BETWEEN TWO LANGUAGES:

A CASE STUDY OF KOREAN LANGUAGE ACQUISITION

BY INTERNATIONALLY ADOPTED KOREANS

By

Susan Lee

A Capstone submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Master of Arts in English as a Second Language

Hamline University
Saint Paul, Minnesota
August 2013

Primary Advisor: Andreas Schramm
Secondary Advisor: Deirdre Kramer
Peer Reviewer: Robert Lee

Copyright by

SUSAN SONG LEE, 2013

All Rights Reserved

To the Korean Adoptee Community

In all of us there is a hunger, marrow deep, to know our heritage, to know who we are, and where we have come from. Without this enriching knowledge, there is a hollow yearning, no matter what our attainments in life, there is the most disquieting loneliness.

– Alex Haley (Roots, 1976 as cited in Evan B. Donaldson Institute, 2009, p.12)

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Thank you, Rob for your continuous love, patience and unwavering support. You were my strength throughout this process. Thank you, Katelyn, for your inspiration and giggles. You embody the histories of us all: American-adoptee, Korean-birth. Because of you I can understand what it means to be a mother and with what difficulty and hope my birth mother gave me up. You are truly a gift from God. I hope I have inspired you to never stop learning.

Thank you to my mom, dad and umma for your unconditional love, encouragement, and support.

I would also like to express deep gratitude to the Korean adoptee participants in this project. Your time and thoughtful participation made this project what it is.

A special thanks to my primary and secondary advisors, Andreas and Deirdre, for sharing your time, expertise and insight throughout this project.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter One: Introduction 1

International Korean Adoption 5

Guiding Questions 6

Summary 7

Chapter Overviews.....7

Chapter Two: Literature Review 9

Language Needs of Adopted KHL Learners 9

Teaching Methods in Heritage Language Classrooms 14

Interaction and Second Language Acquisition 15

Summary 21

Chapter Three: Methodology.....22

Research Design: Case Study 23

Research Participants 24

Ryan 25

Kim 28

Sarah 29

Megan 31

Data Collection Techniques 32

Korean Language Skills Self-Assessment Questionnaire 33

Participant Interview 35

Data Analysis 38

Summary 41

Chapter Four: Results 42

Results 42

Self-Assessment Questionnaire Results 42

Semi-Structured Interview Results 52

Perceived effectiveness of individual CLT activities 53

Themes in interview responses 66

Summary 81

Chapter Five: Conclusions 83

Reflections 84

Implications 85

Examination of All Students' Language Profiles 85

Inclusion of Instruction on How to Engage in CLT Activities 87

Cultural Training for Korean Instructors 88

Enhancement of Learners' Own Personal Experiences 89

Contextualized Classroom Curriculum.....90

Limitations of the Study 92

Recommendations for Further Research.....94

Concluding Remarks.....97

Summary.....99

References.....100

Appendices.....110

Appendix A: Participant Eligibility Survey.....110

Appendix B: Semi-Structured Interview Questions 112

Appendix C: ACTFL Speaking Proficiency Guidelines.....117

Appendix D: Self-Assessment Questionnaire Results.....125

Appendix E: Kim's Self-Assessment Questionnaire 127

Appendix F: Sarah's Self-Assessment Questionnaire 129

Appendix G: Megan's Self-Assessment Questionnaire 131

Appendix H: Ryan's Self-Assessment Questionnaire 133

LIST OF TABLES AND FIGURES

Table 1.1 Characteristics of KHL and Adopted KHL Learners 2

Table 3.1 Participant Questionnaire Ratings and ACTFL Speaking Level 25

Table 4.1 Self-Assessment Questionnaire Data and ACTFL Levels.....44

Table 4.2 Correlated Results of Korean Speaking Skills Self-Assessment Questionnaire 47

Table 4.3 Participant Self-Reported Skill Level Averages and ACTFL Level 49

Table 4.4 Number of CLT Activities Participants Reported Helpful 52

Table 4.5 Participant Responses on the Effectiveness of CLT Activities 53

Table 5.1 Semi-Structured Interview Results and Dornyei's Motivational Components 97

Figure 3.1 Self-Assessment Questionnaire……35

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

I still remember the initial weeks of the first Korean language course I took. The class was held at a language institute in a metropolitan city in the Upper Midwest. Nine of the eleven students, including myself were adopted Korean heritage language learners (adopted KHL learners). The first day concentrated on learning the Korean alphabet *Hangul* and dialogue sets which we repeated after the teacher. The lesson, and its focus on literacy skills and memorization of dialogue sets foreshadowed the path of instruction I would receive from Korean instructors for years to come.

When entering into Korean language classes, I tried to view my language goals realistically. I was adopted at the age of eight months, and my exposure to the Korean language was limited, so I did not expect to have an easy time learning Korean. After taking a beginner level course, I could read and write the Korean alphabet, communicate a handful of common Korean expressions when prompted, and read a few form-focused short sentences. However, my intention in taking the course was to gain a much greater level of communicative proficiency. At Korean restaurants, I had hoped to be able to order confidently and at the Korean market, to be able to make small talk with the storekeepers. Instead, the course left me feeling as though there was a disconnect between me and the Korean language. After similar disappointing experiences in

beginner level courses at two different universities in Korea and 18 months of living, working and studying in Korea, I questioned whether I would ever be able to communicate comfortably in Korean. The language struggle shook me to my core because understanding Korean was not just about learning a second language (L2), it was about connecting to a country and an identity that I felt was lost. As an English as a Second Language (ESL) teacher with a background in L2 learning, I began to wonder if I processed the Korean language instruction differently than Korean heritage language (KHL) learners due to factors related to my adoption. Table 1.1 summarizes key characteristics and differences between KHL and adopted KHL learners.

Table 1.1

Characteristics of KHL and Adopted KHL Learners (Kong, 2011; Higgins & Stoker, 2011; Sohn & Shin, 2007)

KHL Learners	Adopted KHL Learners
Korean descent	Korean descent
Raised in a home where Korean was spoken, sometimes in combination with English.	Raised in a home where English was the only language spoken.
Parents and siblings are ethnic Korean	Parents and sometimes siblings are Caucasian Sometimes siblings are other Korean or internationally adoptees
High Korean oral and listening proficiency due to exposure to spoken Korean	Low Korean oral and listening proficiency due to lack of exposure to Korean
Heightened struggle with orthographic errors due to exposure to more spoken than written Korean	No heightened struggle with orthographic errors due to no exposure to spoken Korean

Korean culture is part of daily life and community in combination with American culture (i.e.: Korean food, Korean grocery stores, Korean restaurants, Korean media and music, Korean religious centers, Korean holidays)	Korean culture is not part of daily life and community. American culture is exclusive to daily life. (i.e.: American food, American grocery stores, American restaurants, American media and music, American religious centers, American holidays)

While reflecting on my Korean language experiences, I recounted times when I would feel overwhelmed in class because of the pace of the course and the ease that KHL learners in my classes comprehended new material. Based on what I knew about myself as an adopted KHL learner, my motivations for studying Korean, and my experiences in the KHL classroom, the concept of unique learner needs of adopted KHL learners remained in my mind as I proceeded in my MAESL coursework.

