as the improved ones by the interviewees from each group: reading and writing skills for the *TESL* interviewees and public speech skills for the *LA* interviewees. Meanwhile, reading skill was rated as the most confident skill, but speaking skill as the least confident one by the two groups of participants. Even though speaking skill was picked up as the one that the both groups wanted to improve the most, it turned out to be the same skill that they rated as the least improved one throughout the semester. In particular, the *TESL* participants’ response to the questionnaire item 16 (*became more confident in speaking/participating in the classroom at the end of the course*) was significantly related to that to Item 28 (*the level of overall satisfaction with the course*: $r=.411, p<.05$), their sense of linguistic improvement proved to be relevant in making their CBI experience meaningful or not. Tables 5 and 6 show how each group of the participants’ confidence in language skills was rated as the strongest or the weakest as well as which skill was considered the most or least improved one throughout the semester, respectively.

The two groups were mostly different in their responses to the following items of the questionnaire as shown in Table 4: whether they considered the course to be operated as a lecture-based one (Item 10), whether they were given enough opportunities to participate (Item 12), through pair- or group-work (Item 11), how much confident they were due to the preparation for each class (Item 14), whether they became more confident in participation at the end of the semester (Item 16), and how much they were encouraged by the instructor to participate (Item 22) with the significance level being set at less than .05 ($p<.05$). Moreover, the two groups differently evaluated CBI course-taking experience when responding to Item 28 asking about overall satisfaction with the course respectively at less than .10 ($p<.10$) with the *TESL* group showing a higher level of satisfaction.

In terms of course-format, the two courses were similarly operated with the lecture and participation opportunities being almost equally structured according to the instructor’s observation. However, it was described as a lecture-based course by all of the three interviewees from the *LA* group while no interviewee from the *TESL* course did say so. Such a different impression might be caused by how much participation was taking place in the classroom. One of the examples of participation was measured by how many

TABLE 5
Strong and Weak Skill of English Language of the TESL Participants

	The Most Confident Skill	The Weakest Skill	Skill Wanted to Improve the most	The Most Improved Skill throughout the course	The Least Improved Skill throughout the course
Listening	6 (24%)	0 (0%)	2 (8%)	6 (24%)	7 (28%)
Speaking	5 (20%)	18 (72%)	17 (68%)	2 (8%)	15 (60%)
Reading	11 (44%)	5 (20%)	4 (16%)	10 (40%)	0 (0%)
Writing	3 (12%)	2 (8%)	2 (8%)	7 (28%)	3 (12%)
Total	25 (100%)	25 (100%)	25 (100%)	25 (100%)	25 (100%)

TABLE 6
Strong and Weak Skill of English Language of the LA Participants

	The Most Confident Skill	The Weakest Skill	Skill Wanted to Improve the most	The Most Improved Skill throughout the course	The Least Improved Skill throughout the course
Listening	5 (35.7%)	0 (6.25%)	0 (0%)	4 (28.5%)	0 (0%)
Speaking	0 (0%)	11 (78.6%)	11 (78.6%)	0 (0%)	10 (71.4%)
Reading	6 (42.9%)	0 (0%)	1 (7.1%)	9 (64.3%)	2 (14.3%)
Writing	3 (21.8%)	3 (21.4%)	2 (14.3%)	1 (7.1%)	2 (14.3%)
Total	14 (100%)	14 (100%)	14 (100%)	14(100%)	14 (100%)

questions were made at the end of their classmates' individual presentations. In fact, one *Individual Presentation* induced more than three questions at average in the *TESL* course, but less than one question at the *LA* course. The interaction happening at the end of the *Individual Presentation* or the lack of it between the presenter and their classmates might lead them to the perception that their respective course was run as an interaction-oriented, or as a lecture-centered one. Table 7 shows how many questions were made at the end of each *Individual Presentation*.

In fact, the three interviewees from the *LA* showed certain regret that their presentation induced almost no question even though they put a lot of efforts in delivering it: "*In contrast to the informative contents and my earnest preparation, it seemed that my classmates were not interested in my presentation, which made me disappointed*" (LA Int. 1). But at the same time they also interpreted that no response from the participants to their presentation was an indication of difficulty in understanding the academic contents rather than as the lack of interest in presentation itself: "*Maybe they were not able to fully grasp the concept or methodology included in the article which was the contents of the presentation, thus they could not dare to make a question*" (LA Int. 2).

