

## PROGRAM EVALUATION THROUGH ATTITUDE CHANGE

Andrew Finch, Ph.D.

Kyungpook National University, S. Korea

Paper based on the author's unpublished Ph.D. thesis

### Abstract

This paper is a report of a formative evaluation of a three-year task-based conversation program designed for tertiary students in the Republic of Korea. Given the importance of student/teacher beliefs about language learning, in terms of determining *what* gets learned by *whom*, this program aimed to investigate and positively influence such perceptions, on the assumption that improved attitudes to learning would result in increased confidence, motivation and independence, and that these would in turn lead to meaningful and enhanced language learning. Program goals promoted acquisition of long-term learning skills through cognitive, affective and social development, within the context of a focus on communicative competence. Assessment reflected these goals via self-evaluation and reflection, and program evaluation used quantitative and qualitative instruments to identify and explore positive attitude change in students and teachers. The extent of such change, which was significant on the part of participating teachers, was taken as a marker of program success.

### I. INTRODUCTION

This paper reports on a study carried out at Andong National University in the Republic of Korea, in which a Conversation-English program was designed, implemented and evaluated, using attitude change as one of the assessment tools. The program, which entered its pilot year in March 1997, and which reached its first year of full implementation in 1999, was commissioned by the president of the university, with the intention of promoting communicative competence in English, in line with government policy (Li 1998, p. 681) for all university students in their first three years of study<sup>1</sup>.

Language learners hold differing beliefs about language learning, which affect (and sometimes inhibit) their receptiveness to the ideas and activities presented in the language class, "particularly when the approach is not consonant with the learners' experience" (Cotterall 1995, p. 203), as well as controlling learning outside the class (Horwitz 1987, p. 120). Disciplines such as socio-cultural theory and psychology tell us that beliefs represent reality for the individual (Rogers 1951) and that independent learning agendas based upon such beliefs drive learning. The language program in this study therefore aimed to address such important factors in the learning process by basing individual and program evaluation on participant perceptions and on positive attitude change, investigating the student/teacher beliefs themselves rather than the learning which was a by-product of those beliefs.

A task-based "process" infrastructure was seen as an appropriate vehicle for a "language-learning as education" package, because: i) it allowed a focus on affective, psycho-social and socio-cultural aspects of learning; ii) it promoted a problem-solving approach to language learning and to learner training (Long & Crookes 1993:33); and iii) it encouraged learner autonomy (Pemberton *et al.* [Eds.] 1996). Such an expanded view of the program's original purpose implied curricular attention to learner training (Dickinson 1987), self-direction/autonomy (Little 1991), self-assessment (Harris 1997), peer-assessment (Tudor, 1996) and reflection (Harris 1997, p.13), along with attention to affective variables such as lack of confidence, language-learning anxiety, and unrealistic expectations - all considered to be barriers to learning in the Korean classroom.

---

<sup>1</sup> Undergraduates in Korea are required to study for four academic years before graduating, though most male students do their compulsory military service (six months to two years) during this time, and can therefore take up to six years to graduate.

Program evaluation recognized research findings that learners do not *learn* what teachers *teach* (Allwright 1984; Williams & Burden 1997) and that learner beliefs and perceptions determine the content and efficacy of learning (Cotterall 1995, p. 195). Self-evaluation and reflection were therefore an important part of the curriculum, providing information on how learners perceived their learning progress and the program's effectiveness. Qualitative and quantitative results obtained through triangulation of questionnaires, interviews, learner journals and self-assessment instruments, provided further data on whether students perceived themselves as more *confident*, *motivated* and *independent* (CMI) – three criteria which were chosen as markers of positive attitude change (cf. Finch, 2000, pp. 194ff for a discussion of these factors as curricular goals).

The evaluation method chosen was “formative” (Breen & Candlin 1980), and “illuminative” (Parlett 1981), since the evaluator was also the program designer, and was involved in the day-to-day running and development of the program. In the “emergent, variable design” (Guba 1978, p.14) of formative evaluation, the emphasis is on “observing, describing, interpreting and understanding how events take place in the real world” (Lynch 1996, p. 14), and on “stimulating learning and understanding” (Rea-Dickins & Germaine 1998, p. 11). In this approach there is no meaningful separation of facts from values (Guba & Lincoln 1989, p. 45), and the program is seen as a process that is continuously changing, shaped by “the nature of the project itself” (Williams & Burden 1994, p. 22), and evaluated through interviews, participant observation, journals, etc. (Lynch 1996). This type of evaluation is “*participative ... principled, systematic* and an *integral* part of curriculum planning and implementation” (Rea-Dickins 1994, p. 72). The stages of a formative evaluation are cyclic and mutually influencing, as the program is continuously implemented, evaluated and reformed, the evaluator producing an “interpretation of a highly complex system” (Parlett 1981), rather than making predictive generalizations, and using the information to modify the program as it is being implemented (Long 1984, p. 417).

