

이 논문은 국제언어문학회 연구윤리위원회 심의(2019.08.10.) 결과,
연구부정행위(표절)가 확인되어 게재가 철회된 논문임

The Ineffectiveness of Korea's English-Only Classroom Policy

Kang-hee Park*

|| 차례 ||

1. Introduction
- 2.1. Korea's Education Goals on English
- 2.2. The Roots of the English-Only Classroom
- 2.3. The DM & FI Language Instruction
- 2.4. The FI Classroom & FI in Korea
- 2.5. A Learner-Centered Environment
- 2.6. Results of Ineffective Language Teaching & The
Prohibition of the L1 in the L2 Classroom
3. Conclusion

[Abstract]

Korea's immersion language instruction is different from the other countries like Canada or Japan. Full Immersion, as it is implemented in the Canadian system, has shown remarkable success. The distinguishing feature of immersion is that a majority (50%-100%) of the regular school curriculum is taught through the medium of a second language. But in South Korea, in order to bolster the English-language instruction time, many public schools offered intensive English immersion programs after normal teaching hours. These are often controversial programs with parents and teachers coming down on both sides of the issue. In 2000 the Korean Ministry of Education implemented its 7th Curriculum and, among the many details covering all areas of Korean primary and secondary education, it also included an extensive plan for English education. At this stage English is the primary language used for business and trade between nations.

* 위덕대학교 영어학과, khpark@uu.ac.kr

But Critics pointed out that there was no evidence that immersion language instruction at a young age caused any problems with native language acquisition. Included in this set of guidelines is an emphasis that classes should be carried out in English only and that is the focus of this Abstract and of my research paper. The following are some of the questions I will attempt to answer over the course of my paper.

- What underpins the drive for English education in South Korea?
- What are the origins and the rationale for excluding the L1 from the L2
- Do learners acquire language more efficiently in this manner or does it induce more stress and slow down the learning process?
- Was the Korean government's policy decision a step in the right direction for English proficiency or is it a mistake and a misunderstanding of the process of second language acquisition?
- Does an English-only classroom environment help South Korea achieve its stated educational goals?

In my search for answers to these questions I will rely heavily on published works by experts in foreign language acquisition.

Key words: Full Immersion Language Instruction. second language acquisition, Direct Method, English language teaching (ELT).

1. Introduction

Korea's total monetary expenditure on English education is upwards of 15 billion dollars per year (Korea Times, 2008). English proficiency remains a firm barrier that students must pass to in order to achieve entry into top schools or employment at the most desirable companies.

Furthermore, There is an estimated 1.8 to 1.9 million research papers and articles published per year, with the majority being published in English (Ware, 2012). As such, English will remain the primary language of science and research, at least for the time being.

Scientists, engineers, and researchers of all kinds will find themselves isolated from the vast world of information that exists only in English if they do not gain a proficiency in the language.

English is also the de facto language of international business. The need to tightly coordinate tasks and work with customers and partners worldwide has accelerated the move toward English as the official language of business no matter where companies are headquartered. (Neeley, 2014). Neeley goes on to state that Between the U.S. and Australia, former colonized countries like Nigeria and India, and the people who've studied it as a second language, English is used by well over a billion people across the world every day.

But how best to educate those students to achieve that goal? This is a hotly debated topic and one in which there is no clear answer. However, we can discuss methods that are more or less effective based on accumulated data and research regarding current findings. Because despite the best efforts of multiple administrations and thousands of English language teachers, English remains a little-used language in the daily lives of Koreans.

The South Korean government has advocated for an English Only classroom when possible (Ministry of Education, Science and Technology, Korea, 2008) and in this paper I will explore the efficacy of that approach. I will review the available data on a 'full immersion' approach to 2nd language acquisition and whether or not an English-only classroom as it is currently used in South Korea is the easiest way to achieve communicative competence.

2.1. Korea's Education Goals on English

In 2017 the Korea Institute for Curriculum and Evaluation published

Education Vision for the Future Curriculum, Instruction, and Evaluation in South Korea. The project that produced this report has the stated goal of predicting the future changes in Korea's education and preemptively proposing the direction and tasks for Korea's elementary and secondary curricular education informed by the predicted changes. (Korea Institute for Curriculum and Evaluation, 2017).