TABLE 7
The Number of Questions Made at the End of Individual Presentations

Date	Course	# of Qs/# of Presenter(s)*	Date	Course	# of Qs/# of Presenter*
3/29/18	TESL	7/2	4/2/18	LA	0/1
4/3/18	TESL	7/2	4/4/18	LA	0/1
4/5/18	TESL	4/2	4/9/18	LA	0/1
4/10/18	TESL	5/2	4/11/18	LA	1/1
4/12/18	TESL	4/1	4/16/18	LA	0/1
4/17/18	TESL	6/2	4/18/18	LA	0/1
4/19/18	TESL	2/1	4/30/18	LA	2/1
5/1/18	TESL	3/1	5/9/18	LA	0/1
5/8/18	TESL	6/2	5/16/18	LA	2/1
5/10/18	TESL	3/1	5/21/18	LA	0/1
5/15/18	TESL	10/3	5/23/18	LA	0/1
5/17/18	TESL	10/2	5/28/18	LA	0/1
5/24/18	TESL	3/2	5/30/18	LA	0/1
5/29/18	TESL	6/2	6/4/18	LA	1/1
5/31/18	TESL	8/2			
Average # of Qs made at the end of each presentation		3.1	Average # of Qs made at the end of each presentation		0.4

* The total number of presenters in the *TESL* course was 27 while that of the *LA* course was 14. Among the 27 course-takers of the *TESL*, 25 of them filled out the questionnaire as described in Section 3.3.1.

Another interpretation was that they were not motivated enough since they knew that the exams would not cover the contents delivered by the *Individual Presentations*: “*The fact that I didn’t have to prepare for the exams with what the Individual Presentations dealt with, I didn’t find myself involved enough to pay full attention to them, thus making it hard for me to make questions*” (*LA Int.* 3). Taken together, it could be the case for the *LA* participants not to develop ‘task motivation’ which is defined as intended effort invested into carrying out a certain activity (Dörnyei & Ushioda, 2011).

Above all, it was suggested that attentive listening and background information about the topics of the *Individual Presentation* be required in order for them to figure it out well enough to make questions. But it seemed hard for the *LA* participants to be engaged in the *Individual Presentations* partly due to challenging contents and the lack of motivation concerned with exams. Meanwhile, the apparently same task of delivering oral presentation in the *TESL* course, whose contents could be understood without much difficulty as described in Section 3.3.2, helped to lead the participants into classroom participation since one presentation induced at least three questions despite the time-constraint at the end of it. Even when they did not make a question, they had different reason than the *LA* interviewees did: “*With some of the speakers of the Individual Presentations, I was reluctant to ask questions since I couldn’t expect them to answer my questions*” (*TESL Int.* 4).

4.3. Cognitive Challenge

While the interviewees of the two groups pointed out the difficulty in understanding contents as a cause making it hard for them to participate, it was the LA interviewees who complained more about the cognitive challenge:

It was hard to comprehend the contents since the theories presented conflicting arguments and perspectives in explaining the phenomena of second language acquisition. I took notes seriously as well as recorded the lecture and listened to it again at home to figure out the main points as clearly as possible. (LA Int. 2)

Having considered that the both groups were homogeneous in terms of linguistic confidence, the cognitive challenge faced by the LA participants was interpreted as the obstacle preventing them from participating in the classroom even after they made serious efforts to figure out the course-contents: “*I made efforts to understand the lecture in a best way by reading the chapter in advance and review almost each session with my classmates. I also asked the instructor questions after the class*” (LA Int. 3).

The fact that *Individual Presentations* in the LA course could induce almost no question might indicate that the level of cognitive challenge experienced by the LA participants was high enough not to allow them to make even one question. Therefore, in addition to the cognitive challenge put forward by the chapters, it seemed that the LA participants had to deal with more than what they can chew all the time in the class, thus unable to practice ‘cognitive fluency’ which refers to “the speakers’ ability to efficiently mobilize and integrate the underlying cognitive processes responsible for producing utterances with the characteristics that they have” (Segalowitz, 2010, p. 48).

On the other hand, the TESL participants also appeared to find the chapters challenging enough, but considered the *Individual Presentations* easy to follow so that they managed to participate at least at the end of each *Individual Presentation*. It might give them an impression that they were given enough opportunities to participate and their class was active in interacting with each other as their response to Item 12 of the questionnaire (I was given enough opportunities to speak/participate in the classroom) turned out to be significantly higher than that of the LA participants ($t=-2.393, p<.05$).

Another factor that might make it hard for the LA participants to participate can be their current level of linguistic competence and confidence. Since the LA group rated their general proficiency and spoken proficiency as less than *Intermediate-High*, their level of proficiency may not be high enough for them to handle academic topics without a reservation as the LA interviewees confessed: “*I’m not confident enough in my speaking*

skills, which made me unable to make questions or answer to the instructor. Due to the lack of speaking skills, I couldn't verbalize my ideas as soon as I wanted to do" (LA Int. 3). Thus, it was understood that the LA participants had to struggle to deal with education-level appropriate contents without reaching a desired level of CALP (Cummins, 2016) yet. Nevertheless, it was inferred that the cognitive challenge might be a more critical factor affecting the level of participation rather than the language skills since the TESL participants assessed their proficiency level as a little lower than that of the LA participants, but they made far more questions especially with the *Individual Presentations*.