## II. ATTITUDES AND BELIEFS: HISTORY OF RESEARCH

Early research on the relationship between attitudes and second language achievement was carried out by Gardner & Lambert in the 1950s, and later by Schumann (1975), who found a number of contributory factors: i) *language shock* (resulting in feelings of dissatisfaction, frustration or guilt); ii) *culture shock* (producing feelings of alienation or anxiety and rejection of native speaker values); iii) *language stress* (shame and loss of self-esteem resulting from a perceived deficiency in language); and iv) *anxiety* (due to the infantile persona necessarily projected by the language learner). Sauvignon (1976) pointed out that teachers also have attitudes and beliefs which affect their teaching:

Not until we have taken a hard critical look at the attitudes and motivation of teachers, both individually and as a profession, will we be ready to determine what obstacles lie in the way of creating the kinds of learning environments which would be most helpful to our students. (Sauvignon, 1976, p. 296)

Major research on language learning beliefs was carried out by Horwitz (1981; 1985; 1999), who developed the “Beliefs About Language Learning Inventory” (*BALLI*) to assess teacher and student opinions on a variety of issues related to language learning (1985, p. 383). Horowitz performed a review of *BALLI* studies in 1999, including the findings of Park (1995) and Truitt (1995) on Korean students studying English in Korea. Results from these two studies showed differences of up to 39% in the responses (Horwitz, 1999, p. 568), which Horwitz found surprising, given the shared culture and foreign language curriculum of the two groups, and which she attributed to individual “or current situational differences” (1999,

p. 573). Wenden (1991, pp.:12-13) calls for attention to be given to ‘person variables’ such as intentions, attributions, expectancies, perceptions and beliefs about learning abilities, which learners bring to the classroom, along with “a clear understanding of attitudes and attitude-change theory in order to address these issues.” Mantle-Bromley (1995) strongly recommends that “teachers design and implement lessons on the language-learning process that incorporate attitude-change methods. Research then needs to be conducted to determine if such lessons can indeed alter students’ beliefs” (1995, p. 383). Cotterall (1995, 1999) found that attitudes to learning and the beliefs which determine them, have “a profound influence on ... learning behaviour” (1995, p.:195; cf. 1999, p. 495) and on learning outcomes, since successful learners tend to develop a more active and autonomous attitude that allows them to take charge of their learning. Mistaken or uninformed beliefs about language learning may lead to dependence on less effective strategies, resulting in indifference toward learning, poor cognitive performance, classroom anxiety (Horwitz *et al.* 1986) and a negative attitude to autonomy (Victori & Lockhart, 1995, p. 225). In view of these findings, the author of this study decided to monitor student/teacher perceptions and attitude changes, and to use them as indicators of program success and successful learning.

### III. THE PROGRAM

Van Lier’s “AAA”<sup>2</sup> curriculum provided a model of a language curriculum as “a process of assisting learning” (Van Lier, 1996, p.4), with basic educational ideals and beliefs as “the central determining factors” (1996, p. 188). The version of this model used at Andong was based on three fundamental principles (CMI), which represent “a unity of epistemological and axiological beliefs ... a fair consensus of our current intellectual knowledge and moral aspirations as language educators” (Van Lier, 1996, p. 4). These three criteria were used by teachers when reflecting on their lessons.

An in-house text was designed and produced for each year of the program (Finch & Hyun 2000a;b;c<sup>3</sup>), the aim of these books being to introduce students to task-based learning and learner training, and to encourage them to choose and direct activities by themselves, as the teacher gradually gave up classroom control and became a teaching resource. This was to take place through a syllabus which included “traditional” structural elements, but in which oral interaction was the main learning content. In the third year of the program the emphasis was fully on learner training and independence, in a project-based format. Students and teachers were expected to identify changing learning needs as the program progressed, and therefore to negotiate their way through the program, diverging from the framework when appropriate (cf. Legutke & Thomas, 1991, pp.:4-5).