With the goal in mind of predicting the changes that Korea will undergo by the year 2030 the institute conducted a series of Delphi surveys with 50 experts on future education in the relevant fields. Of the six main areas of change predicted, I will look at the ones most pertinent to English education in Korea.

Changes most relevant to this research are in the areas of Advancement of the knowledge-based society (2nd prediction), Advancement of science and information technologies (3rd prediction), Changes in the economic and social structures (4th prediction), and Sustainable development for environmental and resource issues (5th prediction).

Under the 2nd prediction, one finding was relevant. It stated that knowledge and information will become the core value drivers and crucial determinants of the competitiveness of individuals, businesses, and nations. Under the 3rd prediction two findings were relevant: Nations will communicate and trade at an increasing speed and People will be able to access or exchange more information regardless of time and space. Under the 4th prediction, one finding is relevant: The growth of multinational companies and the transfer of workers across borders will advance the globalization of the labor market. Under the 5th prediction, both findings were relevant. They are, Nations will seek economic and social growth aligned with the goal of protecting and coexisting with nature and the global community will increasingly be

committed to ensuring the continued existence of mankind in the face of environmental issues and resource deprivation. (ibid.)

All of these areas will rely heavily on science and technology and communicating across borders. In order for Korea to be successful in these areas a high degree of international cooperation will be needed, and individuals involved will need to be prepared to share ideas and receive input from a broad range of nationalities.

It is with these goals in mind, as well as the pressure of surviving in a global economy, that South Korea has designed its English language curriculum. However, their approach has fatal flaws that will not only prevent the achievement of their goals, but may even make matters worse. We will now explore the English-Only classroom and why it is doomed to fail in South Korea.

2.2. The Roots of the English-Only Classroom

The EO classroom is the child of a Full Immersion (FI) approach to L2 acquisition. In exploring the effectiveness of the EO classroom it is necessary to first look at the origins of this approach and how it has changed over the years.

At the root of the EO classroom is The Direct Method, which itself was a response to the failures of the Grammar-Translation Method. In the 19th century and prior, GTM was the primary method of foreign language acquisition. Textbooks were organized by chapters of grammar points which were presented with rules and sample sentences were provided to demonstrate the principles. Very little time was given over to oral communication in the target language. Under the Grammar-Translation Method, speaking the language was not the goal, and oral sentences were constructed to illustrate the grammatical

system of the language and consequently bore no relation to the language of real communication. (Richards, Rodgers, 2016). Titone explained that under the GTM, Oral work was reduced to an absolute minimum, while a handful of written exercises, constructed at random, came as a sort of appendix to the rules. (Titone, 1968)

While GTM is still used in various parts of the world, it is a method that is ill equipped to provide the communicative competence that is in demand in this modern area. This is almost by design since its development was never intended to create communicative competence. As the world modernized in the last 19th and early 20th centuries, however, being able to produce in the target language became the goal for acquiring a foreign language. The necessity of speaking proficiency was recognized and educators sought new methods or approaches that might meet that goal. One such method that emerged from this first major reform of foreign language acquisition was The Direct Method.

2.3. The DM & FI Language Instruction

The Direct Method is a methodology that grew out of observations of child language learning. It is one method that came from what is sometimes called naturalistic principles of language learning, also known as The Natural Method. It was believed by some that you could attain communicative competence in the target language without the use of grammar translation or the L1. Advocates believed that if you conveyed meaning directly through demonstration and action, language could be learned and acquired. The Direct Method teaches grammar inductively, which is to say that students study and are exposed to examples of the target grammar without having been taught the rules and then they derive an understanding of the rule. Teachers provide

the necessary input rather than a textbook at the early stages of learning.

The principles of the Direct Method can be summarized as follows(Richards, Rodgers, 2016):

- Classroom instruction was conducted exclusively in the target language.
- Only everyday vocabulary and sentences were taught.
- Oral communication skills were built up in a carefully graded progression organized around question-and-answer exchanges between teachers and students in small, intensive classes.
- Grammar was taught inductively.
- New teaching points were introduced orally.
- Concrete vocabulary was taught by association of ideas.
- Both speech and listening comprehension were taught.
- Correct pronunciation and grammar were emphasized.

