

Principles of Content-Theme-Based Approach in EFL Education

Jiyoung Jinnie Kim(Kyung Hee Univ.)

<Abstract>

This paper intends to bring attention to the reality of English language education in Korea as it is experiencing a so called “mismatch” between an ultimate goal and a realistic goal of language learning. Further, it raises questions on the side effects of such a mismatch phenomenon and highlights the immediate need and importance of effective measures to provide Korean ELLs with ways to seek and achieve both goals. To deal with such issues, this paper, as an initial attempt at defining and identifying characteristics of a good language program that can create good language learners, revisits and discusses literature on a well-known and effective language teaching approach, the Content-Based Instructional (CBI) approach. In addition, the paper introduces as reliable evidence for the feasibility of CBI in Korean EFL context, a theme-based model English language program conducted on a Korean university campus for intermediate to advanced learners of English. The rationale, framework, and basic outline of the program are introduced as background knowledge for understanding of data to be reported in future follow-up research papers. (176)

I. Introduction

The use of content-based instructional approaches in language learning has increased dramatically during the past two decades and its benefits have been recorded on numerous occasions via studies conducted on successful programs within a wide range of educational environments. As examined in the bulk of literature on Content Based Instruction (CBI), CBI has been widely and consistently used in Western K-12 second language immersion settings, university foreign language programs, English for Academic Purposes programs, K-12 L1 and L2 educational settings, and bilingual programs (Mohan, 1986, 1990; Snow, Met, & Genesse, 1989; Tang, 1994; Adamson, 1991; Snow, 1991, 1998; Wesche, 1993). Unfortunately, due to a rigorous exam-based educational atmosphere, CBI approaches have not been as readily used in many Asian language learning and teaching environments in general, and in Korean language educational contexts in specific. This paper primarily intends to provide a brief overview of the need for and appropriateness of CBI within the Korean EFL context taking into consideration the present status of English language education in the Korean society. Further validation and promotion of the effectiveness of CBI approaches will be introduced based on a high intermediate to advanced level CBI based English language program conducted on a Korean university campus as part of a preliminary study on understanding good language teaching and learning.

1. Korean Educational Environment

The largest boom in English language education in Korea probably occurred with the enactment of the Ministry Of Education's (MOE) 1997 mandate on English language education within the 7th National Curriculum. According to the 7th National Curriculum, the teaching of English as a Foreign Language became a requirement for primary grades through high school and hence, began to attract the entire nation's attention on learning English.

For a highly education conscious population, this announcement brought about rapid

and extreme interest in English language education within all sectors of society. Many language learners, parents, educators, politicians, as well as, lay people all flocked to bookstores, public and private institutions, and even outside of the country to acquire the most effective ways and resources to learn English, fast.

As is with all great phenomena, this enormous focus on English language education did not result in all positive consequences. One of the major negative consequences was the creation of a ‘mismatch phenomenon’ regarding language learning goals. While the 7th National Curriculum sought to enhance learners’ communicative proficiencies, it soon became evident that such a goal did not suit well with the Korean exam-based educational climate. The nation’s ‘ultimate goal’ of reaching communicative fluency (i.e. acquiring language naturally enough to reach native-like proficiency) could not be realized in the face of reality in which English language learners did not have an option other than studying towards an exam (i.e. learning language in a very unmaterialistic ‘study-oriented’ manner) as their main ‘realisticgoal’.

This ‘mismatch phenomenon’ (Kim & Woo, 2005) in terms of goals resulted in a chain reaction of theoretically invalid, but profitable language learning trends and programs all throughout the country. The effects of such trends and programs catered mainly to an exam-based curriculum and caused detrimental effects on language learners belief systems, anxiety levels, strategy usages, and general understandings about language learning. Learners, subconsciously, became immersed in pursuing a goal that they could not reach and thus, becoming even more apprehensive and anxious towards learning English. More specifically, learners began believing that studyinghard for an exam would eventually lead to success in acquiring both fluent and accurate English. Further, they began to believe that if they failed to acquire communicative proficiency even after studying hard, that they were failures and not fit nor capable of learning English at all.