Later in life, after developing close friendships with Korean-Americans who were KHL learners, conversations would arise about our proficiency, or lack thereof, in the Korean language. I remember telling them that I would be utterly fulfilled if I could speak and communicate to their extent, even though they viewed their language abilities to be the level of a child. To my KHL learner friends, speaking Korean with a social vocabulary and a second grade reading level was embarrassing; to me it was fluency in the language. They were occupied with the nuances of reading and writing Hangul, whereas I was trying to figure out how to get beyond, "Hello. My name is Susie. How are you?" while fearing a response that was outside of the form-focused answers I had been taught. My friends had grown up around Korean. They heard it in the background

of their childhood; spoken by their parents, grandparents, pastors and Korean grocery store clerks. They were familiar with the pronunciation, the nuances, the idioms, the slang and *Konglish* (Korean mixing English words with Korean rules of pronunciation). Learning Korean to a KHL learner is a frustration, but it is not an unfamiliar place like it is for the adopted KHL learner.

As I progressed through my Master's coursework and learned about a variety of teaching methodologies, questions expanded from ideas about the general needs of adopted KHL learners to how the instructional needs of KHL and adopted KHL learners may differ. Based on the background of the adopted KHL learner, which will be explored in more depth in Chapter Two, I wondered if certain L2 teaching methods might aid language production and learning? During this time, I learned about the communicative language teaching (CLT) approach to second language acquisition (SLA) instruction. Fundamental to the CLT approach is viewing the ability to communicate in a variety of settings and in a variety of forms (oral, nonverbal, written) as the basis for all teaching and learning (Parrish, 2004). Classroom activities are meaning-based, relevant to the life experiences of the learner, and students are often given authentic materials and real-life context in lessons (Parrish, 2004). Due to the adopted KHL learner's lack of any experience communicating in the Korean language, I considered the CLT teaching approach as a possible good-fit for instruction to the adopted KHL learner population.

International Korean Adoption

International Korean adoption began in 1953 immediately following the Korean War. It became official in 1954 with a presidential order to establish Children Placement Services (currently the Social Welfare Society) (U.S. State Department, 2010). As a result of the war, South Korea was left with poverty and thousands of orphaned children. To date more than 200,000 children have been adopted since the mid-1950's and South Korea has the world's oldest international adoption program (Adoptive Families Magazine, 2010, para. 1). The country continues to open its doors to international adoption, but in a more restricted manner with a drop in adoption since the 1990's (U.S. State Department, 2010). In 2010, only 865 Korean children were adopted internationally to the U.S. in contrast to the over 6,000 adoptions that occurred in 1985 (U.S. State Department, 2010). Even with the drop in numbers. Korea has remained the number four country for the most children adopted annually. It trails behind China, Ethiopia and Russia (U.S. State Department, 2010).

While Korean adoption has slowed, the U.S. State Department (2010) reports, other *intercountry* adoptions (adoptions where adoptive parents adopt a child from a different country than their own), have grown drastically over the last thirty years. Between the years 1991 and 2001 the number more than doubled from 9,050 to 19,237 adoptees each year (Evan B. Donaldson Adoption Institute, 2010). In total, the number of children adopted internationally by U.S. citizens between the years 1971 and 2001 were 265,677 and between the years 1999 and 2011 were 233,934 (U.S. Department of

State, 2012). The age of these children ranged from infancy to pre-teen age at the time of adoption (Evan B. Donaldson Adoption Institute, 2010). When factoring in the current age of this influx of internationally adopted children entering the United States since 1971, it is clear that internationally adopted learners are now common in mainstream, English as a second language (ESL), and foreign language (FL) classrooms both K-12 and post-secondary (Evan B. Donaldson Adoption Institute, 2009).

The many decades of children being adopted from Korea to other countries allows for the language acquisition study of a population of primarily adult adoptee learners who have begun studying the Korean language of their heritage. Given the 1953 start date of international Korean adoption, with the bulk of Korean adoptions to the U.S. occurring before 1990, adopted KHL learners are the largest and the oldest-aged population of internationally adopted HL learners (Evan B. Donaldson Adoption Institute, 2010). Researching this population of learners will provide a much needed foundation for the study of HL acquisition among all internationally adopted persons.

Guiding Questions

While there has been much research on the effectiveness of particular L2 teaching methods, there is little data on the degree to which language instruction needs to take into account the unique language experiences and needs of adopted KHL learners and the dual-cultural dynamic that exists in their learning environment. Activities based in the CLT approach are of particular interest due to the focus on communication that is present

in CLT activities. In this study I search for an answer to the question: What impact do activities based in the CLT approach have on language learning by the adopted KHL learner?

Summary

In this study, I seek to explore what impact activities based in the CLT approach have on Korean language learning by the adopted KHL learner. The issues outlined surrounding Korean language acquisition by adopted KHL learners hold importance beyond just the Korean adoptive community because of the increase in international adoption worldwide over the last two decades. I believe as all internationally adopted children grow into adulthood, the need for effective L2 instruction that takes into account the adoptive experience will increase. Because of the growth in need for relevant, effective L2 instruction, the impact of the adoptive experience upon HL acquisition is a topic that will interest educators at all levels as well as adopted persons and families of adopted children.

Chapter Overviews

In Chapter One, I introduced my research by establishing the purpose, significance, and need for this study. The context of this research was introduced, along with the role and background of the researcher.

In Chapter Two, I will provide a review of literature relevant to CLT approaches to SLA, HL learning and adopted KHL learners.

In Chapter Three, I will discuss the methodology I developed to complete this study. I will provide a description of the case study method used in my research as well as the interview format, questionnaire data collection tool, and research participants.

In Chapter Four, I will discuss the results of my research by presenting the data I collected. Responses to the interview questions and questionnaire are analyzed to determine what impact activities based in the CLT approach have on Korean language learning by the adopted KHL learner.

In Chapter Five, I will include what I learned upon completion of the study. I will use the results and data collected to answer questions about the impact of CLT practices on HL acquisition by adopted KHL learners. I will discuss the implications of the study and will make suggestions for future research related to HL acquisition among Korean and internationally adopted persons.

CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

In Chapter Two, I will compare the instructional needs of Korean heritage language (KHL) learners and adopted Korean heritage language (adopted KHL) learners and in doing so, endeavor to show how adopted KHL learners form a unique language learning sample with instructional needs that differ from other KHL learners. I will investigate teaching methods used in second language (L2) and heritage language (HL) classrooms and will detail previous studies where the effectiveness of each method was researched. I will also address the extent to which teaching methodology influences a learner's interaction with L2 and HL instruction. Lastly, I will discuss the need for further study of the question: What impact do activities based in the communicative language teaching (CLT) approach have on language learning by the adopted KHL learner.

Language Needs of Adopted KHL Learners

Since my initial involvement in the Korean adoptive community and my study of Korean, I have conversed with other adoptees about their struggles in learning the language. I have encountered many other adopted KHL learners striving toward the goal of membership into the Korean language community, yet collectively our success with the language spans from beginner to proficient levels. Seeing the discrepancy in adopted

KHL learners' proficiencies prompted me to ask further questions about adoptee language learning. I wondered why some adopted KHL learners succeeded in acquiring their native language, while others did not? Were there unique aspects of the Korean adoptee experience that influenced how an adopted KHL learner would learn the language? Researchers have discovered there are many affective and socio-cultural factors inherent in the adoptive experience that may impact language learning: age of adoption, intrinsic motivation to learn about their native country, individual learning style, adoptive country culture, birth family reunification, and adoptive family attitudes (DiGregorio, 2009; Pallier et al, 2003; Higgins & Stoker, 2011; Hyltenstam & Abrahamsson, 2003b; Hyltenstam et al, 2009; Snedeker, Geren & Shafto, 2007). The unique language learning context presented by the international adoptee experience became more apparent as I continued to learn about second language acquisition (SLA) theory and practices. The most thoroughly studied factors are of age of adoption (Hyltenstam et al, 2009; Hyltenstam & Abrahansson, 2003b; Pallier et al, 2003; Ventureyra & Pallier, 2004), exposure to Korean after adoption (Snedeker, Geren & Shafto, 2007), and identity-related psychological factors (Higgins & Stoker, 2011).

All adopted KHL learners are exposed to the Korean language and culture in some capacity before their adoption, however, most grow up without enough continued exposure to the language and culture to retain any significant proficiency they may have once possessed (Pallier et al, 2003; Snedeker, Geren & Shafto; Ventureyra & Pallier, 2004). During initial acculturation, Korean language skills rapidly decrease as the adoptee attends to learning the language of the adoptive country (Pallier et al, 2003;

Ventureyra & Pallier, 2004; Hyltenstam & Abrahamsson, 2003b). Even adoptees, who are raised in areas with large numbers of Koreans, do not receive the level of language input needed to maintain language because Korean is not spoken in the home (Pallier et al, 2003; Kondo-Brown, 2005). For many adopted KHL learners there are also psychological and emotional factors inherent in the process of learning their native language that affect how they acquire Korean (DiGregorio, 2009; Higgins & Stoker, 2011).

Adopted KHL learners grow up in the world of their adoptive country and exist as members of their adoptive family, language, culture, and race, yet at the same time, they exist as Korean persons. The search for an identity between two cultures and two languages influences Korean language production, motivation for learning, and comfort in conversation (or one's affective filter, in reference to Krashen) (Higgins & Stoker, 2011).

In their study of seven adopted KHL learner women living in Korea (referred to as Korean adoptee returnee (KAD), Higgins & Stoker (2011) explore how KADs experience their social identities and the role that the Korean language (their HL) has had in negotiating their identity as an 'authentic' Korean in Korean society. The researchers found there to be an internal and external struggle that comes out while learning Korean that is related to the KADs formation of a social identity with Korean society. One of the women, Kelly, expressed a sense of loss that she felt while learning Korean because having to re-learn her HL was a reminder that she had her ability to speak Korean taken

from her when she was adopted and acculturated into the society and language of her adoptive family.

> It's revisiting this place of loss every time you're sitting in the classroom. It's a reminder that something. For me it's extremely sad – not that I want to make it sound like I had it hard or anything, but because I was old enough to remember it happening and because I felt I feel such a deep sense of injustice in the fact that I was forbidden to speak my own language. I feel like it was taken from me. I feel that part of me was taken and stolen from me not by my choice and here I am as an adult, and I'm unable to speak this language and communicate with my family. And even though I really want to it's just hard. And I think that when it comes down to it I think I have to sit down and force myself to study. (p.406)

Kelly's excerpt illustrates one aspect of the internal struggle within the adopted KHL learner that is ongoing during classroom learning. In Kelly's case, the sense of loss of language and culture makes language study a battle. Her excerpt reveals an obstacle to learning Korean that is unique to the adopted KHL learner, separate of KHL and Korean foreign language (KFL) learners.

Another area that often impacts learning is the belief that the adopted KHL learner should have an easier time learning Korean than KFL learners who have no heritage to Korea. Related to the idea of ease is the adopted KHL learner's belief that

s/he is failing when s/he does not meet certain standards of language proficiency. This standard could be created by the goals the learner had or by perceived outside language standards determined by Korean society (Higgins & Stoker, 2011). These strong emotions of failure and not being 'good enough' can have significant impact on the learning an adopted KHL learner is able to accomplish in the classroom (Higgins & Stoker, 2011).

Lastly, adopted KHL learners carry a unique character of dual language and dual identity into the classroom setting. Often times, the dual language and identity become an internal balancing act between the adoptive language, culture and identity and the Korean language, culture and identity. Through learning Korean, the adopted KHL learner does not necessarily want to become like a native Korean, but rather is seeking to find a personal balance between the two identities and worlds in which they live (Higgins & Stoker, 2011). For many adopted KHL learners, particularly those living in Korea (KADs), a place to belong is often found in a *third place* of the KAD social network rather than in the societies of Korea or their adoptive country (Higgins & Stoker, 2011). It is inevitable that negotiation of personal balance occurs within the classroom because language and society are intertwined (Romaine, 2000).

Research shows that the interwoven complexity of sociolinguistic context and cultural experience need to be taken into account when providing language instruction to adopted KHL learners in order for the greatest level of language acquisition to be achieved. While there has been some research on how dual language and identity

influence the adopted KHL learner, there is little research on how adopted KHL learners may benefit from CLT activities in the classroom.

Teaching Methods in Heritage Language Classrooms

Often the term *heritage language learner* is used to describe a language student who has had significant experience with the language of study. Many times it is assumed that the learner's heritage language is spoken in the home environment and that the learner has had large amounts of exposure to the oral language of the heritage language that is being taught (Joo, 2009; Jo, 2002; Kang, 2010; Lee, 2000; Lee, 2002; Pyun & Lee-Smith, 2011). However, in the case of an adopted KHL learner, a large amount of exposure to the heritage language is uncommon.