With this understanding of the Direct Method in mind we can begin exploring Full Immersion language instruction. FI is, to put it simply, a type of foreign language instruction in which the regular school curriculum is taught through the medium of the foreign language. The language is the vehicle for the content instruction; it is not the subject of instruction. (ibid.) According to Bostwick, Full Immersion got its start in Canada in the 1960s (Bostwick, 1995). Canada has both English and French as national languages and therefore has a somewhat unique situation in which proficiency in both languages is almost a necessity. And Full Immersion, as it is implemented in the Canadian system, has shown remarkable success.

The distinguishing feature of immersion is that a majority (50%-100%) of the regular school curriculum is taught through the

medium of a second language. For example in Canada, an immersion teacher for a class of English-speaking students uses only French (the foreign language) to teach math, science, social studies, art. Language learning is therefore integrated with the academic curriculum of the school (ibid.).

Students involved in Canada's FI program attain near native levels of proficiency in the target language. These students perform as well or better as monolingual students on achievement tests of the first language. Similar results were also seen when a program modeling the Canadian methods was introduced in Japan.

These results were made possible by true immersion into the target language. Students were exposed to the L2 at all levels and all throughout the school day and through all subjects. It was the medium of instruction as well as the method for the completion of tasks. If we can use the results of Canada's schools, and Japan's experiments, with a true full immersion program, this is perhaps the best way for young learners to achieve communicative competence in a target language. But not only is this not possible in Korea, it is currently illegal. But before we explore that, let's look at what full immersion is and what it requires.

2.4. The FI Classroom & FI in Korea

As previously stated, an immersion program is a method of second language instruction in which the regular school curriculum is instructed through the medium of the target language. Genesee (1987) explains:

“Generally speaking, at least 50% of instruction during a given

academic year must be provided through the second language for the program to be regarded as immersion. Programs in which one-subject and language arts are taught through the second language are generally identified as enriched second language programs. For instance, in English immersion programs, English is not the subject of instruction; rather it is the medium through which the school subject matters are taught”.

According to Cummins, Immersion is used in two different ways. He says,

“In the first sense 'immersion programs' are organized and planned forms of bilingual education in which students are 'immersed' in a second language instructional environment with the goal of developing proficiency in two languages. First language instruction is typically introduced within a year or two of the start of the program and forms an integral part of the overall plan. In its second sense, the term 'immersion refers to the immersion of immigration or minority language children in the classroom environment where instruction is conducted exclusively through their second (or third) language. He adds immersion program is a form of bilingual education that immerses students in a second language instruction environment for between 50 and 100% of instructional time with the goal of developing fluency and literacy in both languages”.

Johnson and Swain (1997) have outlined eight core features of full immersion programs:

- The L2 is the medium of instruction.
- The immersion curriculum parallels the local L1 curriculum.
- Overt support exists for the L1.
- The program aims for additive bilingualism where students add L2 proficiency while continuing to develop their L1.
- Exposure to the L2 is largely confined to the classroom.

- Students enter with similar (and limited) levels of L2 proficiency.
- The teachers are bilingual.
- The classroom culture is that of the local L1 community.

From the examples above we can see that beginning a full immersion program requires significant resources and careful planning that goes well beyond merely instructing students through a second language.

While the results of a full immersion program are well understood we can see that it is no easy task to undertake. Someone with little understanding of the effort and dedication required to begin such a program might easily make the mistake of saying that all one needs is to teach the L2 in the target language and the desired effects will follow. It is also easy to understand why school systems, often over-burdened and underfunded, would be hesitant or against starting a true FI program. But if communicative competence in the target language is the goal, merely applying full immersion to the foreign language classroom is not only inadequate, but could also retard language acquisition.

In South Korea, in order to bolster the English-language instruction time, many public schools offered intensive English immersion programs after normal teaching hours. These are often controversial programs with parents and teachers coming down on both sides of the issue.