Recently, the need to develop effective measures to overcome this mismatch phenomenon has been recognized (Kim & Woo, 2005); however, unfortunately, research regarding the mismatch phenomenon and its effects on English language learners is not readily available within Korea. Therefore, it is of utmost importance that society, government, and individual people come together to devise an effective plan to help learners achieve both their ultimate communicative proficiency goals and realistic

exam-based goals and thus, remedy and overcome the side effects of a mismatch between the two types of goals.

To do so, it is necessary that educators use an approach that provides language skills, but also interesting materials that learners can engage in and develop naturally diverse styles of communication in a variety of situations. Content-Based Instruction (CBI), by providing both content and language, has been acknowledged as a key approach that can benefit English language learners and help them reach both their content and form goals. The following section outlines briefly the theoretical rationale and principles of CBI that further prove its validity and reliability in teaching and learning a foreign language.

II. Literature Review

1. Theoretical Rationale

Despite the different ways of distinguishing between learning language to attain native-like communicative proficiency and learning language for test-taking purposes, there is a common consensus on the fact that the former involves natural exposure to and experience in the target language, whereas, the latter involves more of an academic study approach to language learning (Krashen, 1982, 1985; Cummins, 1989; Freeman & Freeman, 200). Korean students, who are mostly focused on passing exams, are usually categorized under the latter category; however, they too share characteristics of the former type (Kim & Woo, 2004; Woo, 2004).

Whether to pursue the former or latter is based upon the present and future needs of the learners themselves. It is evident that Korean English language learners (ELL) need to study English in order to enter university, which allows more opportunities for a successful life in Korean society. Simultaneously though, Korean ELLs need to acquire English to a certain acceptable level of proficiency in order to survive and succeed in the international arena. In theory, learners can do better on exams after they've acquired the language naturally. However, Korean ELLs are not given ample

time to develop their English naturally due to a continuous battery of tests. In other words, Korean ELLs are unwillingly subject to a highly unnatural learning situation and hindered from experiencing a more natural and effective acquisition experience.

Krashen's (1982, 1985) distinction between 'learning' a language and 'acquiring' a language and argument that language is best acquired incidentally through extensive and natural exposure to comprehensible input in the target language supports the fundamental rationale of CBI approaches that language is best developed through a natural process of inputting content that is interesting and that makes sense to the learners. Although there exists controversy on whether comprehensible input is enough to assist language acquisition (Swain, 1985), when one reviews literature on language and literacy development from the past several decades, one will find that hardly any scholar denies the importance of input that is comprehensible and therefore, interesting and meaningful to learners. CBI is capable of providing such good input (Kim, 2005) to learners with its extensive supply of content materials that befit learner interests and needs.

The Vygotskian emphasis on the importance of social interaction and negotiation, private speech, and student appropriation of learning tasks are notions applicable to CBI contexts as well. Vygotsky, by stating the necessity to move learners from their present state of competence to a more advanced stage of potential development, recognized the importance of diverse types of interaction between the learner and people around the learner's environment (Moll, 1989). CBI based approaches very much abide by this principle by supplying ample opportunities to engage in various interactive communications, such as discussions, debates, and presentations.

Freeman and Freeman (2001) talk about 'exploratory classrooms' as an optimal setting for exploratory learning as well as natural language and literacy development. They use the term 'exploratory' to emphasize the creativity and imagination of learners and their contribution to the learning process. In other words, exploratory involves a highly learner-centered approach to language and literacy acquisition by way of discovering new knowledge based on interesting, meaningful, and comprehensible experiences. Through exploration, they emphasize that learning should focus on understanding what is being learned and eventually becoming autonomous learners. CBI approaches use content to explore new ideas, knowledge, and language

and therefore, can also be categorized as an exploratory method suitable for an exploratory class.

Smith (1989) defined reading as “making sense of print” and recognized its absolute importance not only in terms of becoming independent readers, but also developing language and literacy skills. He introduced to the field the concept of “membership” into the “literacy club” as a way of naturally acquiring love for reading and thus, eventually, becoming advanced readers, writers, as well as speakers (Smith, 1988). The CBI approach to languageteaching creates membership into the world of print materials and equips learners with abundance of information and knowledge, which can be channeled into a source of energy for further challenges in developing language and literacycompetence. In this sense, CBI again stands as an exemplary approach for our learners, not only in acquiring English, but also in gaining confidence and reducing anxiety through membership into the world of English print materials.