While Korean is the native language of an adopted KHL learner, because of language interruption at adoption, access to the language is limited (Ventureyra & Pallier, 2004). It is helpful to look at sociolinguistics to understand how the Korean language relates to the adopted KHL learner. Tarone (2007) explains sociolinguistic context as "the linguistic structure of learner language [that is] systematically affected by specific aspects of social context" (p. 838).

In her investigation of the current outlook of Korean heritage language education, Lee (2008) highlights:

> An increasing number of Korean language learners come from homes where Korean is not spoken on a day-to-day basis. Included in this group are children who are adopted into American families, children of mixed heritage, and third or fourth-generation Korean Americans who grow up

> hearing and speaking predominantly English at home. They are learning Korean to reconnect to their heritage, as well as to define their ethnic and cultural identity. These heritage learners clearly have socio-psychological needs that are different from those who are learning Korean as a foreign language (p. 2).

Studies of KHL learners have not taken into account the lack of language exposure and the acculturation process because the focus is on the learner who is part of the majority, rather than the adopted KHL learner who is part of the minority (Joo, 2009; Jo, 2001; Jo, 2002; Kang, 2010; Lee, 2002; Lee, 2008; Lee-Ellis, 2009).

While the basic pedagogical issues of heritage language instruction are similar to those of foreign language instruction, the challenge of heritage language instruction is in understanding the diverse needs of minority language communities and a particular group of learners (i.e.: adopted KHL learners) and adapting and developing pedagogical approaches that can bring about the best results (Valdes, 2001).

Interaction and Second Language Acquisition

Since the debates over the need for instruction in order to acquire language versus the concept of a natural acquisition of language (Krashen, 1980), the notion of how interaction within the classroom might impact language learning has been studied (Celce-Murcia, Dornyei & Thurrell, 1997). To understand the communicative language teaching (CLT) approach it is helpful to briefly look at the instructional methods that came before it and some of the theories that have influenced how interaction in the classroom is

viewed. Richard Allwright (1984) starts at the very foundation of the idea of classroom interaction by looking at the "management of interaction". He defines interaction as the contributions of all peoples within the classroom: teacher and all learners (Allwright, 1984).

Allwright's interaction perspective is particularly necessary to see how connected all aspects of the classroom experience are in influencing the acquisition of a second language. The idea that what students learn in the classroom is influenced by variables other than just teacher instruction has stood in contrast to behaviorist theories of language acquisition and the audio-lingual method (ALM) of L2 instruction. ALM emphasized that language was learned through habit formation of the target language, explicitly teaching sound imitation and sound repetition, minimal pair drills, and memorization of dialogues and sentence patterns (Celce-Murcia, Brinton & Goodwin, 1996, Lightbrown & Spada, 2003, Parrish, 2004). ALM methods began to be questioned in part when Chomsky (1988) theorized a universal grammar (UG) that is common to all languages. UG further challenged how researchers viewed the influence of interaction and instruction on language learning because it extended the idea that language structures (such as grammar) do not need to be taught explicitly in order to be produced (Celce-Murcia, Dornyei & Thurrell, 1997;Chomsky, 1988; Gass & Selinker, 2008).

One of the most influential theories in the creation of the CLT approach emerged through research done by Stephen Krashen (1980). The monitor model (Krashen, 1980) generated great interest in how acquisition of an L2 is influenced by knowledge gained

outside of direct instruction by the teacher. A pillar of the model is that L2 knowledge develops in two independent ways: (1) through acquisition and (2) through learning. Krashen asserts that during *acquisition* the learner is unaware of the process of gaining new knowledge. *Acquisition* is unconscious and it is compared with the learning a child experiences when he/she learns a first language (L1). The focus is on meaning, rather than on form. Contrastingly, during *learning*, the mind understands new knowledge consciously in the form of language rules and grammar. *Learning* is the traditional view of language instruction: there is error correction, a focus on the grammar forms of the L2, and formal instruction in rules of the language (Gass & Selinker, 2008; Krashen, 1980).

CLT incorporated Krashen's theory into a method for language instruction. In CLT, both the teacher and the learners mainly focus on using language as a way to communicate, rather than as a way to learn "linguistic code" or rules of the language (Ellis, Basturkmen & Loewen, 2001; Nunan, 1991). Activities common to CLT are those that are based in meaning, are authentic (such as ordering from a menu), and require written and oral communication (Ellis, Basturkmen & Loewen, 2001; Nunan, 1991; Parrish, 2004). Parrish (2004) provides this example of CLT: A student in a communicative classroom might transition from role-playing ordering at a restaurant (stating a request) to participating in a class discussion (stating an opinion) to completing an information-gap activity (asking questions) where they use information in a listening passage to fill in a restaurant reservation form. The important mark of CLT being the lessons' emphasis on learning about language through *doing* the communicating in the

language rather than *learning* about how to communicate through direct instruction (Bogaards, Andersen & Krashen, 1992; Nunan, 1991; Parrish, 2004).

Nunan (1991) identifies five main features of CLT:

1. An emphasis on learning to communicate through interaction in the target language.
2. The introduction of authentic texts into the learning situation.
3. The provision of opportunities for learners to focus, not only on language but also on the learning process itself.
4. An enhancement of the learner's own personal experiences as important contributing elements to classroom learning.
5. An attempt to link classroom language learning with language activities outside the classroom. (p. 279)

Although CLT classrooms may not look identical, when the approach is implemented, the learner is active and at the center of instruction. The CLT activities are real-world and they align with learners' strengths, desires and needs (Parrish, 2004).

While CLT and the monitor model were dominant and highly accepted by many researchers and practitioners, criticism of both the approach and the model also surfaced (Celce-Murcia, Dornyei & Thurrell, 1997; Lightbown, Spada, & White, 1993; McLaughlin, 1978; White, 1987). The criticism prompted many studies to further investigate how a focus-on-form or a focus-on-meaning influences overall second

language growth and whether both could be integrated into L2 instruction (Celce-Murcia, Dornyei & Thurrell, 1997; Gass & Varonis, 1994; Lightbrown & Spada, 1990; Long, 1996; Pica, Doughty & Young, 1986).

It was suggested that a CLT approach to language learning that involves interaction and communication (role-plays, information-gap activities, discussions, etc.) is more helpful in facilitating language acquisition than memorization of dialogues and metalinguistic rules alone. However, CLT in isolation, without any instruction on grammar and language features may prove to hinder potential language growth.

Over the last two decades, the literature has moved from a debate on the good and bad of CLT to looking at how form-focused instruction (FFI) or an attention to language form (grammar) should be incorporated into a CLT approach (Celce-Murcia, Dornyei, Thurrell, 1997; Long, 1991; Norris & Ortega, 2000; Spada & Lightbrown, 2008). Examples of FFI include implicit-inductive grammar teaching, explicit grammar teaching, consciousness-raising activities, and dictogloss (Ellis, Basturbeken & Loewen, 2001).