On the one hand, parents who cannot afford to send their children to often expensive private academies welcome the opportunity for free or cheap access to additional language instruction. But on the other hand other parents and educators, worried about the stress students are under, wish to ban or severely curtail such after school immersion

programs. And such concerns are not without merit. Suicide is currently the leading cause of death among Koreans aged 15 to 24.

Suicide is a complex and sensitive topic and it is not the aim of this research to lay the blame on the shoulders of foreign language acquisition. However, in light of the statistics regarding student suicides we can begin to understand the fear of piling too much work on top of already overworked students.

In February, 2016 the South Korean Constitutional Court upheld a ban on English immersion programs (Korea Herald, May 2016). The ban centered around the program at Young Hoon Elementary School in Seoul, which was running a full immersion English program. The students were learning from foreign-language textbooks in math and science. According to the Korean government, this violated a prohibition on immersion education for the first two grades of a child's education on the fears that it would hinder acquisition of the native language.

There are also those who oppose bilingual education for political or cultural reasons. Cummings explains, In the current era of globalization, with unprecedented human mobility and social interchange across cultural and linguistic boundaries, processes of language learning (and language loss) are apparent in societies around the world. (Long, Doughty, 2011)

In South Korea, a country intensely proud of its native language, some parents, educators, and politicians are concerned that English immersion would hinder or inhibit the acquisition of Korean, which is often seen as a vital part of being Korean. Critics of the ban pointed out that there was no evidence that immersion language instruction at a young age caused any problems with native language acquisition, but the court was unmoved and the ban was upheld (Korea Herald, May

2016).

This ban has not stopped private schools and after school academies from attempting to implement various kinds of immersion programs, but few if any schools are implementing a full immersion program as was outlined by Bostwick, Genesee, Swain, or Cummings. Their efforts are slap-dash at best. Such a comprehensive program needs extensive support from school administrators and the government to succeed and under the present climate surrounding English immersion in South Korea, such a thing is not possible.

2.5. A Learner-Centered Environment

Nunan (1986) outlines the primary differences between a traditional means-ends curriculum model and a learner-centered model.

In a curriculum based on the traditional means-ends model, a fixed series of steps is followed. Thus, in the curriculum planning process proposed by Taba (1962), planning, implementation, and evaluation occur in a sequential order, and most of the key decisions about aims and objectives, materials and methodology are made before there is any encounter between teacher and learner. In a learner-centered curriculum, on the other hand, these processes are cyclical. Much of the consultation, decision making and planning is informal and takes place during the course of program delivery, and any aspect of the course can be modified to take account of changing needs.

This sort of curriculum design is a vast departure of the traditional Korean curriculum design. This is a laudable goal as a learner-centered curriculum is much more adaptable to student needs than the more traditional approach, and can better serve to engage students in their learning.

Traditionally, Korean classrooms were centered more around a Confucian model wherein the teacher's main role is as the transmitter of the required information (Hue, 2008). The traditional Korean classroom also relied heavily on the principles of Chinese Legalism which make a distinct division between the roles of teacher and students (ibid). However, that is beginning to change.

The curriculum of South Korea has been designed so that it is learner-centered and aims to promote students' autonomy and creativity (National School Curriculum, 2008). While this might work in a classroom where the medium of communication is Korean, teachers would be hard-pressed to carry out this objective in the English-language classroom as it is currently being run.

Weirmer (2002) outlines the five characteristics of the learner-centered classroom.

- Learner-centered teaching engages students in the hard, messy work of learning.
- Learner-centered teaching includes explicit skill instruction.
- Learner-centered teaching encourages students to reflect on what they are learning and how they are learning it.
- Learner-centered teaching motivates students by giving them some control over the learning processes.
- Learner-centered teaching encourages collaboration.

If South Korea were to make second language acquisition a top priority as was done in Canada (Bostwick, 1995), then creating a true learner-centered classroom would be a feasible goal. However, as it stands right now, with a ban on immersion language teaching until the third year, a reduction or elimination of after-school programs, and no strong or uniform curriculum requirements for private academies, the Ministry of Education has created an impossible goal for SLA teachers

in the country. As a result, English language instruction is often disorganized and ineffective and achieves none of its stated goals. Despite the decades-long push for English proficiency, the billions of dollars spent, and the uncountable man hours invested by students for generations, South Korea currently ranks 17th out of 47 countries in ToEIC scores (Yonhap News Agency, 2018). A better way is necessary.