There exists not much literature specifically on examining ‘good language learners’, however, there are many studies that have mentioned or drawn conclusions that include aspects of good language learners. Although of different background with different amounts of prior knowledge and experiences, good language learners have been characterized to share similar characteristics that might be significant in distinguishing them from other language learners. Those who succeed at acquiring native-like proficiency in a target language have shown low levels of anxiety, positive beliefs about learning a language, successful use of learning strategies, and have been identified to possess a good amount of prior knowledge and experience in terms of content and languageaccrued from diverse social-cultural interactive situations (Stern, 1975; Rubin, 1975; Cohen, 1977; Naiman et al., 1978; Raphael, 1981; Nation & McLaughlin, 1986; Freeman & Freeman, 1998; Norton & Toohey, 2001). It is common to hear from good language learners that they “like” the target language and that they have been involved in English related activities or hobbies for some time. Learner testimonials and research on good language learners evidence that good language learners acquire English through input that stimulates their interests, has meaning in their lives, and that makes sense to them. CBI approaches are designed to provide good input via rich and varied content materials containing appropriate language and thus, stimulate learner interest, lower

anxiety, and foster knowledge acquisition as well as incidental language acquisition.

Goodman (1982; 1986), forefather and harbinger of the concept of Whole Language Education, highlighted the importance of approaching language and literacy development from a meaning-based, form-supplementary perspective. This means that language should be foremost treated as that which carries and conveys meaning and then, should be broken down into discrete parts when and if necessary to facilitate understanding of the meaning. In other words, he maintained that language should be learned from its whole (meaning) to its part (form) in order for learners to naturally acquire it. CBI is representative of a whole-to-part approach in that it covers the content within the lessons and distinguishes discrete language skills embedded in the context only when necessary for better comprehension and/or review of the content material.

2. Content–Based Instructional Approach

1) Defining “content”

Some definitions of “content” used in the term Content- Based Instruction (CBI) are as follows. Crandall and Tucker (1990) referred to “content” as subject matter while Genesee(1994) stated that it need not be confined to academic subject matter, but can include any topic, theme or non-language issue of interest or importance to the learners. Chaput’s(1996) view of “content” was that of any topic of intellectual substance which contributes to the students’ understanding of language in general, and the target language in particular.

More recently, Met(1999) introduced “content” to represent material that is cognitively engaging and demanding for the learner, and that extends beyond the target language or target culture. Despite the differences in term definitions, there is somewhat a consensus on the fact that however “content” is defined, it should include materials that create interest in the learners, are meaningful to the lives of learners, and provide messages comprehensible to the learners.

2) Instructional types: Content-Driven and Language-Driven Instructions

Despite diverse characteristics, there are largely two positions on a continuum onto which different content-based programs, models, and approaches can be placed. The two positions illustrate the role of content and language within different instructional experiences. Instructional experiences geared towards learning content over language is referred to as a “content-driven position”, whereas, those that are geared more towards meeting language needs over acquiring knowledge of specific content material are referred to as a “language-driven position” (Met, 1991).

Met (1991) places these two positions on a continuum and uses it to distinguish between content and language driven programs, models, and approaches. As stated in the continuum, content-driven instruction teaches content in the target language, considers content as its priority and language learning as its secondary objective, seeks to achieve content-based objectives, allows teachers to select language objectives, and evaluates learners based on content knowledge. Language-driven instruction, on the other hand, uses content to learn the target language, considers language learning its primary objective and content as matter to be acquired incidentally, seeks to achieve language based objectives, evaluates learners on language learned through content and does not hold learners accountable for content material knowledge.

CBI is a teaching method that emphasizes the integration of content and language in language teaching (Met, 1998). Its focus is mainly on the content of what is being learned with a sub-focus on the language used in learning the content (Davies, 1987). Within an ESL or EFL context, this would mean that the learners are focused on the content matter, subject matter, theme, topic, or task rather than the target language, English.

3) Models of CBI

CBI has been introduced into different educational settings using different nomenclature that carry different emphasis and cater to the diversity of needs and issues within particular learning environments. The following are three main models of content and language integration in postsecondary education: sheltered model, adjunct model, and theme-based model (Brinton, Snow, and Wesche, 1989). Although all three models teach both content and language, their positions on the continuum of content

and language driven instructional distinction are different.