Spada and Lightbrown (2008) summarize the role of the two types of FFI in the CLT classroom. Isolated FFI (instruction that is provided in separate activities from communicative activities) and integrated FFI (instruction that occurs during the context of communicative activities) were both found to be beneficial to language learning within a CLT classroom. In CLT classrooms where learners share the same first language (L1), isolated grammar lessons can help learners overcome problems related to their L1's influence on interlanguage (Spada & Lightbrown, 2008). Integrated instruction is most

useful in CLT classrooms when learners need help developing fluency for communication outside of the classroom (Spada & Lightbrown, 2008).

The literature indicates that using a CLT approach with the inclusion of FFI allows for the grammar forms to be consciously focused on, learned, and produced without sacrificing the practice of meaningful communication. Instances of both isolated and integrated FFI within the CLT classroom are considered useful to the adopted KHL learner because of the mixed contexts of Korean instruction. Many adopted KHL learners have studied Korean in their adoptive countries where all the learners are speakers of the same L1. In this context, isolated FFI within CLT activities may be most helpful to learners. Adopted KHL learners have also studied Korean in Korea where many learners have a different L1 and fluent communication outside of the classroom is pertinent, so integrated FFI within CLT activities may be beneficial.

While there has been extensive research on the CLT instructional approach, and considerable research on the instructional needs of KHL learners, there has been little research on the instructional needs of adopted KHL learners and the effect of CLT activities with adopted KHL learners. Given the apparent gap in literature when it comes to studying the impact of CLT activities on the Korean language acquisition of adopted KHL learners, I seek to investigate the question: What impact do activities based in the CLT approach have on Korean language learning by the adopted KHL learner?

Summary

A growing population of adopted KHL learners are enrolling in Korean language courses at universities and language institutes in the U.S. and in Korea. These courses are either tailored for the foreign language learner of Korean or the heritage language learner of Korean, to which the adopted KHL learner is neither one nor the other completely. It has been found that adopted KHL learners have a unique socio-cultural identity that encompasses them as Korean language learners and directly impacts how they process Korean language instruction and use (Higgins & Stoker, 2011; Snedeker , Geren & Shafto, 2007).

In the following chapter I will present the research paradigm used in this study. The methods used in the study will be discussed, participant information will be given, and how the data will be collected and analyzed will be shared. Through the case study the following question will be answered: What impact do activities based in the CLT approach have on Korean language learning by the adopted KHL learner? Chapter Four will include the results of the data analysis. Chapter Five will conclude with a discussion of the study and implications and recommendations for further study.

CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY

The literature reviewed in Chapter Two affirms the uniqueness of the adopted KHL learner and it examines research that has been done within the field of SLA, and in particular, the CLT approach. To examine the impact of CLT activities on Korean language acquisition by adopted KHL learners, a case study was conducted on four adult adopted KHL learners. Data collection tools used in the case study included: (1) a self-assessment questionnaire to understand participants' Korean language learning skills and (2) a semi-structured interview to understand participants' attitudes towards CLT and non-CLT activities and the effectiveness of those activities. The self-assessment questionnaire and interview data provide insight into how effective and helpful CLT activities were viewed by the adopted KHL learner participants. The data collected is used to determine the impact of CLT activities on Korean language learning by adopted KHL learners.

This chapter documents the method and data collection used to answer the following question: What impact do activities based in the CLT approach have on Korean language learning by the adopted KHL learner?

Research Design: Case Study

The purpose of the study was to examine and discuss the impact of CLT activities on the acquisition of the Korean language by adult adopted KHL learners. As I set out to begin my research, it quickly became apparent that I would be collecting qualitative data and that I would need a method of collection suitable to providing descriptive information about the adoptee language learning experience. The case study presented itself as a strong method to use, since it emphasizes detailed descriptions of specific learners within their language learning setting. The method allowed me to narrow my data collection to four specific individual learners whose language learning I could then study.

Mackey & Gass distinguish a case study from ethnographies as a difference between focusing on cultural patterns within groups (ethnographic) to providing a holistic description of language learning for a specific population and setting, which is the goal of a case study (Mackey & Gass, 2005). Schmidt and Frota (1986) used a case study in conjunction with a diary study to document and analyze the language learning of an adult learner of Portuguese. The method proved successful as it aided in collecting data about the learner's perception of language learning as well as providing introspective information about learner motivation and the impact of teaching methods on language learning. The case study method allowed me to analyze data about individual adoptees' experiences studying Korean, the impact of CLT activities on their language learning,

and the significance of their unique adoptive experience to their subsequent language progress.

Research Participants

The participants in the case study were four Korean adopted adults, one male and three female. To meet the research criteria, the participants were over the age of 18, were Korean adoptees who had been adopted by Caucasian, English-speaking parents living in the United States, were fully proficient and acculturated into their adoptive country, language and culture, and had taken at least one Korean language course at the university level in the U.S. or South Korea. All participants were born in South Korea and all were adopted during infancy. The four learners have all lived and either studied and/or worked in South Korea during adulthood for a minimum of six months. Although not requirements to participate in the study, two other similarities between the learners surfaced: (1) all participants have either completed or are in the process of completing a Master's degree in their respective fields and (2) all participants in the study have attempted a search in Korea for their birth family, with two of the four having ongoing contact with members of their biological family.

In the following sections, I will provide descriptive histories of each participant's life. Details given include age of adoption, adoptive family background, general education background, Korean language background, and information about the participant's time spent in Korea. For purposes of anonymity, I have changed the names

of all participants. In Table 3.1 below a synopsis of each participant's background is displayed.

Table 3.1
Participants' Adoption and Korean Education Profiles

Profiles	Ryan	Kim	Sarah	Megan
Current Age	31	41	33	33
Adoption Age	3 mo.	6 mo.	11 mo.	6 mo.
Time Lived in Korea	10 yrs. *	10 yrs.	1 yrs.	1.25 yrs.
Amount of Instruction	6 semesters	8.5 semesters	3+ semesters	1 semester
Level of Instruction Completed	Level 4	Level 6	Level 4	Level 1
Location of Instruction	U.S. & Korea	U.S. & Korea	U.S. & Korea	U.S.
Type of Instruction	University	University, Private Tutor	University, Institute	University
Years since study of Korean	1 year	2 years	Currently studying	11 years

Note. * = Years with Breaks

Ryan

Ryan is a 32-year-old male adopted KHL learner who was adopted at the age of three months from South Korea to the United States. From the age of two, Ryan lived in a small farming town about an hour-and-a-half from a large metropolitan city in the upper Pacific Northwest. The town consisted of many migrant workers and Hispanic and

Caucasian residents. Both of his adoptive parents worked and his family lived a lower middle class lifestyle.