2.6. Results of Ineffective Language Teaching & The Prohibition of the L1 in the L2 Classroom

We have already seen how ineffective South Korea's push to create communicative competence in its students has been. All of the external pressures only add to the stress students already feel. Failure by the students to achieve not only their personal goals but those imposed upon them by society lead to a loss of self-esteem and a feeling of ineffectiveness. Children can develop emotional disorders, anxiety, and depression leading up to suicide. In light of this, schools should be doing everything they can to provide students with the best chance of success both in the classroom and in the future. And while Korea excels in math and science on international tests, they consistently lag behind with regards to English.

At the heart of this failure is a lack of understanding of both how a foreign language is learned (Korea Institute for Curriculum and Evaluation, 2017).

Since the The Direct Method was first conceived there have been numerous reforms in second language acquisition. When coupled with our explosive growth in knowledge about linguistics and in understanding how the brain processes and uses language, we have

more tools than ever at our disposal for developing effective methods for acquiring new languages. But even with over a century of advances, the ban on using the L1 in the L2 classroom remains constant across nearly every method or approach currently in use today.

The prohibition on using the L1 in the L2 classroom doesn't seem to be based on any real science or rational foundation. Instead, it appears to have its roots in the Direct Method that was explained previously in this paper, and the discredited notion behaviorism played in language acquisition starting in the 1930s.

In regards to the Direct Method, Howatt explains that the monolingual principle, the unique contribution of the twentieth century to classroom language teaching, remains the bedrock notion from which the others ultimately derive(Howatt, 1985). Nelson Brooks, the man who coined the phrase Audiolingualism (the primary method which sprung from behaviorism and is still in practice today), said about the method that one should render English inactive while the new language is being learnt (Brooks, 1964). Brooks was speaking in regards to native English speakers learning a foreign language but the thinking holds true across all Audiolingual-based classes. In fact no major method or approach currently in use encourages the use of the L1 or treats it as anything other than a hindrance at best in the L2 classroom.

As noted above, the Direct Method seeks to recreate the conditions in which the mother tongue is acquired by all children. The sentiment appears to be that since children acquiring their L1 do not have any other language to fall back on then those conditions should be recreated in the L2 classroom. This sort of thinking makes the goals of the L1 user and the L2 user identical, even though very few L2

learners ever achieve true fluency. Very few L2 learners appear to be fully successful in the way that native speakers are (Towell & Hawkins, 1994). Placing such requirements on EFL students is an unnecessary burden and can be viewed as a form of punishment for not achieving the fluency in the target language.

Another justification often given for keeping the two languages separate is from the idea of coordinate bilingualism. This states that the two grammar systems are distinct in the speaker's mind rather than a compound bilingualism in which the two grammars form a compound system. Diller explains:

“Since the fifties, linguists and psychologists have talked of compound and coordinate bilingualism as if such a phenomena existed in identifiable form. The terms were conceived in the context of behaviorist learning theory and the Saussurean theory of signs, and apparently Ervin and Osgood were the first to use them in print. The notion seems to be based on the belief that different manners of learning second languages will result in radically different grammars in the brain” (Dillar, 1970).

It was believed that a compound bilingual does not have an independent grammar for their second language and will always be dependant on (i.e., compounded to) their L1. In contrast, a coordinate bilingual is a person who learned two languages in separate contexts; as a result, the grammars of their two languages would be independent. The prohibition on using the L1 in class is the desire to keep them separate and so all learning should be done in the L2. Linking the grammar systems of the L1 and the L2 (as in a compound bilingual) was believed to lead to errors.

Many problems exist with this notion, however. As Dillar pointed out compound and coordinate bilingual is not well defined. As a result of a

lack of clear definitions it was suggested that compound and coordinate bilingual be arranged on a spectrum instead. There were also incompatible definitions given and even authorities on the subject could not agree on terms or gave incompatible definitions themselves. He also notes the lack of any experimental evidence for the concepts of either compound or coordinate bilingualism (ibid.).