(1) Sheltered type

The sheltered model is more content than language driven and is mostly seen in subject matter courses within university contexts. Usually, in a sheltered type of CBI program, non native speakers are placed in regular subject courses with native speaking learners. Content lessons are of priority and language secondary. Learners in a sheltered subject matter course will therefore, need to concentrate on understanding the subject matter and be responsible for exams consisting of subject matter knowledge. Language, being a secondary objective, is dealt with within content lessons according to student needs.

(2) Adjunct type

The adjunct model somewhat lies at the center of the content and language driven continuum as it serves both content and language goals. Therefore, adjunct models require a collaborative effort between one content teacher and one language teacher. The two teachers are responsible for coordinating lessons based on content material and language used within each task.

(3) Theme-Based type

The theme-based model lies closer to the language-driven position. Thus, the primary goal of theme-based courses lies in developing target language skills. Also, theme-based courses are taught not by a content teacher nor co-teachers, but a language teacher who has expertise in language education. Theme-based lessons emphasize themes taken usually from a diverse range of learner interests. The choice of a global theme allows instructors more freedom in introducing various content materials which in turn provides learners with more opportunities to engage in the matter being learned. Content is introduced in relation to each chosen theme and learners become involved in using a variety of language skills in relation to the content. A common theme can also act as a common thread in bringing learners together to create a dynamic learning atmosphere. Theme-based models have been most successful in EFL contexts with learners with intermediate to advanced levels of proficiency.

4) CBI Appropriateness

Eskey (1997) referred to theme-based instruction as a “missing dimension” in traditional form-focused and rule-focused designs that makes up for the lack of interesting materials needed for real engagement in communicative situations.

Similarly, Met (1989; 1991; 1998; 1999) states that integration of content and language provides several benefits to L2 learners. It helps learners succeed academically by ensuring that they learn the content within a given curriculum and it also provides learners with specific language skills, styles, strategies needed in their fields of expertise. Further, it engages learners in the matter being learned by providing interesting and therefore, comprehensible content materials. And last, but not least, it grants many opportunities to use language in meaningful and purposeful ways with topics selected from a diverse range of interests.

Theme-based instruction, unlike content-driven instructions, is far more flexible in selecting the content to be taught within a program. As long as the content consists of topics or themes of interest to the learner, any type of content material can be introduced into the curriculum (Brinton, Snow, and Wesche, 1989; Eskey, 1997; Genesee, 1994).

Asian education, being highly exam-oriented, requires learners to learn in detail the discrete parts of the target language and a bulk of vocabulary. Theme-based instruction is most appropriate in such an Asian EFL environment for the reasons listed above, but also because of its primary focus on language enhancement. By having language acquisition as its underlying goal, but using interesting content to deliver such language skills, learners can experience much less anxiety and simultaneously, gain language skills as well as content knowledge.

5) Six T's

Quite a few scholars have been involved in research related to CBI and have produced different guidelines as to what CBI approaches should contain and how it should be developed and administered to learners of a second or foreign language. The ‘Six-T’s Approach’ (Stoller and Grabe’s, 1997; Stoller, 2002) will be used to describe the essential elements of the CBI program in this paper. The ‘Six Ts’ include, Themes, Texts, Topics, Threads, Tasks, and Transitions as follows:

(1) Themes

Core ideas that pull together all materials learned within all the curricular units and that cater to learner interests, needs, expectations, and comprehension. Usually global themes are chosen to foster greater opportunities for personalization of materials being learned.

(2) Texts

Materials, main or sub, that are used within each lesson and throughout the whole curriculum. Texts need to contain content that is interesting, meaningful, and comprehensible to the learner for optimal acquisition of both content and language.

(3) Topics

Sub-themes in each unit being taught within the curriculum. Topics are organized and situated under particular themes to deal with more specific details of the themes that are being learned.

(4) Threads

Links that connect the different themes within the curriculum. By doing so, learners are able to relate all learned material with each other and gain a better wholistic picture of the overall learning experience. Diverse styles and usages of language are also acquired through this act of coherence.

(5) Tasks

Activities that are conducted within each day-to-day lesson. Tasks are planned based on the texts that carry interesting, meaningful, and comprehensible materials. Tasks are made to foster further understanding of the materials being learned via social interactive and communicative experiences with content and language.