Bassano (1986, p. 15) offers the teacher six steps towards dealing with student beliefs: i) become aware of students’ past classroom experiences and their assumptions about language learning; ii) build students’ confidence; iii) begin where the students are and move slowly; iv) show them achievement; v) allow for free choice as much as possible; and vi) become aware of the students’ interests and concerns, their goals and objectives. Morgan (1993) also suggests that four aspects of classroom persuasion should be considered in attempting to change attitudes: i) learning content should require active learner involvement; ii) the classroom environment should be one of “change or novelty”; iii) students need to struggle with complex material and reach their own conclusions; and iv) students should become aware of their attitudes toward language and culture (1993, p. 73) (cf. Mantle-Bromley 1995, pp.:373-4). These considerations were incorporated in the textbooks and in open seminars and

---

<sup>2</sup> *Awareness, autonomy, and authenticity*

<sup>3</sup> These books can be viewed online at <http://www.finchpark.com>

reflective class observations, with the aim of promoting a non-threatening learning environment which would encourage CMI and result in positive attitude change.

#### IV. EVALUATION

Six instruments were used to triangulate data over the years 1998-1999. These consisted of four quantitative/qualitative<sup>4</sup> questionnaires and two interviews/verbal reports (Cohen 1996). In addition to their research role, instruments 1, 2 and 3 were also integral formative components of the program, helping participants progress from awareness of beliefs to reflection on and modification of those beliefs, and to more efficient and effective learning, in addition to providing data for the ongoing evaluation and transformation of the program. The research instruments are listed below:

1. "My abilities" (pre/post course self assessment) (appendix A).
2. Internal questionnaire (students) (appendix B).
3. Internal questionnaire (teachers) (appendix B).
4. External (university-administered) questionnaire (appendix C).
5. Student interviews (appendix D).
6. Teacher interviews (appendix E).

##### IV.1. RESEARCH INSTRUMENT 1: SELF-ASSESSMENT.

This deficiency analysis (appendix A), based on Oscarsson's (1980) self-assessment instrument, and covering the syllabus of the first two books, appeared at the beginning and the end of each of these books, in English and Korean, each question having five possible responses along a 5-point Likert Scale. Having made their responses, students calculated a score, which was used for comparison purposes when they did the activity again at the end of the semester. The function of this instrument was to provide students with feedback on their *perceived* progress in relation to syllabus goals. In this way it could be used as a measure of student confidence as well as of student performance on syllabus goals.

Results for this instrument showed a general "stepwise" trend in terms of self-assessment results, increasing during semesters, and dropping during vacations. The general can hide the specific, however, and closer examination of the data showed some interesting examples of students "taking off", with individual initial and final scores in 1999 (1/99/1 to 2/99/2) showing marked increases. The scores also provided useful information for the teachers, whose used them in discussing learning plans with students, and in promoting attitude modification.

##### IV.2. RESEARCH INSTRUMENTS 2 & 3

The questionnaire which was used for instruments 2 (students) and 3 (teachers) (appendix B) was designed to provide formative information on the program, to reflect student perceptions of the learning environment, and to investigate student awareness of learning strategies and of development of CMI and learning skills. Comparison of results would also provide evidence of how student/teacher perceptions were changing in relation to each other. This 57-item questionnaire was based on various published instruments: Hills (1976, p.:30); Horwitz (1988) *BALLI*; Willing (1988) "Student perceptions" questionnaire; Oxford (1990) *SILL*; and Hahn *et al.* (1989). All 57 items (5 sections) were in Korean and English, and students responded on a three-point scale.

Research instrument 2 was administered to 28 classes of 1<sup>st</sup>/2<sup>nd</sup>/3<sup>rd</sup> year students (n = 658) in December 1998 and June 1999. Seven of these classes were taught by the author, and the

---

<sup>4</sup> i.e. questionnaires giving quantitative data about qualitative perceptions.

other 21 were the classes from which interview students were chosen for research instrument 5. In similar fashion to Horwitz's (1988) *BALLI*, and Hills' (1976) investigation of student/teacher needs, research instrument 2 was also administered to teachers (at the end of semesters 2/1998, 1/1999 and 2/1999) as research instrument 3. Items were identical, except that "I" and "me" (sections A, D, E) were replaced by "My students". "The teacher" (section C) was replaced by "I", and items 56 & 57 were combined into item 56: "My students need more English classes". It was therefore possible to examine and compare student/teacher perceptions, including how they perceived each others' perceptions (Hills 1976).