One possible cause for this view of separate grammars and compound vs. coordinate bilingualism can be placed at the feet of Contrastive Analysis. Paul Lennon explains that the main idea of contrastive analysis was, that it is possible to identify areas of difficulty a particular foreign language will present for native speakers of another language by systematically comparing the two languages and cultures. Where the two languages and cultures are similar, learning difficulties will not be expected, where they are different, then learning difficulties are to be expected, and the greater the difference, the greater the degree of expected difficulty (Gramley, 2008).

Whether intentionally or not, contrastive analysis become linked with behaviorist psychology, upon which much language teaching was based at the time. Under a behaviorist model language learning was seen as mere habit formation. Language teaching was broken down into patterns of stimulus, response, and then reinforcement that would be repeated again and again until pronunciation and grammar errors were eliminated.

With contrastive analysis being wedded to behaviorism and the rise of Audiolingualism errors were believed to be caused by interference from the L1. Uriel Weinreich's highly influential book, *Languages in Contact* (1953) explored the way languages influence each other when they come into contact. He believed that a foreign language learner's L1 would influence the L2 and begin first by causing errors at the

phonological level; this would continue up the chain to the structural and lexical levels. However, Weinreich's work did not focus on learners in the classroom, instead focusing on language interference across Europe. As a result, his work is inadequate to tell us how language is acquired and in what way that acquisition can best be accomplished. Unfortunately that did not prevent it from influencing language teaching for years afterward.

Problems and shortcomings with contrastive analysis became apparent as it was put into practice. For one thing, while it was originally intended to identify areas of difficulty in language learning it became a tool for predicting error. It also assumes that error comes exclusively from first language interference but various studies in error analysis through the years have shown this not to be the case. Rather, these studies indicate, that certain errors recur among language learners of various L1 backgrounds and seem to be more related to the intrinsic difficulty of the subsystem involved than cross-lingual influence (Gramley, 2008)

There have been numerous studies done since the time contrastive analysis was first introduced that show that languages become interwoven in the learner's mind. We see this in, vocabulary (Beauvillain & Grainger, 1987), in syntax (Cook, 1994), in phonology (Oblor, 1982) and in pragmatics (Locastro, 1987) (Cook, 2001).

This idea of language as a learned behavior and that learners compartmentalize language in the brain has long been debunked but the deleterious effects have lingered well into modern times. It is very possible that those designing new methods or approaches to language acquisition do not even question the exclusion of the L1 in their lesson plans because it has become such a bedrock principle.

Another thing to consider is the inherent racism and bigotry that is

at the root of the English-only classroom. It was not always the case that the L1 was prohibited in the L2 classroom but is rather a relatively recent invention as was explained above, via things like the Direct Method and other approaches and methods that came after. We often talk about the big push for foreign language acquisition coming after the second world war and the U.S. government's push to train more Americans to speak a foreign language, which is true, but it was not the first. In reality there was another push to teach English to non-native speakers that arose from the large waves of immigration to the US in the early 20th century.

With increased immigration both pre and post World War I came a rise xenophobia, as well. There was an Americanization movement at all levels of society, from elementary schools to jobs and the utilization of basic services. English became a vehicle to enhance loyalty both to company and country, (Auerbach, 1993). English ability also served to function as a defacto gatekeeper, allowing easy ways to exclude foreigners from daily life, keeping them from acquiring jobs, obtaining professional licenses, or even opening a bank account.

According to Auerbach (1993), it was this rise in nativism and anti-foreign political sentiment that put the final nail in the coffin of a bilingual language education. This accelerated the spread of the concept of the English-Only classroom and cemented into the foundations of nearly all language teaching practices that are in use today.

The United States was also not the only country to help institute this practice of L1 exclusion. British neocolonial policies also served to create English language teaching (ELT) as a profession. Under these policies English was a key factor of British control which prompted a great deal of funding that went to ELT development in the 1950s and

60s.