(6) Transitions

Actions that create links across topics in each theme unit and across tasks within each topic at hand. In other words, each topic is followed by another that shares common characteristics; and each task is followed by another task relevant to the

previous one.

These six elements, when all present, create an optimal environment for conducting and developing CBI approaches and consequently reaping successful results in acquiring the target language.

III. Program Design

The following is a brief outline of a Content-Theme-Based Program developed and conducted on a university campus in Seoul, Korea for high intermediate to advanced level learners of English. The program is going into its third year and has been acknowledged to be successful according to learner surveys as well as official annual evaluations conducted by the Metropolitan Office of Education.

1. Program Name: The REACH Program

2. Program Philosophy:

Emphasizing the following global educational values through content material that is interesting to the learners, meaningful to their lives, comprehensible enough to understand, and that positively motivates learners' learning behaviors.

1) R-Reflection:

To reflect on past learning experiences, outline goals, and develop future plans.

2) E-Empower

To empower oneself through intense learner-centered, teacher-facilitated education.

3) A-Achieve

To achieve goals gradually and steadily, but efficiently and satisfactorily.

4) C-Challenge

To challenge oneself by taking voluntary risks, planning strategies to maximize one's strengths and minimize one's weaknesses.

5) H-Harvest

To harvest wholesome results and learn to value the 'process' that leads to success more so than the 'product' of success itself.

3. Program Goals:

1) Language

To acquire fluent and accurate use of the target language in diverse social and cultural communicative situations.

2) Content

To gain better knowledge regarding diverse areas of interest and expertise.

3) Affect

To overcome fear of the target language and thus, gain self-confidence, self-esteem, self-motivation in autonomously learning and using the target language.

4. Program Duration:

The program usually runs for 4 weeks, 90-120 hours per session during summer and winter vacation periods. Although each day's schedule differs from each other, classes begin from 9am in the morning and end by 5pm each day.

5. Program Size:

The program consists usually of one or two classes per student and teacher groups respectively. Each class has a limit of twelve students per class. If there are less number of students who qualify, the class size is reduced accordingly. There are largely two types of classes depending on which route you enter the program. One type consists of university students or people from off campus who meet entrance evaluation criteria. Another type consists of junior high and high school English teachers who come for teacher training programs through the Metropolitan Office of Education (MOE) and thus, receive full tuition remission via the MOE's policy plus incentives that can be applied to future promotions or other program participation opportunities. Both classes run on the same curriculum or five major courses and two supplementary courses.

6. Program Qualification Criteria

1) Written Exam

Applicants are given a list of global topics from which applicants can choose freely one topic of interest and free write for 10 minutes. Writings are rated by five different qualified raters based on the standardized ACTFL Written Proficiency rubric (Buck, Byrnes, and Thompson, 1986).

2) Interview

Applicants are subject to an interview with a panel of five qualified interviewees regarding the applicant's general profile, past and present experiences, and future plans. Both fluency and accuracy are rated by each interviewee based on the ACTFL Oral Proficiency rubric (Buck, Byrnes, and Thompson, 1986).

Both the written exam and interview scores from all 10 raters are averaged into one whole score and sent to the reviewcommittee for final decisions. Accepted candidates are informed and gathered together for an orientation prior to the start of

the program.

7. Program Courses:

1) Reading & Writing focus: This course uses content generated from authentic literature, such as, Kafka, Shakespeare, etc. The main theme of this course deals with ‘Identity’ and uses diverse types of authentic texts, tasks, and transitions to introduce and talk about the theme and its subtopics. Learners are expected to focus on content material and discussions related to learners’ identities and contribute information acquired from prior knowledge and experience in relation to new information exchanged within class.

2) Speaking & Listening focus: This course focuses on developing awareness towards the different types of Englishes through content material that contains various social-cultural types of English speech. The main themes deal mostly with communicative issues and topics, threads, tasks, and transitions further elaborate such themes for detailed and real use of the target language.

3) Real World Experience: This course is designed to provide more hands-on and authentic visual and audio experiences in the target language. Through this course, learners are expected to overcome their fears toward a new language and new culture. As in other courses, themes vary according to the instructor. For instance, in one of the many sessions, the instructor conducted mock job interview situations and presented different interview situations through content material that dealt with employment processes and individual perspectives and ways of coping with real world encounters and stress generated through such meetings.