Ryan grew up in a family of six with three older sisters who were biological children to his parents. While Ryan has varying levels of relationship with his sisters, ranging from close friendship to civil relationships, he never felt he was treated differently because of his adoptive status by either his parents or his siblings. During his K-12 years, Ryan was one of only five Asians in his school. He knew of other Korean adoptees at his high school, but he did not have relationships with them.

Throughout adulthood, Ryan had many different educational experiences in the Korean language. After graduating high school in 1999, Ryan went on to study biology at a university in the Pacific Northwest and completed his BA degree in 2003. It was during his junior year of college that he took his first Korean language course. The class was an intensive three month beginner level summer course and it fulfilled his university's language requirement. Ryan had a very positive experience with both the Korean language and the cultural experience he received during the class. He believes he learned more in this beginning level class than he did in all subsequent Korean instruction, excluding the level four class he took as part of his MA degree. He attributes the extensive learning in the summer course to the teaching style of his instructor, the instructor's personal interest in the students' learning and lives, and the classroom environment. One unique component to the course was the language partner. As a voluntary part of the course, students could be matched with a native Korean speaker (an

international student at the university) for Korean language practice outside of class. The language partners Ryan had in this course would be the first of thirty language partners he has had since studying Korean. These language partners have been facilitated by both the schools he has attended and through his own networking.

In 2004, after graduating college, Ryan participated in a 1 semester long Korean language and cultural program at a Korean university. The program was created specifically for the adult adopted KHL learner. It included cultural enrichment courses, Korean language instruction, and the inclusive environment of living with other adult adopted KHL learners along with native Korean college students who had an interest in learning English and living in a special "English" dormitory. (The author of this capstone was also a participant in the program.)

In 2008, Ryan received a grant to teach English in Korea through a U.S. institute of international exchange. Through the program he received one month of training which included Korean language and cultural training. He went on to teach English and live for a year in a small town in South Korea. At the end of the program, Ryan received an academic scholarship that allowed him to complete his MA degree at a Korean university. After spending time in the U.S. and then vacationing and volunteering in Korea, he began the MA program in 2011. As part of the requirements of the program, he took one-and-a-half years of Korean language (completed level four of a six level program). He describes the first three levels of the program as a review of the concepts

and skills he gained in his first Korean language class. Ryan is currently living in Korea and plans to complete the MA program this year.

Kim

Kim is a 41-year-old female adopted KHL learner who came to the U.S. when she was six months old and was legally adopted at one-and-a-half years old. She was adopted with her biological sister. Kim grew up in a small rural town in the upper Midwest and she describes her family as blue collar. She has the unique situation of knowing her biological family from a very early age as she was reunited with them in 1972 when her birth mother did a search for Kim and her sister. However, Kim did not meet them in-person until 1995. Kim began studying the Korean language after meeting her birth family because she wanted to be able to communicate with them. She was a highly motivated learner, however, she had limited resources for instruction. Initially, she tried self-study through the use of Korean language cassette tapes, but found it to be insufficient for learning.

In 2004, Kim decided to take part in a semester long Korean language and cultural program at a Korean university; the same program that Ryan and the author were participants. While the program was exclusively for adopted KHL learners, Kim found the instruction to be mediocre in meeting her instructional needs of learning basic conversational Korean in order to communicate with her birth family. She gained more skills in conversational and everyday Korean outside of the classroom through

friendships she made with Korean students. She describes these friendships as her, “level one Korean class”.

Kim went on to attend language programs at three other Korean universities, all located in a large metropolitan city in Korea. She completed one semester in 2005, two-and-a-half semesters at another university in 2007 while working at an English-Korean newspaper, and four semesters at another university. She finished the program (Level 6) at the last university two years ago in 2011. Two of the universities Kim attended had created their own set of curriculum including textbooks, workbooks and listening CDs for each level while the other university used the curriculum of another Korean university.

In addition to university study, between the programs in 2005 and 2007, Kim worked with a private tutor for one year in a small group setting consisting of one KHL learner and one other adopted KHL learner. The class was taught by a native Korean who was unemployed at the time. Kim views the private tutoring experience as very valuable to her language learning because she and the other learners could learn at their own pace within a comfortable environment. She also appreciated the gentle and patient manner of her instructor and his willingness to teach concepts that were of interest to Kim and the other learners.

Sarah

Sarah is a 33-year-old female adopted KHL learner. She was adopted to the United States at the age of eleven months. Growing up, Sarah was the younger of two girls from a middle class family in a small northern Midwest town. Her sister, also a

Korean adoptee was adopted at the age of three. Sarah was the first of the two girls to be adopted.

The first time Sarah returned to Korea was in 1995 at the age of fifteen. She went with her family on a tour as part of a Korean adoptee cultural program facilitated by Sarah's adoption agency. It was during this visit that she met her biological father and older sister. She is grateful to have met them at this time because both have since passed away. She continues to stay in touch with other members of her birth family. In 2000, Sarah chose to return to Korea by herself for a period of two weeks. Based on her positive experiences in Korea, Sarah decided to return to Korea in 2002 to teach English. She stayed for one year and during that time also took informal Korean language sessions at a language institute.

Sarah began her Korean language study at age twenty, as a senior at a large upper Midwest university. She took the first two beginner level courses (a total of two semesters) of a four course beginner language program to fulfill the university's language requirement. While initially taking the course to complete degree requirements, Sarah also had a longtime interest in studying Korean because of her Korean heritage. Later, while completing her MBA degree from the same university, she skipped the third level and completed the fourth level of the program and an additional advanced class. While completion of the advanced class was an achievement, Sarah doesn't believe her Korean language skills were adequate for completion, as she felt lost during most of the course.

Currently, Sarah is continuing to pursue proficiency in the Korean language. She is taking a Korean language class through a small Korean institute in a metropolitan city in the upper Midwest. Students in the course are adopted KHL learners, adoptive parents, KHL learners who immigrated to the U.S. as children, and one student is the daughter of a Korean adoptee mother. Sarah describes the general environment as less academic and more life-based. There is no formal testing and she describes the class philosophy as, "you learn what you can".

Megan

Megan is a 33-year-old female adopted KHL learner who was adopted to the U.S. at six months of age. She grew up in a large metropolitan city in the upper Pacific Northwest with her Caucasian parents and sister who is adopted from Colombia. Though Megan's sister is nine months older, Megan was the first to be adopted. Her family lived a middle-to-upper-middle class lifestyle.