Apart from a general consensus that the program was helping students to speak in English (item 34, section D), major differences in opinion were apparent in various items from these two research instruments, confirming Hills' conclusion (1976, p. 28) that "students and teachers not only see their own needs in ways which differ from each other, but they also see each other's needs in a somewhat different light." Thus teachers in general saw more evidence of communication and participation (section A), greater development of learning strategies (section C), more confidence and enjoyment (section D), and less need for direction (section B). Students saw themselves as more punctual (section A), needing more communication activities, games, correction and grammar (section B), showing poor comprehension of the teacher (section C), lacking learning strategies (section D) and preferring streaming (section E). Development of CMI was apparently noticeable in the students, but the implicit nature of the learner training in the program had not drawn students' attention to this change.

#### **IV.3. RESEARCH INSTRUMENT 4: STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE (EXTERNAL).**

When the university administered a course-assessment instrument (appendix C) to all students in all subjects in semesters 1/1998 and 2/1998, comparison with other programs in the university became a possibility, though it had not been included in the original research plans<sup>5</sup>. Immediately noticeable in the results of this questionnaire is the fact that the Language Centre (LC) received the highest average score in the University (3.93) in June 1998, and that it increased that score in December 1998. This external instrument provided reassuring evidence on the perceived value of the language program, its methods and teachers. Results showed that students placed conversation classes above all other classes in the university in terms of the assessed topics. While this instrument gave no specific information in terms of CMI, it made it evident that students valued the English Conversation program highly.

#### **IV.4. RESEARCH INSTRUMENT 5: STUDENT INTERVIEWS.**

In view of "renewed interests in both concurrent and retrospective verbal report techniques" (Matsumoto, 1996, p. 143) resulting from studies on learner strategies, learner beliefs, attitudes, and perceptions (Cohen 1996; O'Malley and Chamot 1990), it was decided to complement research instruments 1 to 4 with structured interviews, investigating student perceptions of the program. These interviews took place between the author and three or four students (at a time) from each of 21 classes (a Freshman, Sophomore and Junior class from each of the 7 university departments), during both semesters in 1999. The first of the three sets of student-interview sessions (April 1999) took the form of evaluator-directed "learning conversations" (Harri-Augstein & Thomas 1991) about the program, in the hope that matters significant to the students would be raised. However, students found it difficult to express themselves without a focus of interest, and a different approach was therefore taken in the 2<sup>nd</sup> & 3<sup>rd</sup> sessions (June and November 1999), when a list of 11 questions (appendix D) was devised, printed in English and Korean, and given to students before they came to the interviews. In the (recorded) interview session, students were free to respond in either

---

<sup>5</sup> This was the first time such an instrument had been administered in the university.

language, either to the interviewer, or to a Korean student intern, who helped the students feel at ease. Results of these sessions showed evidence of:

1. *intrinsic motivation for learning English.*
2. *awareness of the important of confidence and motivation.*
3. *language-learning awareness.*
4. *lessons and teaching methods being well-received.*
5. *lack of direction in terms of learning strategies.*

#### **IV.5. RESEARCH INSTRUMENT 6: TEACHER INTERVIEWS**

Structured interview sessions between the author and all teachers on the program were conducted in semesters 1 & 2 of the 1999 academic year (appendix E). Topics reflected issues which had been identified in teachers' meetings, informal conversations with teachers, and reflective teacher-observations. As with the student interviews, initial "open" conversations were subsequently focused into 9 questions (appendix E) in the 2<sup>nd</sup> & 3<sup>rd</sup> sessions. These latter interviews kept to the discursive nature of the interchange however, since teacher perceptions were well articulated and very relevant to this study. In Question 4, for example, teachers identified significant attitude change in the students:

I've seen noticeable increases in their willingness to have conversations in English, and some classes have gone from not being particularly interested ... to being pretty hungry for it. Now they always come to class on time and are very enthusiastic and are rightfully proud of their accomplishments. (Finch, 2000, p. 423)

Not every student, but ... examples of students have taken off. At first they came in a little unsure of what they were doing, and by the end of the term they were self-correcting, and telling their classmates who were not working as hard as they should be to 'let's finish this ... let's move on' and so I really was quite surprised. I wasn't expecting so much ... peer moderation (Finch, 2000, p. 423)

Most of the [Junior] students do have good attitudes now ... Generally, they enjoy the projects. (Finch, 2000, p. 424)