4) Reading Club: This course is designed to instill in learners a true sense of pleasure in reading different genres of writing in English. Global themes are employed to assist learners in reading materials with less anxiety and participating in free discussions on very to less personal issues related to the print materials. The main

emphasis of this course is freedom to read as much as one wants without accountability for what has been read and to communicate any ideas stimulated through the readings. It is a time to enjoy reading books with others and become a member of what Frank Smith refers to as the “literacy club” (1988).

5) R.E.A.C.H. Out and Touch Someone: This course is designed to emphasize the importance of one’s identity. Through different types of reflective, empowering, achieving, challenging, and harvesting experiences, learners are led to develop a better sense of one’s identity in comparison and/or contrast to other members of the class. By sharing with each other on the five different values of the program, learners are expected to use the target language in freely expressing diverse types of emotions and reactions to specific situations and tasks.

6) Special Topic Courses: These courses are based on two main criteria including instructor expertise and student interests. Instructors in the program are given an opportunity to develop an ESP(English for Specific Purposes) course based on their individual expertise, such as, photography, music, art, food, and so forth to provide optimal input for learners in the program. These courses suffice affective goals by allowing learners to relax and enjoy interesting activities that can become part of their hobbies in real life situations. The courses also satiate content knowledge acquisition and language pertinent to each content delivered. Usually, four to five courses are offered each session.

8. Program Outcomes

The program outcomes have been collected through different assessment tools that sought to measure both quantitative and qualitative results of the program. The details of the research in terms of outcomes is not shared in this paper, but the overall outcomes and tools used to measure the outcomes are briefly summarized below as prologue to more detailed future reports.

1) Language: Incidental acquisition of language fluency and accuracy through interesting, meaningful, and comprehensible content input. Results were collected through pre and post achievement evaluation tools.

2) Content: Acquisition and personalization of content knowledge from diverse topics of interest and expertise based on global themes. Results were collected through short essay writings, in-class and outside of class journals and reflection activities.

3) Affect: Lowering of anxiety and inhibitions toward learning a foreign language; enhancement of learner motivation; strengthening of positive language learning beliefs; awareness and balanced use of learning strategies; positive self-esteem; and positive relationships with peers and teachers. Results were collected through pre and post attitudinal surveys.

IV. Conclusion and Concerns

It is hard to judge whether a program or a particular approach can be successful for learners from different environments and different backgrounds. However, it is true that there are certain overlapping conditions among such diversity that cater to successful learning experiences. The CBI approach to language acquisition provides learners not only with content and language acquisition, but has been evidenced through our program to build in learners a sense of true maturation and achievement. When education can touch learners minds and hearts, there is where real success begins. It is our hope that more learners can experience learning that is interesting, meaningful, and comprehensible and thus, one day become autonomous pupils in the classroom and successful members of society.

Finally, a few concerns should be noted regarding successful administration of a content-theme-based approach to EFL education. First of all, before venturing to replicate CBI approaches, it is very important to fully comprehend the main principles underlying this instructional approach. Sometimes, misunderstandings can lead to worse

outcomes than no understanding at all. Hence, educators must educate themselves with abundant reading and first-hand observation of successful CBI instructional approaches or better yet, experience a class taught using the approach, such as the REACH Program.

Secondly, after one has understood the rationale and effectiveness behind CBI approaches, it is also important to plan in detail both content and language goals and materials that will support the achievement of such goals. Last minute lesson preparations will not suffice in conducting CBI approaches.

Last, but not least, teachers will have to find a support network of other CBI interested educators to consistently discuss, exchange, and research information and ideas regarding first hand experience with CBI lessons and activities and insights accrued through CBI based programs.

Further detailed reports in relation to the REACH Program are presently being constructed around learner beliefs, achievements, reflections, and specific individual experience-based interview testimonies to provide more in depth knowledge about the effectiveness, rewards, concerns, and future prospects of successfully conducting content-theme-based approaches, not only in post-secondary, but all levels of learners learning English as a foreign language.