Makerere University in Uganda held a conference which, among other things, drafted five tenants which have become bedrock principles of ELT worldwide. These tenants are:

- English is best taught monolingually
- The ideal teacher of English is a native speaker.
- The earlier English is taught, the better the results.
- The more English is taught, the better the results.
- If other languages are used too much, standards of English will drop. (Phillipson, 1992)

Not allowing the L1 into the L2 classroom is seen as an almost common sense approach to language instruction. But this is not based on any actual research or scientific data. This notion got its start based on a flawed and ineffectual teaching method designed before we had a good understanding of how the brain acquires either the L1 or the L2. English-only teaching was then further reinforced by both subtle and overt forms of racism and bigotry stemming from American xenophobia and British neocolonial imperialism which saw English as a tool of dominance and dependence between native speakers and immigrants in the case of the US, and developed and developing countries under British colonial rule. By the time we get to more enlightened times of the 60s and 70s these ideas had already been woven into the fabric of language instruction to the point where it is rarely questioned, even today.

This dogmatic adherence to a flawed doctrine is doing a great disservice to language learners all over the world who struggle with an unnatural approach to foreign language acquisition. It also removes a valuable tool from the toolkit of language teachers which could be used to enhance comprehension and accelerate language acquisition. Rather

than requiring an elaborate song and dance to avoid communicating a concept, word, translation, or bit of grammar in the student's L1, simply allowing it as needed. Creating a low-stress environment is vital for students to learn any subject. Our goals as language teachers should be to strive for just such an environment so that students are not hindered by the stress of only communicating in the target language, whether or not they are ready to do so.

3. Conclusion

Given that a true full immersion classroom environment is unlikely to be implemented in the South Korean education system, we must look at other alternatives to try to make the most of the limited time students have. Not only in Korea but in language classrooms across the world, using the L1 as a method of teaching the target language is either discouraged or forbidden outright for reasons stated above. However, it is time to reexamine this notion and embrace the use of a student's L1 in the EFL classroom.

There is no argument that the students need to encounter the target language in order to achieve communicative competence. There is the view that since the language teacher may be their only source of input in the target language, it is the teacher's responsibility to maximize that exposure time; time spent using the L1 in the classroom is time lost for providing more input in the L2. Despite views to the contrary, using the L1 in the classroom is not incompatible with those language acquisition goals.

Rather than requiring an English-only classroom teachers should be

educated and trained on the value of utilizing and allowing the utilization of the L1. This would smooth over many bumps on the road to language acquisition and communicative competence. It allows for scaffolding wherein more advanced students can use the L1 can provide support and guidance to those students not as proficient in the L2, thus creating whole new avenues for community language learning. This in turn places students more in the driver's seat of their own education. Students that feel they have more control over their classroom environment are more likely to engage and maintain intrinsic motivation, which is another essential component to language acquisition and communicative competence; students at all levels learn better when they are engaged in the process.

We have seen that the entire notion of the English-only classroom is based on flawed and even harmful ideas and although it was only touched on in this paper, there is already a large body of evidence that demonstrates the effectiveness of bilingual education. However, because of the long-standing assumption that allowance of the L1 in the L2 classroom is bad, few educators or administrators ever take the time to consider the possibility.

[국문초록]

한국의 영어전용교실 정책의 비효율성

박강희

캐나다, 일본의 영어몰입교육에 비해 한국의 영어전용교실, 영어몰입교육은 비효율성 문제를 지닌다. 모든 과목 습득에 L2가 노출되어지나 한국의 몰입교육은 그렇지 않다. 단순한 의사소통만을 요구하는 한계를 지닌다. 물론 목표어를 가르치기 위해서 L1 사용이 금지되거나, 문제가 있는 것으로 여겨져 왔지만, 한국에서처럼 제한된 시간 속에서 의사소통만을 강조하면서 이루어지는 EFL 교실에서는 사용을 재검토 할 필요는 있다. L2로부터 L1 사용을 금지하는 것은 과학적 이성적 근거에 기초를 두고 있지 않고, 뇌의 언어습득 이해 이전 방식에 의존하고 있다. 또한 지배 과정 속에서 인종주의, 편견 등에 의해 강화되어온 측면도 있기는 하다. L1 사용시간도 L2 입력시간을 잃어버리는 시간이 아니고 언어습득 목표와 양립할 수는 있다. 그러나 이중언어교육 효과에 대한 증거도 많고 L2 교실에서 L1 사용 허용이 나쁘다는 주장도 많지만, 한국 영어몰입교육의 비효율성을 극복하고 수월성을 확보하기 위한 한계 극복이 필요하다.