I noticed an extreme attitude change in some of my classes from the first semester to the second semester. (Finch, 2000, p. 424)

Question 5 (appendix E) asked about perceived attitude changes in the teachers themselves. Results showed teachers recording definite, though difficult changes, 10 agreeing "in general" that attitude change has occurred, and 5 concurring "to a certain extent". In addition to the "learning curve" that seemed evident ("I'm going through such an incredible learning process", Finch, 2000, p. 426), a number of teachers also attested to increased CMI and improved affect in themselves:

Yea. My confidence in the program and my confidence as a teacher have increased. (Finch, 2000, p. 425)

Yes. From the first semester to the second. ... At first, I wasn't sure of myself ... however, the more I just let go and relaxed ... I think now I'm feeling pretty confident. (Finch, 2000, p. 426)

Once I got used to it, I suppose I was more motivated, once I started to understand what the program was. (Finch, 2000, p. 426)

There is no longer [any] fear of periods of uncertainty. ... When I first came here, I felt the need to correct. ... I'm less threatened. ... I see the purpose of having the students fill in the gap themselves. ... I think it has given me more motivation and independence and confidence. (Finch, 2000, p. 426)

These (and other) responses showed that the program was in some way a learning experience for teachers, prompting significant attitude change, which self-labelled "doubters" were not afraid to acknowledge:

I've learned a lot from the program. ... I was a bit cynical ... but when I came here I saw it could work. (Finch, 2000, p. 425)

There has been an amazing growth in the students, semester to semester. ... Maybe my vision has changed. (Finch, 2000, p. 424)

At first I didn't really buy into your ideas ... This year I am really happy with the program. (Finch, 2000, p. 426)

Yes. Moving away from a teacher-centred, teacher-controlled learning environment, has required me to become more patient. Fighting the temptation to dominate the direction and "learning" content and pace, took some practice, to be honest. In classes with students who are used to and more than willing to give all control to an instructor, I had to struggle to change my attitude about my role in the classroom. (Finch, 2000, p. 427)

## V. CONCLUSION

During the duration of this study, students and teachers showed signs of attitude change in the direction of increased confidence, motivation and independence, and students' oral skills were observed to improve by the teachers. The most notable change occurred with the teachers themselves, as reported in research instrument 6. Responses to questions in this instrument showed positive attitude change regarding the program and its effect on the students, and remarkably frank comments from teachers who had not "bought in" to the program when they started at the Language Centre. Teachers also saw an increased enthusiasm for learning in the students and improvement in CMI and communicative competence. The approach of "All the students talking all the time" was seen as effective in promoting these qualities, and the holistic task-based format was seen as an appropriate and facilitative means of giving the students the opportunity to use the target language in a non-threatening learning environment:

I'm very impressed with the way the program has got the students speaking straight away. ... and they're very enthusiastic about it and I think the success is generating more enthusiasm as they go along. (Finch, 2000, p. 433)

When I saw that the students were actually able to do the tasks that were set, I could see that the program has actually worked in bringing that about ... they had actually learned from the program. (Finch, 2000, p. 437)

This was not a comparative study, and there were no control groups (the program was given to all ANU students). In the absence of long-term post-research results, it can be said that the program was successful in promoting positive attitude change in students and teachers

in this learning environment, and at this point in time. While not claiming generalizability, the results suggest that a similar task-based, formative, holistic approach would produce equivalent growth and positive attitude change in similar situations. This change will be positive in terms of learning effectiveness (for the students) and in terms of professional practices (for the teachers).

... whatever is available to teachers in terms of tasks, techniques, or principles, there is no substitute for personal warmth, tolerance and a positive attitude to people: to oneself and to others. (Legutke & Thomas, 1991, p. 35)