Hence, this project holds great hope and expectations for researchers in this field to continue conducting additional research regarding the administration and benefits of, issues in implementation, and obstacles to conducting a content-theme-based approach in the Korean EFL environment. Until now, we have experienced enormous quantitative increase in English education in Korea. Now, it is about time that we paused for a while and evaluate our past so that we can plan a future with a shared goal of reaching qualitatively higher standards and achievements in acquiring English in general, and individual dreams in particular.

Reference

- Adamson, H. (1991). Academic Competence. *Journal of Intermediate English Studies*, 5, 55-79.
- Brinton, D.M., Snow, M.A., & Wesche, M.B. (1989). *Content-based second language instruction*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Buck, K., Byrnes, H., Thompson, I. (1986). The evaluation of communicative language proficiency: A critique of the ACTFL oral interview. *Modern Language Journal*, 70, 380-390.
- Chaput, P. (1996). Difficult choices: Planning and prioritizing in a language program. *ADFL Bulletin*, 28(1), 29-34.
- Cohen, A. (1977). Successful second language speakers: A review of research literature. *Balshanut-Shimushit: Journal of Ithe Israel Association of Applied Linguistics*, 1, 3-21.
- Crandall J. & G. Tucker (1990). *Content-based instruction in second and foreign languages*. In A.
- Padilla, H. Fairchild, & C. Valadez (Eds.). *Foreign Language Education: Issues and Strategies*. Newbury Park, CA: SAGE.
- Cummins, J. (1981). The role of primary language development in promoting education success for language minority students. *In Schooling and Language Minority Students: A Theoretical Framework*. Los Angeles: California State University, Evaluation, Dissemination, and Assessment Center.
- Cummins, J. (1987). *Immersion programs: Current Issues and future directions*. In L. Stewin & S.
- Mc Cann (Eds.). *Contemporary Educational Issues: The Canadian Mosaic*. Toronto: Copp Clark.
- Cummins, J. (1989). *Empowering Minority Students*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Davies, A. (1987). A Whole Language Program in the Intermediate Grades: Questions and Answers. Retrieved March, 2004 from the World Wide Web: <http://eric.ed.gov./Eskey>,
- D. E. (1997). Syllabus design in content-based instruction. In M.A.
- Freeman, Y. & Freeman, D. (1998). *ESL /EFL Teaching: Principles for Success*. NH: Heineman.
- Freeman, Y. & Freeman, D. (2001). *Between Worlds: Access to Second and Language Acquisition*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

- Genesee, F. (1994). Integrating language and content: Lessons from immersion. (Educational Practice Report 11). National Center for Research on Cultural Diversity and Second Language Learning.
- Goodman, K. (1986). What's Whole About Whole Language? *A Parent/Teacher Guide to Children's Learning*.
- Goodman, K., E. B. Smith, R. Meredith, & Y. Goodman. (1982). *Language and Thinking in School: A Whole Language Curriculum*. (3rd ed.). NY: Richard C. Owen.
- Kim, J. (2005). Something to think about: What is good input for good language acquisition? *KATE FORUM*, 29(2)
- Kim, J. & S. Woo. (2004). Korean English language learners: Discussions on language learning goals, beliefs, anxiety, and strategies. *Linguistic Research*, 21, 1-27.
- Krashen, S. (1981). Immersion: Why it works and what it has taught us. *Language and Society*, 12, 61-64.
- Krashen, S. (1982). *Principles and Practices in Second Language Acquisition*. NY: Pergamon Press.
- Krashen, S. (1985). *The Input Hypothesis: Issues and Implications*. NY: Longman.
- Met, M. (1989). Which foreign languages should students learn? *Educational Leadership*, 7(1), 54-55.
- Met, M. (1991). Learning language through content: learning content through language. *Foreign Language Annals*, 24, 281-295.
- Met, M. (1998). Curriculum decision-making in content-based language teaching. In J. Cenoz & F. Genesee (Eds.). *Beyond Bilingualism: Multilingualism and Multilingual Education*. 35-63. Philadelphia, PA: Multilingual Matters.
- Met, M. (1999). Content-based instruction: Defining terms, making decisions. (NFLC Reports). Washington, DC: The National Foreign Language Center.
- Mohan, B. (1986). *Language and Content*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Moll, L. (1989). *Teaching second language students: A Vygotskian perspective*. In D. Johnson & D. Roen (Eds.). NY: Longman.
- Naiman, N., M., Frohlich, H. Stern, & A. Todesco. (1978). *The good language learner. (Research in Education Series No. 7)*. Toronto, CA: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.
- Nation, R. & B. McLaughlin. (1986). Novices and experts: An information processing approach to the "good language learner" problem. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 7, 41-56.