4.4. Suggestions for Promoting Participation

While all the six interviewees complained that the chapters were challenging, the three LA interviewees wanted the instructor to provide her lecture in a succinct and comprehensible manner to help them figure out course-contents as clearly as possible:

I sometimes found it hard to follow the lecture since the ppt slides presented by the instructor did not exactly reflect how the contents were ordered in the chapter. I wished that the instructor had developed more organized ppt slides to support her lecture effectively for each chapter.
(LA Int. 1)

Such a complaint was shared by the other interviewees as well: *"For this kind of content-course, the instructor should've organized the lecture more systematically. Since the current course dealt with dense information, it was hard to figure out the chapters by myself but required attentive listening to the instructor"* (LA Int. 2). What the LA interviewees wanted was the well-organized lecture for them to understand the course-contents, which should be a critical part of any quality instruction. It was also a pre-condition for their participation since they all mentioned that they cannot participate without a good command of contents. Since the two CBI courses observed by the current study were practiced as SI, the sheltered instruction observation protocol (SIOP) which proposes a systemic framework for planning, delivering, assessing, and evaluating instructional practices that can help ELLs attain English proficiency and achieve academically in content areas (Echevarría, Vogt & Short, 2013) can be employed in order to improve the instructional design and quality for the similar courses for the future cohort groups.

Meanwhile, all the interviewees made suggestions that the instructor set up pair- or group-discussions for which *"discussion questions should be given in advance so that the students can prepare for classroom participation without having to worry about what and*

how to speak” (LA Int. 1); “*Since Korean students are not actively participating without being pushed to, there should be certain apparatus through which we have to participate*” (LA Int. 3). But, at the same time, they were worried that the group-discussion might erode out the time which should be guided by the instructor and spent for enhancing the content knowledge: “*If we had to be involved in the group- or pair-work, we could not have had learned as much as we did since it might have decreased the time to listen to the instructor*” (LA Int. 2). Moreover, another interviewee was doubtful of the validity of the group discussion itself addressing “the epistemic issues in peer interaction” (Jakonen & Morton, 2015, p. 77):

I’m afraid of the possibility of getting inaccurate information when involved in the group discussion with classmates. Thus, I’d prefer the participation opportunities initiated by the instructor through which we can increase the level of interaction between the instructor and students. (TESL Int. 4)

They were also concerned about the quality of participation if they would be put into group-discussion: “*As a senior who experienced pair- and group-work many times so far, I sometimes found members switching into the native language and it was not always easy for the instructor to control the discussion in an effective way*” (LA Int. 2); “*I’m wondering whether we can do our best without a credit for participation. However, I’m not sure whether it is a good idea to assign a credit to the students’ participation*” (TESL Int. 5). What the interviewees discussed revealed that they were aware of the benefits as well as drawbacks of pair- and group-work and suggested a compromising means of promoting participation without having to make them anxious due to the burden of preparation:

If the instructor arranges a pre-session time in the beginning of each class during which we can brainstorm about the topics, then we can say something even without reading the chapter in advance. Or at the end of each class, the instructor can spend about 10 minutes to let the groups and pairs talk about important parts of the chapter by themselves, through which we can practice speaking skills. (LA Int. 1)

In contrast to their ambivalent attitude toward the pair- or group-discussion, all the interviewees appreciated the contribution of *Individual Presentation* as an opportunity to practice formal speech through which they were “*able to experience high-level of speech skills*” (LA Int. 2). The TESL participants who had to do group presentation in addition to the individual presentation also appeared to welcome such a chance of prepared speaking:

Thanks to the individual presentation and group project, I had good opportunities to speak in front of the class, it seemed that I was trained to deliver public speech, which would help me handle public speech I'll have to do after graduation. (TESL *Int.* 6).

What the interviewees talked about the *Individual Presentation* (for the TESL group, group presentation as well) suggested that the college-level EFL learners took a required and rehearsed speech opportunity such as the presentation more positively, through which they can have a feeling of accomplishment and improvement as the L2 user. Having considered that “there is a widespread consensus that many L2 students do not have much opportunity to enhance their spoken fluency in classroom” (Derwing, 2017, p. 253), it was recommended that an output task such as *Individual Presentation* be implemented as an essential part of the CBI course.

5. CONCLUSION

The current study explored what kind of expectation the EFL college-level learners would have and how they perceived the CBI experience in terms of content-enhancement and language skill development in order to make suggestion on how to better serve such a particular group of L2 learners. Having paid attention to how well the participants participated in their respective CBI course, the study found that the participants appeared to put top priority on enhancing the content-knowledge with the L2 using skills being assumed to develop additionally.

They were clearly aware that the CBI course they took were not a language-course, but a content-course offered by their department and they should make serious efforts to earn the course contents accordingly. Their attitude toward the contents and the L2 seemed consistent with the argument of Coleman et al. (2018) that “in many, possibly most, EMI settings, the key motivation for using English as a medium of instruction is not to teach English. English is not the end; it is the means” (p. 705). That the participants of the current study mentioned the enhancement of content knowledge as a top priority in the CBI course was partly in line with the findings of CBI research conducted in Korean contexts (Jung, 2010; S. Kang & H. Park, 2005), but even more clearly manifested by the current study.