### REFERENCES

- Allwright, R.L. (1984). Why don't learners learn what teachers teach?: the interaction hypothesis. In D. M. Singleton, & D. Little (Eds.). *Language Learning in Formal and Informal Contexts*. Dublin: Irish Association for Applied Linguistics. Pp. 3-18.
- Bassano, S. (1986). Helping learners adapt to unfamiliar methods. *English Language Teaching Journal* 40/1, pp. 13-19.
- Breen, M.P. & Candlin, C. (1980). The essentials of a communicative curriculum in language teaching. *Applied Linguistics*, 1/2, pp. 89-112.
- Cohen, A.D. (1996). Verbal reports as a source of insights into second language learner strategies. *Applied Language Learning*, 7/1 & 2, pp. 5-24.
- Cotterall, S. (1995). Readiness for autonomy: Investigating learner beliefs. *System* 23/2, pp. 195-205.
- Cotterall, S. (1999). Key variables in language learning: what do learners believe about them? *System* 27, pp. 493-513.
- Dickinson, L. (1987). *Self-Instruction in Language Learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Finch, A. E. (2000). A formative evaluation of a task-based EFL programme for Korean university students. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Manchester.
- Finch, A.E. & Hyun, T. D. (2000a). *Now You're Talking!* Seoul: Hakmunsa Press.
- Finch, A.E. & Hyun, T. D. (2000b). *Tell Me More!* Seoul: Hakmunsa Press.
- Finch, A.E. & Hyun, T. D. (2000c). *The Way Ahead*. Seoul: Hakmunsa Press.
- Guba, E.G. (1978). Toward a methodology of naturalistic enquiry in educational evaluation. CSE monograph series in evaluation 8. Center for the Study of Evaluation. Los Angeles: University of California
- Guba, E.G. & Lincoln, Y.S. (1989). *Fourth Generation Evaluation*. California: Newbury Park.
- Hahn, S. L., Stassen, T., & Reschke, C. (1989) Grading classroom activities: effects on motivation and proficiency. *Foreign Language Annals*, 22/3, pp/ 421-252.
- Harris, M. (1997). Self-assessment of language learning in formal settings. *English Language Teaching Journal*, 51/1, pp. 12-20.
- Harri-Augstein S. & Thomas, L. (1991). *Learning Conversations: The Self-Organised Learning Way to Personal and Organisational Growth*. London: Routledge.
- Hills, P. J. (1976). *The Self-teaching Process in Higher Education*. Croom Helm: London.
- Horwitz, E.K. (1981). Beliefs about language learning. Unpublished instrument. The University of Texas at Austin.
- Horwitz, E.K. (1985). Using student beliefs about language learning and teaching in the foreign language methods course. *Foreign Language Annals* 18/4, pp. 333-340.
- Horwitz, E.K. (1987) Surveying student beliefs about language learning. In A. Wenden & J. Rubin (Eds.). *Learner Strategies in Language Learning*. Cambridge: Prentice-Hall. Pp. 119-129.

- Horwitz, E.K. (1988). The beliefs about language learning of beginning university foreign language students. In *The Modern Language Journal*, 72/3, pp. 283-294.
- Horwitz, E.K. (1999). Cultural and situational influences on foreign language learners' beliefs about language learning: a review of BALLI studies. *System* 27. pp. 557-576.
- Horwitz, E.K., Horwitz, M.B. & Cope, J. (1986). Foreign language classroom anxiety. *Modern Language Journal* 70/2, pp. 125-132
- Lee, W.K. (1991). A task-based approach to oral communication testing of English as a foreign language. Ph.D. thesis, Manchester University. Seoul: Hanshin Publishing Co.
- Legutke, M & Thomas. H. (1991) *Process and Experience in the Language Classroom*. Harlow: Longman.
- Li, F. (1998). "It's always more difficult than you plan and imagine": teachers' perceived difficulties in introducing a communicative approach in South Korea. *TESOL Quarterly*, 32/4, pp. 677-702
- Little, D. (1991). *Learner Autonomy 1: Definitions, Issues and Problems*. Dublin: Authentik
- Long, M. H. (1984). Process and product in ESL program evaluation. *TESOL Quarterly*, 18/3, pp. 409-425.
- Long, M.H. & Crookes, G. (1993). Units of analysis in syllabus design: the case for the task. In G. Crookes & S.M. Gass (Eds.). *Tasks in a Pedagogical Context*. Cleveland, UK: Multilingual Matters. Pp. 9-44.
- Lynch, B. K. (1996). *Language Program Evaluation: Theory and Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mantle-Bromley, C. (1995). Positive Attitudes and Realistic Beliefs: Links to Proficiency. *The Modern Language Journal* 79/3, pp. 372-386.
- Matsumoto, K. (1996). Helping L2 Learners Reflect on Classroom Learning. *ELT Journal*, (V)50/2. pp143-149.
- Morgan, C. (1993). Attitude change and foreign language culture learning. *Language Teaching*, 26, pp. 63-75.
- O'Malley, J.M. & Chamot, A.U. (1990). *Learning Strategies in Second Language Acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Oscarsson, M. (1980). *Approaches to Self-Assessment in Foreign Language Learning*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Oxford, R.L. (1990). *Language Learning Strategies: What Every Teacher Should Know*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Newbury House.
- Park, G. P. (1995). Language learning strategies and beliefs about language learning of university students learning English in Korea. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, The University of Texas at Austin TX.
- Parlett, M. (1981). Illuminative evaluation. In P. Reason & J. Rowan. *Human Enquiry*. Chichester: Wiley. Pp. 219-226.
- Pemberton, R. Edward, S.L., Or, W.W.F., and Pierson, H.D. (Eds.). (1996). *Taking Control: Autonomy in Language Learning*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.
- Rea-Dickens, P. (1994). Evaluation and English language teaching (state of the art article). *Language Teaching*, 27/2, pp. 71-91
- Rea-Dickens, P. & Germaine, K. P. (1998). The price of everything and the value of nothing: trends in language programme evaluation. In P. Rea-Dickens, & K. P. Germaine (Eds.). *Managing Evaluation and Innovation in Language Teaching*. Harlow: Longman. Pp. 3-19.
- Rogers, C.R. (1951). *On Becoming a Person*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Sauvignon, S.J. (1976). On the other side of the desk: a look at teacher attitude and motivation in second-language learning. *The Canadian Modern Language Review* 32, pp. 295-304