Upon graduation from high school in 1998, Megan took part in a Korean cultural exchange program with other high school students in her area, one of them being another Korean adoptee. During this time, she traveled to Korea for two weeks. Her motivation at the time was to learn more about Korean culture. At the age of twenty-one, while studying at a large university in the Pacific Northwest, Megan took an intensive 15 credit summer introductory Korean language course. The program consisted of 5-6 hours of study a day and was the condensed version of a full year of college language credit. It has been ten years since the course and while at the time she was able to learn a good

amount of Korean language, she does not feel she has maintained the language. Following her completion of her BA, Megan went on to finish her MA in education.

In 2007, five years after the intensive Korean language course, Megan returned to Korea to live and work for one-and-a-half years. Her primary reason for returning at the time was to complete a search for her birth mother. She succeeded in finding her birth mother, but has not had contact since 2007.

While living in Korea, Megan found that many of the skills she attained during the Korean language course were not carried over. She recounted using basic concepts such as numbers for interaction in daily Korean life, but because of deterioration of the language she had learned, and a lack of need to use Korean language skills she, she rarely used what she learned in her Korean language course during her stay. Part of this lack of use she attributed to working at an English institute and being surrounded with English speakers, lessening her need to use Korean. However, looking back Megan wished she would have tried to speak Korean more often when she had the opportunity in Korea.

Data Collection Techniques

My research took a two-pronged approach to data collection to answer the guiding question for this study, What impact do activities based in the CLT approach have on language learning by the adopted KHL learner? First, I used a self-reported, self-assessed proficiency questionnaire to engage the participants' language goals and perception of their Korean speaking skills level. Second, I conducted a semi-structured

interview to elicit participants' response about language activities they engaged in during instruction, how often they engaged in the activities, and their attitudes about activities used by Korean instructors.

Korean Language Skills Self-assessment Questionnaire

In my collection of data about each language learner, I needed to assess the Korean language skills of each participant. Initially, I sought a standard assessment tool, such as a language proficiency test, but after determining this would not be a feasible assessment, I turned to the questionnaire as a source to collect language proficiency data. The questionnaire is a modified version of Lee-Ellis' (2009) *Self-assessment Questionnaire*. The questionnaire used in my study is located in Figure 3.1.

All of the questions included in the questionnaire were closed-item, meaning that I pre-determined the possible answers and made them numerical based on a scale of 1-5. The strength of a closed-item questionnaire was in the greater uniformity of measurement (the 1-5 scale), therefore, there was a greater reliability than an open-ended questionnaire (Mackey & Gass, 2005). The closed-item questions also allowed me to more efficiently analyze all participant answers because they were already quantified (Mackey & Gass, 2005). The downfall of a closed-item question, however, was that the respondents were not be able to express their own thoughts and ideas in their own words, thus more unexpected and insightful data may have been lost (Mackey & Gass, 2005). However, because I ordered my data collection to complete the interview following completion of the questionnaire, respondents had an opportunity to provide their own words to both the

ratings they gave themselves on the questionnaire and the instruction they received throughout Korean language coursework.

Participant Name _____

Please return this form to Susan Lee by April 12, 2013

Please indicate how well you can carry out the following tasks in Korean using the scale of:	Please indicate how you would rate the importance of the task as a personal Korean language goal using a scale of:
5 (no problem at all)	5 (great importance)
4 (somewhat easily)	4 (important)
3 (with some difficulty)	3 (some importance)
2 (with great difficulty)	2 (of little importance)
1 (cannot at all)	1 (not a goal)

Easy---Difficult		Important--Not Important
5 4 3 2 1	Count to 10 in Korean.	5 4 3 2 1
5 4 3 2 1	Say the days of the week.	5 4 3 2 1
5 4 3 2 1	Give the current date (month, day, year).	5 4 3 2 1
5 4 3 2 1	Introduce myself in social situations, and use appropriate greeting and leaving expressions.	5 4 3 2 1
5 4 3 2 1	Order a simple meal in a restaurant.	5 4 3 2 1
5 4 3 2 1	Give directions on the street.	5 4 3 2 1
5 4 3 2 1	Give simple biographical information about myself (place of birth, family structure, early schooling, etc.)	5 4 3 2 1
5 4 3 2 1	Describe my present job, studies, and major life activities accurately and in detail.	5 4 3 2 1
5 4 3 2 1	Describe my latest travel experience accurately and in detail.	5 4 3 2 1
5 4 3 2 1	Sustain everyday conversation in casual style Korean with a Korean friend.	5 4 3 2 1
5 4 3 2 1	Sustain everyday conversation in very polite style Korean with a person much older than I am.	5 4 3 2 1

5 4 3 2 1	Report an event or news that happened around me recently (e.g., a crime report or sports event) in detail.	5 4 3 2 1
5 4 3 2 1	Describe and discuss the U.S. educational system in detail.	5 4 3 2 1
5 4 3 2 1	State and support with examples and reasons of my position on a controversial topic (e.g., gun violence, cigarette smoking, environmental pollution).	5 4 3 2 1
5 4 3 2 1	Construct a structured hypothesis on an abstract issue (e.g., globalization and ethnic identity) and discuss the topic knowledgably.	5 4 3 2 1

Figure 3.1 *Self-Assessment Questionnaire (adapted from Lee-Ellis, 2009)*

Participant Interviews

Perception of language learning during CLT activities was gauged in the interview by participants' verbal descriptions of their Korean language skills while answering semi-structured interview questions about teaching methods and activities used in the classroom. Thus, speaking communication skills learned were determined by (1) answers to questions in the interview and (2) by the participants' rating of themselves on specific speaking tasks on the self-assessment questionnaire.

I took the approach that the data collected during the interview served as a reflection of the adoptees' classroom reality outside of the interview (Seale et al, 2004). Mackey & Gass (2005) report that the strength of interviews is in their ability to connect with learners in an interactive manner that may be more comfortable than other modes of data collection. I used the format of a semi-structured interview in the case study. The semi-structured interview allowed for flexibility both in questions asked by the researcher and in the answer given by the learner (Seale et al, 2004).

Rather than conforming to a rigid script, I conducted the interview using a written list of questions as a guide for directing the interview. The use of pre-determined questions aided me in keeping the interview targeted on specific topics, while providing me with the freedom to deviate from the questions and probe for more information as needed (Seale et al, 2004). I based the end of the interview (10-15 minutes) around a stimulus; the completed self-assessment questionnaire. Interviews completed in this format have proved advantageous for investigation of language learning phenomena that are not easily observable by researchers. This is particularly true in cases where understanding learners' self-reported perceptions about language learning are part of the goal of the study (Mackey & Gass, 2005).

The types of language tasks questioned in the interview were representative of three instructional approaches: ALM, CLT and FFI. The questions were separated into two categories: CLT and non-CLT activities. Questions that focus on a specific method of instruction have proved useful for data collection when self-assessment of language is involved and researching communication skill is part of the study (Kondo-Brown, 2005).