Likewise, at least for the participants of the current study, the main concern of the CBI course should be in attaining academic and discipline-specific contents and information as any other quality course would do. In this view, first of all, they expected that the CBI course should be supported by quality instruction through which they were able to figure

out the contents and become familiar with the field of their major discipline. It stands to reason that any course-taker expects to receive quality instruction, but such an expectation was even more strongly manifested with the CBI course-takers like the participants of the current study. As all of the interviewees complained of the hardship they experienced in comprehending the chapters and the lack of understanding the contents made it hard for them to participate in the classroom, their frustration was mainly expressed when they pointed out that the ppt slides developed and presented by the instructor should have been more systematically organized with the chapter contents being clearly elaborated.

The cognitive challenge was again addressed as a major cause of lack of participation when the *LA* interviewees regretted that their individual presentation with an academic article did not induce even one question from their classmates at average, which was mainly due to the fact that the cognitive demand put forward by the article was more than they were able to handle. The *LA* participants' lack of participation with regard to their classmates' *Individual Presentation* was sharply contrasted with rather active participation observed by the *TESL* participants at the end of their *Individual Presentation* which they said was readily comprehensible without academic information or background knowledge being required. Such a difference in terms of level of participation between the two groups can be attributed to the effects of different degrees of cognitive pressure imposed on each group.

Second, the participants appeared to prefer participation opportunities induced by the presentation requirement and instructor-initiated questions to the pair- or group-discussion between and among themselves. In particular, the interviewees highly appreciated the contribution of such a prepared and rehearsed speaking task as *Individual* and *Group Presentation* through which they earned the sense of improving language skills appropriate for formal speech reflecting their educational experience and cognitive maturity as Derwing (2017) suggested that greater fluency be supported by practicing formal speaking. Having considered that the participants of the current study regarded their L2 spoken proficiency level almost as *Intermediate Mid* (*TESL* group) and higher than *Intermediate Mid* (*LA* group), it seemed that they were ready for the opportunity to practice the L2 in a formal and professional way rather than simply satisfied with individual talk with their classmates.

It could be partly due to culture in which Korean students were traditionally used to teacher-centered instruction while currently learner-centered approaches are urged and experimented throughout various educational settings including college classrooms. In particular, what the interviewees confessed indicated that they were afraid of possible confusion caused by their own discussion and inefficient use of class-hour which should be otherwise spent by the instructor who is to deliver enough and accurate information. Such an attitude the participants showed toward the lecture and peer-discussion seemed to again

reflect their awareness that the CBI course was a content-course, not a language-course.

In a language course, interaction itself between and among themselves should be served as 'collective scaffolding' (Donato, 1994; Storch, 2002) contributing to increasing the target-skills which may be language using abilities (Long, 1985, 1996). But the participants of the current study appeared to expect their CBI courses to provide them with content-knowledge and discipline-specific information which was not assumed to be acquired through peer-discussion, but provided by the instructor clearly and efficiently.

Another interpretation can be brought up by what the interviewees mentioned that there were no discussion questions given in advance. That is, the pair- or group-discussion was not systematically planned and organized. The participants were put into spontaneous peer-discussion without due preparation, which seemed to make themselves not confident enough in their own discussion especially when sharing their ideas over the academic contents in addition to the difficulty of verbalizing their ideas on the spot. The 'epistemic practices' (Knorr-Cetina, 2010) which can happen and should be facilitated through the peer-discussion was not effectively operated in such a classroom in which carefully constructed scheme for the peer-discussion was not ready for the L2 learners like the participants of the current study.

In conclusion, based on the research findings of the study, it was suggested that the CBI instructor should be able to make the course contents as comprehensible as possible for the course-takers. Especially for those who were supposed to attain their discipline-specific information by taking CBI courses, a highest level of comprehensibility needs to be achieved not by reducing the contents, but by quality instruction supported with well-organized supporting materials and clear presentation. Having reflected on what CBI should offer, "it is imperative that we plan lessons that are not negatively biased for students acquiring English and that include age-appropriate content and materials" (Echevarría, Vogt, & Short, 2004, p. 21). For the CBI course to maximize the EFL college learners' academic achievement and language experience appropriate for their educational and professional expectation, they should be provided with authentic contents suitable for their discipline in a comprehensible way as 'a proactive approach' (Lyster, 2017, p. 97) to CBI suggested, in which planning and guided autonomous practice are integrated to produce best learning outcome.

Meanwhile, the current study found and highlighted that the language experience that the participants appeared to anticipate turned out to be formal and professional way of using the language. They pointed to *Individual Presentation*, taking the exams and reading the chapters as the contributing tasks to upgrading the way of using the L2 as college-level learners who are supposed to function in the target language for their current study and future job. Such a tendency was more strongly manifested along with the TESL participants for whom it was the first CBI course-taking experience at the college setting. It

made them recognize what kind of as well as what level of English language they are supposed to acquire as college students as suggested in Cummins (2016) and Leaver and Shekhtman (2002).

In addition, it was emphasized that they wished for instructor-initiated interaction rather than being put into pair- or group-discussion. Taken together, at least for the participants of the current study, it can be suggested that college-level CBI courses should set up language tasks which they need to prepare and rehearse in a rigorous way to move up toward CALP level. Having been reminded of time constraint of class-hour, the types of output opportunities should be developed as the authentic tasks which can serve to the purpose of college-level CBI making the learners ready for their social and professional roles.