- Schumann, J.H. (1975). Affective factors and the problem of age in second language acquisition. *Language Learning*, 25/2, pp. 209-235
- Truitt, S. N. (1995). Anxiety and beliefs about language learning: a study of Korean university students learning English. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, The University of Texas at Austin TX.
- Tudor, I. (1996). *Learner-centredness as Language Education*. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge.
- Van Lier, L. (1996). *Interaction in the Language Curriculum: Awareness, Autonomy, and Authenticity*. London: Longman.
- Victori, M. & W. Lockhart (1995) Enhancing metacognition in self-directed language learning. *System* 23/2, pp. 223-234
- Wenden, A. L. (1991). *Learner Strategies in Language Learning*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Williams, M. & Burden, R.L. (1994). The role of evaluation in ELT project design. In *English Language Teaching Journal*, 48/1, pp. 22-27
- Williams, M. & Burden, R.L. (1997). *Psychology for Language Teachers: A Social Constructivist Approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Willing, K. (1988). *Learning Styles In Adult Migrant Education*. Adelaide, Australia: National Curriculum Resource Centre.

#### APPENDIX A: RESEARCH INSTRUMENT 1.

<b>If I meet an English native speaker in Korea ...</b>	
1. I can greet him.	(TMM, Ch. 1; NYT, Ch. 1).
2. I can introduce myself.	(TMM, Ch. 1; NYT, Ch. 1).
3. I can talk about my family.	(TMM, Chs. 2, 6).
4. I can talk about my school/job.	(TMM, Ch. 1).
5. I can talk about my hobbies.	(TMM, Chs. 4, 5; NYT, Ch. 8).
6. I can talk about my room/office.	(TMM, Ch. 3).
7. I can talk about my hometown.	(TMM, Ch. 3).
8. I can talk about Korea.	(TMM, Ch. 1; NYT, Chs. 5, 12).
9. I can give directions.	(TMM, Ch. 9).
<b>If I visit an English-speaking country ...</b>	
10. I can ask for directions.	(TMM, Ch. 9; NYT, Ch. 5).
11. I can buy a train/bus/plane ticket.	(TMM, Ch. 1; NYT, Ch. 6).
12. I can buy food from the supermarket.	(TMM, Ch. 7).
13. I can buy clothes.	(TMM, Ch. 8).
14. I can order a meal at a restaurant.	(TMM, Ch. 7).
15. I can use the telephone.	(TMM, Ch. 12).
16. I can ask for information on the phone.	(NYT, Chs. 6, 7).
17. I can use the Post office/Bank.	(NYT, Ch. 10).
18. I can talk to native speakers.	(TMM all Chs., NYT all Chs.).
19. I can read English newspapers.	(NYT, Ch. 3).
20. I can understand road maps and signs.	(TMM, Ch. 10).