- Norton, B. & Toohey, K. (2001). Changing perspectives on good language learners. *TESOL Quarterly*, 35(2), 307-319.
- Raphael, G. (1981). Teaching English to less-able learners. *ELT Journal*, 35(2), 109-114.
- Rubin, J. (1975). What the “good language learner” can teach us. *TESOL Quarterly*, 9, 41-51.
- Smith, F. (1986). *Insult to Intelligence*. NY: Arbor House.
- Smith, F. (1982). *Understanding Reading*. (3rd ed.) NY: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.
- Smith, F. (1988). *Joining The Literacy Club*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Snow, M. (1989). A conceptual framework for the intergration of language and content in second / foreign language instruction. *TESOL Quarterly*, 23(2), 201-217.
- Snow, M. (1991). Teaching language through content. In C. Murcia (Ed.). *teaching English as a Second of Foreign Language*. Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle.
- Snow, M. (1998). Trends and issues in content-based instruction. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 18, 243-267.
- Snow, M. & D. Brinton. (1997). The content-based classroom: Perspectives on integrating language and content. *White Plains*. NY: Longman.
- Snow, M., M. Met, & F. Genesse (1989). Project LEAP: Learning English for Academic Purposes Training Manual Year One & Training Manual Year Two. Retrieved May, 2005 from the World Wide Web: <http://www.eric.ed.gov/>
- Stern, H. (1975). What an we learn from good language learners? *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 31, 304-318.
- Stoller, F. (2002). Content-based Instruction: A Shell for language teaching or a framework for strategic language and content learning? *A Paper presented at the 2002 TESOL convention in Salt Lake City*, Utah, April 2002.
- Stoller, F. & W. Grabe. (1997). *A six-T's approach to content-based instruction*. In M.Snow & D. Brinton (Eds.). *The content-Based Classroom: Perspective on Iontegrating Language and Content*. NY: Longman.
- Swain, M. (1985). Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development. In S. M. Gass & C. G. Madden (Eds.). *In put in Second Language Acquisition*. 235-253. NY: Newbury House.
- Tang, G. (1994). Teacher collaboration in integrating language and content. *TESL Canada Journal*, 11(2), 100-116.

Wesche, M. (1993). Discipline-based approaches to language study: Research issues and outcomes.

In M. Krueger & F. 杓무 (Eds.). Language and Content: Discipline-and Content-Based Approaches to Language Study. Lexington, MA: D. C. Heath.

Woo, S. (2004). A studyon the influence of learner's beliefs about learning English, anxiety, and learning strategies on English achievement: Focused on middle school level English language learners in Korea. Unpublished master's dissertation. Kyung Hee University, Seoul, Korea.

□ 논문접수일: 2005. 10. 25 / 심사일: 11. 20 / 심사완료일(게재승인): 12. 10

□ 김지영

소속 · 직위: 경희대학교 국제교육원 교수

최종학력: Univ. of South California Ph.D, Language and Literacy

관심분야: Language and Literacy

이메일: jinniek@khu.ac.kr

국문요약

본 논문은 한국교육청지침으로 제시되었던 7차 교육과정하의 영어교육 목표인 의사소통위주의 통합식영어교육과 교실이라는 학습현장에서 현실적으로 추구할 수 밖에 없는 입시위주영어교육의 불일치적인 목표성의 실태를 인식하고 일차적으로 이에 대한 능동적이고 효과적인 대응책으로서 내용중심접근법이라는 언어교육 접근법의 적합성을 논하고자한다. 내용중심접근법의 개념 및 원리를 이와 같이 제시한 후 같은 접근법을 사용하여 효과적으로 진행되어 온 영어교육 프로그램의 교과과정을 소개함으로써 국내 영어교육의 이원화되어있는 교육목표를 동시취득할 수 있는 가능성여부 또한 검토해보고자한다.

Key words : Mismatch Phenomenon - 목표성 불일치/이원화 현상

Content- Theme Based Approach - 내용주제중심 접근법