The current study had limitations that further studies should be able to overcome in order to show more concrete evidence of cognitive growth and linguistic development by taking CBI courses through experimental research design of collecting pre- and post-test data from the college-level EFL learners who are considered to have already earned BICS level, but yet to reach CALP. In particular, a fuller picture of how the adult learners are growing into social and professional users of the L2 can be provided if they are observed for longer than one semester-long period.

REFERENCES

- Baker, C. (2001). *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism*. (3rd ed.). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Bang, Y. (2013). EFL college students' perceptions toward content-based learning. *Modern English Education*, 14(1), 23-47.
- Björklund, S., Mård-Miettinen, K., & Savijärvi, M. (2013). Swedish immersion in the early years in Finland. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 17(2), 197-214.
- Bostwick, M. (2001). English immersion in a Japanese school. In D. Christian & F. Genesee (Eds.), *Bilingual education* (pp. 125-138). Alexandria, VA: TESOL.
- Bradford, A., & Brown, H. (Eds.). (2017). *English-medium instruction in Japanese higher Education: Policy, challenges and outcomes*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Buns, A. (2005). Action research: An evolving paradigm? *Language Teaching*, 38, 57-74.
- Canagarajah, S. (2013). *Translingual practice: Global Englishes and cosmopolitan realities*. London: Routledge.
- Cenoz, J. (2015). Content-based instruction and content-language integrated learning: The same or different? *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 28(1), 8-24.
- Cenoz, J., & de Zarobe, Y. (2015). Learning through a second or additional language:

- Content-based instruction and CLIL in the twenty-first century. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 28(1), 1-7.
- Cenoz, J., Genesee, F., & Gorter, D. (2013). Critical analysis of CLIL: Taking stock and looking forward. *Applied Linguistics*, 35(3), 243-262.
- Coleman, J., Hultgren, K., Li, W., Tsui, C., & Shaw, P. (2018). Forum on English-medium instruction. *TESOL Quarterly*, 52(3), 701-720.
- Crooks, G. (2009). *Values, philosophies, and beliefs in TESOL: Making a statement*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Crystal, D. (2003). *English as a global language* (2nd ed.). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Cummins, J. (1984). *Bilingualism and special education: Issues in assessment and pedagogy*. Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Cummins, J. (2008). BICS and CALP: Empirical and theoretical status of the distinction. In B. Street & N. Hornberger (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of language and education Vol. 2: Literacy* (2nd ed., pp. 71-83). New York: Springer.
- Cummins, J. (2016). Reflections on Cummins (1980), The cross-lingual dimensions of language proficiency: Implications for bilingual education and the optimal age issue. *TESOL Quarterly*, 50(4), 940-944.
- Dalton-Puffer, C., Nikula, T., & Smit, U. (2010). Language use and language learning in CLIL: Current findings and contentious issues. In C. Dalton-Puffer, T. Nikula, & U. Smit (Eds.), *Language use and language learning in CLIL classrooms* (pp. 279-291). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Dearden, J. (2014). *English as a medium of instruction—A growing global phenomenon*. Manchester, UK: British Council.
- Derwing, T. (2017). L2 fluency development. In S. Loewen & M. Sato (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of instructed second language acquisition* (pp. 246-259). London: Routledge.
- Donato, R. (1994). Collective scaffolding in second language learning. In J. Lantolf & G. Appel (Eds.), *Vygotskian approaches to second language research* (pp. 33-56). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2007). *Research methods in applied linguistics*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Dörnyei, Z., & Ushioda, E. (2011). *Teaching and researching motivation* (2nd ed.). Harlow: Longman.
- Dressler, C., & Kamil, M. (2006). First- and second-language literacy. In D. August & T. Shanahan (Eds.), *Developing literacy in second-language learners. Report of the National Literacy Panel on Language-Minority Children and Youth* (pp. 197-238). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