#### APPENDIX B: RESEARCH INSTRUMENT 2,

<b>Section A: My contribution in class:</b>	<b>Always</b>	<b>Some- times</b>	<b>Never</b>
1. "I speak in English in class."			
2. "I give ideas to my group."			
3. "I participate in the activities."			
4. "I ask the teacher for help when I need it."			
5. "I ask classmates for help when I need it."			
6. "I help my classmates when they ask me."			
7. "I come to class on time."			
8. "I do the homework."			
9. "I visit the teacher's office."			
10. "I send emails to the teacher."			
<b>Section B: The Lessons (1). "Do we need more of anything?"</b>	<b>We need more</b>	<b>This is OK</b>	<b>We need less</b>
11. Talking in English (discussion).			
12. Communication activities (pair-work, information gap).			
13. Listening activities			
14. Language games			
15. Help from the teacher.			
16. Correction from the teacher.			
17. Grammar			
18. Discussion			
19. Homework			
20. Advice from the teacher			
<b>Section C: The Lessons (2) (the teacher).</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Maybe</b>	<b>No</b>
21. "The teacher works hard to help us speak English."			
22. "The teacher knows our learning needs."			
23. "The teacher respects us as people."			
24. "The teacher makes interesting classes for us."			
25. "The teacher wants us to study hard."			
26. "The teacher emphasizes punctuality."			
27. "The teacher shows us our mistakes."			
28. "The teacher shows us our successes."			
29. "The teacher talks to us out of class."			
30. "The teacher shows us how to be good learners."			
31. "I can understand everything the teacher says."			
32. "My teacher makes it easy for me to learn English."			
33. "I am satisfied with my teacher."			

<b>Section D: The lessons in the Language Center ...</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Maybe</b>	<b>No</b>
34. "...help me speak English..			
35. "...help me for my future life (career, study abroad).			
36. "...help me understand other cultures."			
37. "...give me confidence to use English."			
38. "...give me a chance to talk to foreign teachers."			
39. "...help me study English by myself."			
40. "...help me think about my learning goals."			
41. "...help me become a good learner."			
42. "...make want to continue studying English."			
43. "...help me in my other studies."			
<b>Section E: General.</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Maybe</b>	<b>No</b>
44. "The textbook is OK for my level."			
45. "The textbook is too easy for me."			
46. "The textbook makes English interesting."			
47. "I have improved my English speaking skills this year."			
48. "I am more confident about speaking English now."			
49. "I enjoy English more now."			
50. "I want a special "High-level" English class."			
51. "I want a special "Basic-level" English class."			
52. "I want classes to be chosen by the level of the students."			
53. "I want many different levels in one class."			
54. "I want English to be a selective course."			
55. "I want English to be a required course."			
56. "I want more English classes."			
57. "I want fewer English classes."			

APPENDIX C: UNIVERSITY STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE, JUNE 1998.

<b>University Student Questionnaire, June 1998.</b>
1. Students understand the overall Course Plan.
2. Teachers explain the object of each class.
3. Teachers explain the contents of each class.
4. Teachers try to develop motivation in the students.
5. The teacher does his/her best in class.
6. Lesson preparation.
7. Teachers use the full 50 minutes of the lesson.

8. Teachers respect the students' opinions.
9. The text and teaching materials are appropriate.
10. The grading/assessment method is appropriate.
11. The teacher informs students of the assessment methods.
12. Student interest and attention in the classes is improving.
13. The students feel that they are learning new things.
14. The students are satisfied with the classes.
15. The classes are valuable.

#### APPENDIX D: RESEARCH INSTRUMENT 5: STUDENT INTERVIEW QUESTIONS.

---

1. What are your long-term goals?
  2. What are your short-term goals?
  3. Why do you need English?
  4. How can you solve your learning problems?
  5. How do you feel about your speaking skills?
  6. How do you feel about your English class?
  7. How do you feel about pair-work in the class?
  8. How do you feel about group -work in the class?
  9. How do you feel about the classroom?
  10. How do you feel about homework?
- 

#### APPENDIX E: RESEARCH INSTRUMENT 6: TEACHER-INTERVIEW QUESTIONS.

---

1. Is the programme achieving its goals (student confidence, motivation, independence)?
  2. How do you feel about these goals?
  3. Is the programme helping the students to develop their oral skills in English?
  4. Have you noticed any attitude changes in the students during the programme?
  5. Have you noticed any attitude changes in yourself during the programme?
  6. What do you need more of as a teacher on this programme (support, training, etc.)
  7. How important is supportive management for this programme?
  8. Have you noticed problems that need to be addressed?
  9. How can the programme progress from this point?
-