주제어: 완전몰입교육, 직접교수법, 영어전용교실, 완전몰입언어교육, 제2언어습득.

Works Cited

- Auerbach, Elsa Roberts. Reexamining English Only in the ESL Classroom. *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol. 27, No. 1, Spring 1993
- Beauvillain, C. and Grainger, J. Accessing Interlexical Homographs: Some Limitations of a Language-Selective Access. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 26, 658-672. 1987
- Bostwisk, R. Michael and Gakuen, Katoh. After 30 Years: The Immersion Experience Arrives in Japan. *The Japan Association of Language Teaching* Vol. 19 No. 5, May 1995
- Brooks, Nelson H. *Language and Language Learning: Theory and Practice*. Harcourt, Brace & World, 1964.
- Cook, Vivian. *Using the First Language in the Classroom*. 2001
- Cummins, J. Bilingual and Immersion Program. M Long and C. Doughty (Eds). *Handbook of Second Language Teaching*. London: Blackwell
- Diller, Karl. *Compound and Coordinate Bilingualism: A Conceptual Artifact*, *Word*, 26:2, 254-261, DOI: 10.1080/00437956.1970.11435596 (1970)
- Genesee, Fred. *Learning through Two Languages: Studies of Immersion and Bilingual Education*. Newbury House Publishers., 1987.
- Gramley, Stephan. *Bielefeld Introduction to Applied Linguistics: a Course Book*. Aisthesis-Verl., 2008.
- Herald. [FEATURE] English Immersion Still Prevalent at Private Schools. The Korea Herald, 10 May 2016, [www.koreaherald.com/view.php?ud = 20160510000842](http://www.koreaherald.com/view.php?ud=20160510000842).
- Howatt, Anthony Philip Reid. *A History of English Language Teaching*. Oxford University Press, 1985.
- Hue, Ming-tak, and Wai-shing Li. *Classroom Management: Creating a Positive Learning Environment (Hong Kong Teacher Education)*. Hong Kong University Press, HKU, 2008.
- Johnson, Robert Keith., and Merrill Swain. *Immersion Education: International Perspectives*. Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- Joo Hyung-M, et al. *Education Vision for the Future Curriculum, Instruction and Evaluation in South Korea (I): New Directions for Korean Elementary and Secondary School Curricula*. Korea Institute for Curriculum and Evaluation.

- Bolim S&P Co. LTD. October, 2017
- Long, Michael H., and Catherine Doughty. *The Handbook of Language Teaching*. Wiley-Blackwell, 2011.
- LoCastro, Virginia. *Discourses Across Cultures. Aizuchi: A Japanese Conversational Routine*. New York: Prentice Hall. 1987
- Ministry of Education, The Republic of Korea. The National Curriculum for the Primary and Secondary Schools. *Proclamation of the Ministry of Education #2015-74 [Annex 1]*
- Ministry of Education, Science and Technology. *The School Curriculum of The Republic of Korea*. 2008-160
- Nunan, David. *The Learner-Centered Curriculum: Principles and Procedures*. National Curriculum Resource Centre, Adelaide, South Australia. 1986
- Phillipson, Robert. *Linguistic Imperialism and Linguicism. Linguistic Imperialism*, Oxford: OUP, pp. 50-57. 1992
- Richards, Jack C., and Theodore S. Rodgers. *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching*. Cambridge University Press, 2016.
- Taba, Hilda. *Curriculum Development: Theory and Practice*. New York, NY, Harcourt, Brace & World, 1962.
- Towell, Richard, and Roger Hawkins. *Approaches to Second Language Acquisition*. Multilingual Matters, 1994.
- Ware, Mark. The STM Report: An Overview of Scientific and Scholarly Journal Publishing. November, 2012
- Weimer, Maryellen. *Learner Centered Teaching Five Key Changes to Practice*. Jossey-Bass, 2002.

이 논문은 2018년 11월 16일 접수되어 12월 06일까지 심사받아 12월 17일 게재 확정됨.