- Duff, P. (2012). How to carry out case study research. In A. Mackey & S. Gass (Eds.), *Research methods in second language acquisition: A practical guide* (pp. 95-116). West Sussex, UK: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Echevarría, J., Vogt, M., & Short, D. (2004). *Making content comprehensible for English learners* (2nd ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson.
- Echevarría, J., Vogt, M., & Short, D. (2013). *Making content comprehensible for English learners: The SIOP model* (4th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson.
- Flowerdew, J., & Peacock, M. (2001). *Research perspective on English for academic purpose*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Genesee, F. (2004). What do we know about bilingual education for majority language students? In T. Bhatia & W. Ritchie (Eds.), *Handbook of bilingualism and multilingualism* (pp. 547-576). Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Genesee, F., & Lindholm-Leary, K. (2013). Two case studies of content-based language education. *Journal of Immersion and Content-based Language Education*, 1, 3-33.
- Gorsuch, G. (2005). Discipline-specific practice for international teaching assistants. *English for Specific Purposes*, 25, 90-108.
- Gorsuch, G. (2016). International teaching assistants at universities: A research agenda. *Language Teaching*, 49(2), 275-290.
- Halbach, A. (2012). Questions about basic interpersonal communication skills and cognitive language proficiency. *Applied Linguistics*, 33(5), 608-613.
- Harley, B. (1989). Functional grammar in French immersion: A classroom experiment. *Applied Linguistics*, 10, 331-359.
- Harley, B. (1993). Instructional strategies and SLA in early French immersion. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 15, 245-260.
- Hays, D., & Singh, A. (2012). *Qualitative inquiry in clinical and educational settings*. New York & London: The Guilford Press.
- Hultgren, A., Jensen, C., & Dimova, S. (2015). Introduction: English-medium instruction in European higher education: From the North to the South. In S. Dimova, A. Hultgren, & C. Jensen (Eds.), *English-medium Instruction in European Higher Education*, 1-16. Berlin: Mouton.
- Hwang, J. (2002). L2 learners' anxiety and motivation in an English-only content-based class. *English Teaching*, 57(1), 193-211.
- Jakonen, T., & Morton, T. (2015). Epistemic search sequences in peer interaction in a content-based language classroom. *Applied Linguistics*, 36(1), 73-94.
- Jung, E. (2010). Content-based instruction from an insider's perspective. *Foreign Languages Education*, 17(3), 141-170.
- Kang, A. (2013). What a TBI case offers to college-level L2 learners. *English Teaching*, 68(2), 3-27.

- Kang, A. (2018). Exploring how to ensure participation in CBI. *Journal of the Korea English Education Society*, 17(2), 1-27.
- Kang, D. (2008). An exploratory study of university EFL students' participation in CBI. *English Language Teaching*, 20(1), 19-40.
- Kang, S., & Park, H. (2005). English as the medium of instruction in Korean engineering education. *Korean Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 21(1), 155-174.
- Kasper, L. (Ed.). (2000). *Content-based college ESL instruction*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Kim, Y. (2017). Cognitive-interactionist approaches to L2 instruction. In S. Loewen, & M. Sato (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of instructed second language acquisition* (pp. 126-145). London: Routledge.
- Knorr-Cetina, K. (2010). Objectual practice. In T. Schatzki, K. Knorr-Cetina, & E. Savigny (Eds.), *The practice turn in contemporary theory* (pp. 175-188). London: Routledge.
- Kohlberg, L., & Mayer, R. (1988). Development of the aim of education. In J. R. Gress & D. E. Purpel (Eds.), *Curriculum: An introduction to the field* (2nd ed., pp. 101-107). Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing.
- Krashen, S. (1985). *The input hypothesis*. London: Longman.
- Kym, I., & Kym, M. (2014). Students' perceptions of EMI in higher education in Korea. *The Journal of Asia TEFL*, 11(2), 35-61.
- Leaver, B., & Shekhtman, B. (2002). Principles and practices in teaching Superior-level language skills: Not just more of the same. In B. Leaver & B. Shekhtman (Eds.), *Developing professional-level language proficiency* (pp. 3-33). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Lightbown, P., & Spada, N. (2013). *How languages are learned* (4th ed.). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Loewen, S., & Sato, M. (2018). Interaction and instructed second language acquisition. *Language Teaching*, 51(3), 285-329.
- Long, M. (1985). Input and second language acquisition theory. In S. Gass & C. Madden (Eds.), *Input in second language acquisition* (pp. 377-393). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Long, M. (1996). The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition. In W. William & T. Bhatia (Eds.), *Handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 413-468). Cambridge, MA: Academic Press.
- Lyster, R. (2017). Content-based language teaching. In S. Loewen & M. Sato (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of instructed second language acquisition* (pp. 87-107). London: Routledge.
- 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.
- Mackey, A. (2017). Classroom-based research. In S. Loewen & M. Sato (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of instructed second language acquisition* (pp. 541-561). London: Routledge.
- Macaro, E. (2017). English medium instruction: Global views and countries in focus. *Language Teaching*, 1-18.
- Mackey, A., & Gass, S. (Eds.). (2012). *Research methods in second language acquisition: A practical guide*. West Sussex, UK: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Marsh, D. (Ed.). (2002). *CLIL/EMILE the European dimension*. Jyväskylän Yliopisto, Finland: University of Jyväskylä.
- Marsh, D. (2008). Language awareness and CLIL. In J. Cenoz & N. Hornberger (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of language and education, Vol 6: Knowledge about language* (pp. 233-246). New York: Springer.
- Mcpherron, P. (2016). English in the professional lives of college graduates in China. *TESOL Quarterly*, 50(2), 494-507.
- Met, M. (1991). Learning language through content: Learning content through language. *Foreign Languages Annals*, 24, 281-295.
- Miller, L. (2017). English for science and technology. In V. Bhatia & S. Bremner (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of language and professional communication* (pp. 304-320). London: Routledge.
- Nation, P., & Newton, J. (2009). *Teaching ESL/EFL listening and speaking*. New York: Routledge.
- O'Donoghue, T. (2007). *Planning your qualitative research project: An introduction to interpretivist research in education*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Oh, H., & Lee, E. (2010). College students' attitude towards teaching English through English and its effectiveness. *English Language Teaching*, 22(4), 211-229.
- Pak, Y. (2005). A study of university students' perceptions on TETE. *English Language Teaching*, 17(1), 59-82.
- Park, H. (2006). The effectiveness of English mediated courses with engineering students. *English Language Education*, 33, 86-119.
- Pérez-Vidal, C. (2009). The integration of content and language in the classroom: A European approach to education (The second time around). In E. Dafouz & M. Guerrini (Eds.), *CLIL across educational levels: Experiences from primary, secondary and tertiary contexts* (pp. 25-40). Madrid: Richmond Publishing.
- Pica, T. (2002). Subject-matter content: How does it assist the interactional and linguistic needs of classroom language learners? *Modern Language Journal*, 86(1), 1-19.
- Pica, T. (2009). Integrating content- and task-based approaches. In V. Cook, & L. Wei (Eds.), *Contemporary applied linguistics: Language teaching and learning* (pp. 75-

- 98). New York: Continuum.
- Plonsky, L. (2017). Quantitative research methods. In S. Loewen & M. Sato (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of instructed second language acquisition* (pp. 505-521). London: Routledge.
- Riazi, A., & Candlin, C. (2014). Mixed-methods research in language teaching and learning: Opportunities, issues and challenges. *Language Teaching*, 47(2), 135-173.
- Roquet, H., & Pérez-Vidal, C. (2017). Do productive skills improve in content and language integrated learning contexts? The case of writing. *Applied Linguistics*, 38(4), 489-511.
- Sanz, C. (2014). Contribution of study abroad research to our understanding of SLA processes and outcomes: The SALA project. In C. Pérez-Vidal (Ed.), *Second language acquisition in study abroad and formal instruction contexts* (pp. 1-17). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Seedhouse, P. (2004). *The interactional architecture of the language classroom: A conversation analysis perspective*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- Segalowitz, N. (2010). *The cognitive basis of second language fluency*. New York: Routledge.
- Short, D. (1991). *How to integrate language and content instruction: A training manual*. Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Stryker, S. & Leaver, B. (1997). *Content-based instruction in foreign language education: Models and methods*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Stoller, F. (2008). Content-based instruction. In N. Van Deusen-Scholl & N. Hornberger (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of language and education. Vol. 4: Second and foreign language education* (pp. 59-70). New York: Springer.
- Storch, N. (2002). Patterns of interaction in ESL pair work. *Language Learning*, 52, 119-158.
- Swain, M. (1985). Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development. In S. Gass & C. Madden (Eds.), *Input in second language acquisition* (pp. 235-253). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Swain, M. (1991). Manipulating and complementing content teaching to maximize second language learning. *TESL Canada Journal*, 6, 68-83.
- Swain, M. (2005). The output hypothesis: Theory and research. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 471-483). New York: Routledge.
- Tedick, D., & Wesely, P. (2015). A review of research on content-based foreign/second language education in US K-12 contexts. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 28, 25-40.
- Tomlinson, B., & Masuhara, H. (2018). *The complete guide to the theory and practice of*

- materials development for language learning*. Oxford, UK: Wiley Blackwell.
- VanPatten, B., & Benati, A. (2010). *Key terms in second language acquisition*. New York: Continuum.
- VanPattern, B., & Williams, J. (Eds.). (2015). *Theories in second language acquisition: An introduction* (2nd ed.). London: Routledge.
- Wächter, B., & Maiworm, F. (2014). *English-taught programmes in European Higher Education: The state of play in 2014*. Lemmens: ACA Papers on International Cooperation in Education.
- Wen, Q. (2018). The production-oriented approach to teaching university students English in China. *Language Teaching*, 51(4), 526-540.
- Wesche, M. (1993). Discipline-based approaches to language study: Research issues and outcomes. In M. Krueger & F. Ryan (Eds.), *Language & content: Discipline- and content-based approaches to language study* (pp. 57-79). Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath and Company.

APPENDIX A

Questionnaire Spring 2018

This questionnaire was developed to see how you have perceived the course-taking experience, which was provided by Content-Based Instruction (CBI, or English-medium course). Your responses are highly appreciated.

1. Grade: Freshman (), Sophomore (), Junior (), Senior (), Graduate-student ()
2. General English proficiency level:
Beginning (), Intermediate-Low (), Intermediate-Mid (), Intermediate-High (),
Advanced ()
3. Spoken English proficiency level:
Beginning (), Intermediate-Low (), Intermediate-Mid (), Intermediate-High (),
Advanced ()
4. What is your most confident skill in English?
Listening (), Speaking (), Reading (), Writing ()
5. What is your weakest skill in English?
Listening (), Speaking (), Reading (), Writing ()
6. What skill do you want to improve the most in English?
Listening (), Speaking (), Reading (), Writing ()

Please respond to the following statements by circling one of the options among the five:

① Strongly Disagree ② Disagree ③ Neutral ④ Agree ⑤ Strongly Agree

7. Having taken the course, I expected that I was able to increase my English language skills.

① Strongly Disagree ② Disagree ③ Neutral ④ Agree ⑤ Strongly Agree

8. Having taken the course, I expected that I was able to enhance the content-knowledge in the chosen field.

① Strongly Disagree ② Disagree ③ Neutral ④ Agree ⑤ Strongly Agree

9. I think that one of the best ways to improve my English language skills is to take academic courses in English

① Strongly Disagree ② Disagree ③ Neutral ④ Agree ⑤ Strongly Agree

10. The course was largely lecture-based one so that I did not have many chances to speak in the classroom.

① Strongly Disagree ② Disagree ③ Neutral ④ Agree ⑤ Strongly Agree

11. The instructor asked us to speak through pair/group-work, presentations or instructor-initiated questions.

① Strongly Disagree ② Disagree ③ Neutral ④ Agree ⑤ Strongly Agree

12. I was given enough opportunities to speak/participate in the classroom.

① Strongly Disagree ② Disagree ③ Neutral ④ Agree ⑤ Strongly Agree

13. I'm confident in speaking/participating in the classroom since my English language skills are good enough.

① Strongly Disagree ② Disagree ③ Neutral ④ Agree ⑤ Strongly Agree

14. I'm confident in speaking/participating in the classroom since I have prepared for each class.

① Strongly Disagree ② Disagree ③ Neutral ④ Agree ⑤ Strongly Agree

15. I'm confident in speaking/participating in the classroom since I have reviewed each class.

① Strongly Disagree ② Disagree ③ Neutral ④ Agree ⑤ Strongly Agree

16. I became more confident in speaking/participating in the classroom at the end of the course.

① Strongly Disagree ② Disagree ③ Neutral ④ Agree ⑤ Strongly Agree

17. The lack of English language skills makes me nervous about speaking/participating in English.

① Strongly Disagree ② Disagree ③ Neutral ④ Agree ⑤ Strongly Agree

18. The lack of comprehension of the contents makes me nervous about speaking/participating in English.

① Strongly Disagree ② Disagree ③ Neutral ④ Agree ⑤ Strongly Agree

19. I can participate more actively if I'm required to speak/participate in the class.

① Strongly Disagree ② Disagree ③ Neutral ④ Agree ⑤ Strongly Agree

20. I can be nervous if I'm required to speak/participate in the class.

① Strongly Disagree ② Disagree ③ Neutral ④ Agree ⑤ Strongly Agree

21. I can speak/participate more actively if I'm involved in pair- or group-discussion.

① Strongly Disagree ② Disagree ③ Neutral ④ Agree ⑤ Strongly Agree

22. The instructor did encourage the students to speak/participate in the class.

① Strongly Disagree ② Disagree ③ Neutral ④ Agree ⑤ Strongly Agree

Please respond to the following statements by circling one of the options among the five:

① Almost never ② Usually not ③ Neutral ④ Usually ⑤ Almost always

23. I prepared for or reviewed (each) class on my own.

① Almost never ② Usually not ③ Neutral ④ Usually ⑤ Almost always

24. I worked together with my classmate(s) to prepare for or review (each) class.

① Almost never ② Usually not ③ Neutral ④ Usually ⑤ Almost always

25. Which skill do you think was most improved throughout the course?

Listening (), Speaking (), Reading (), Writing ()

26. Which skill do you think was least improved throughout the course?

Listening (), Speaking (), Reading (), Writing ()

27. What do you think was most beneficial to improving English language skills? You can check more than one activity.

1) Reading the textbooks ()

2) Pair-discussion ()

3) Individual/Group presentation ()

4) Listening to the instructor ()

5) Listening to the classmate-presenters ()

6) Doing the written assignment(s) ()

7) Making questions and/or comments at the end of the classmate's presentation ()

8) Making questions and/or comments to the instructor ()

9) Preparing for and taking exams ()

10) Others (Please specify what contributed to improving your English language skills):

28. Overall, are you satisfied with your experience in the course?

① Not at all ② Hardly satisfied ③ Neutral ④ Satisfied to a certain extent ⑤ Well satisfied

29. Could you please provide suggestions to improve the course for the future?

APPENDIX B

Interview Questions

1. What helped you participate in the classroom?

- preparation, language skills, interaction and output opportunities

2. What prevented you from participating?

- contents, lack of preparation, language skills, lack of interaction or output opportunities

3. Having taken the course, what did you find most challenging among reading the chapters, participation, relationships with classmates or other things?
4. Do you think that you were given enough opportunities to participate in the classroom? If so, why? If not, why not?
5. Do you think that you were able to improve language skills through taking course?
6. How to promote participation in this kind of CBI course?

Applicable levels: College and higher

AeJin Kang, Ph. D.
Professor
Dept. of TESL, School of English
Sookmyung Women's University
47-gil 100, Chungpa-ro, Yongsan-gu
Seoul 04310, Korea
Email: ajkang@sm.ac.kr

Received on September 22, 2018
Reviewed on November 28, 2018
Revised version received on December 7, 2018