Sample interview questions were:

1. Describe hands-on activities that required you to actively communicate with your classmates. For instance: role playing real-life situations like ordering food at a restaurant. Do you feel these activities helped you learn Korean? Did these activities occur on a daily, weekly, only a few times during the course, or never basis? (CLT activity)

2. Have you ever done memorization of dialogues and repeated practice speaking the dialogues in your Korean language classes? If so, describe. Do you feel these activities helped you learn Korean? Did these activities occur on a daily, weekly, only a few times during the course, or never basis? (ALM activity)
3. Describe grammar writing activities you have done in your Korean language classes. Do you feel these activities helped you learn Korean? Did these activities occur on a daily, weekly, only a few times during the course, or never basis? (ALM, FFI and integrated and isolated FFI within CLT activities)
4. Have you ever done a reading activity in your Korean language classes that required you to use real-world material such as a Korean news article? If so, describe. Do you feel these activities helped you learn Korean? Did these activities occur on a daily, weekly, only a few times during the course, or never basis? (CLT activity)

A full list of all interview questions is included in Appendix B.

During the data collection phase, I conducted one interview occurring between April 12-24, 2013. Depending on the location of the participant (living in the U.S. or Korea) the interview was be given either via telephone or Skype video conference. In either case, the interview was an audio-recorded conversation. Prior to the interview, each participant was given the Korean language skills self-assessment questionnaire and it was completed and returned. The topics discussed during the interview included: adoption, family and educational background, Korean language background, teaching

methods and classroom interactions experienced by the participant, and questions related to participant answers on the Korean language skills self-assessment questionnaire. The adoption and family background were important background pieces because they ensured that the participants had a common background in areas that have been shown to be variables in language learning (e.g. age of adoption) (Ventureyra & Pallier, 2004). Educational background was included as background information to provide a fuller picture of the educational experiences of the participants, outside of just Korean language education.

Data Analysis

In the data analysis process, the task of gathering questionnaires, interview notes and recordings, and consent forms can potentially be overwhelming. To help in organizing the process, I kept a file folder for each individual participant. In this way, I was able to keep the questionnaires, interview transcriptions, recordings and forms separate and easy to access when comparing participant responses to one another.

Self-Assessment Questionnaire

The questionnaire was analyzed with participant responses from the interview to arrive at four pieces of data: (1) data showing the participant rated Skill Level (SL) for each speaking task and Skill Goal (SG) for each speaking task (2) data showing the participant rated SL and SG for each speaking task and comparing the ratings to ACTFL levels (3) data informing the researcher about how the SG and SL correlated (4) data

connecting each participant's SL and SG correlated value to interview data shared about the level of coursework completed by the participant (5) data comparing the data in 2 and 4 to interview data about how often the participant reported engaging in a helpful CLT activity in the classroom. Analyzing both the questionnaire and interview data through this four-step process revealed the impact of CLT activities on language learning by the adopted KHL learner.

The questionnaire data was analyzed using the American Council on Teaching Foreign Languages (ACTFL) speaking proficiency guidelines. I have used ACTFL to show a documented, researched speaking proficiency scale. ACTFL has created five levels of speaking proficiency. These include novice, intermediate, advanced, superior, and distinguished levels. Each level has a range of low-mid-high (ACTFL, 2012). ACTFL guidelines are used to aid in providing accurate speaking proficiency level categories. These levels are not used to rate the participants' skills, but rather to provide a structure for determining the proficiency level they have rated themselves on each speaking skill task. During data analysis, each ACTFL speaking guideline level was aligned with the questionnaire's speaking skill tasks. The ACTFL scale helped me to determine whether the skill tasks were novice, intermediate, advanced or superior skills. A full description of ACTFL levels is located in Appendix C. After participants provided self-reported ratings for the skills tasks, I used the ACTFL levels to determine whether each participant attained a novice, intermediate, advanced or superior SL and what level s/he wanted to achieve in the SG.

Semi-Structured Interview

Since I needed to identify the types of activities completed by participants, I organized the semi-structured interview questions about Korean language instruction according to *CLT instructional method* or *Non-CLT instructional method*. This allowed me to efficiently categorize and analyze the responses from the interview that were related to language skills and to compare them with the quantified data I collected from the questionnaire. In addition, looking at the interview data by CLT or non-CLT method allowed me to analyze participants' responses to CLT activities. For instance, in Example Question 1 below about CLT activities, the participant's answer provides information about what types of CLT listening activities were used in the classroom, how often they occurred, and the participant's perception of how effective the activity was at increasing his/her Korean communication skills.

Example Question 1:

> Describe hands-on activities that required you to actively communicate with your classmates. For instance: role playing real-life situations like ordering food at a restaurant. Do you feel these activities helped you learn Korean? Did these activities occur on a daily, weekly, only a few times during the course, or never basis?

Further, using common communicative speaking tasks in the self-assessment questionnaire, grouping communication task skills by difficulty, and starting the

questions with the easiest tasks and increasing to more difficult tasks with each question allowed for me to categorize and order each participant's skills more efficiently when analyzing the data collected.

By providing an analysis of interview data that includes participants' descriptions of perceived Korean language learning with self-assessment questionnaire data that was numerically rated, self-reported data, I allowed for both a quantitative and a qualitative answer to my research question: What impact do activities based in the CLT approach have on Korean language learning by the adopted KHL learner?

Summary

In this chapter, I provided a description of the four adopted KHL learner participants as well as the setting of my research. The case study provided me with a holistic description of each language learner in the study and allowed me to compare and contrast the data I collected from the participants. I used the data collection tools of a semi-structured interview and a Korean language skills self-assessment questionnaire. By triangulating my data, I increased the validity and reliability of my research and reduced any interviewer biases (Mackey & Gass, 2005). The implementation of data collection began on April 12, 2013 and commenced on April 24, 2013.

CHAPTER FOUR: RESULTS

The purpose of the study was to explore the impact of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) activities on the acquisition of the Korean language by adopted KHL learners. Research has indicated that students may learn more effectively when engaged in communication tasks (Bogaards, Anderson & Krashen, 1992; Krashen, 1980; Nunan, 1991; Spada & Lightbrown, 2008). I wanted to see if CLT activities promoted language learning by adopted KHL learners. In Chapter Four, I examine and summarize findings from the data collection. The guiding question used was: What impact do activities based in the CLT approach have on Korean language learning by the adopted KHL learner?

Results

Self-Assessment Questionnaire Results

I will first present questionnaire data related to the Korean communicative speaking skills proficiency of each participant. The questionnaire data was the initial data collected and it is therefore presented before interview data. In the questionnaire, communicative speaking proficiency was based on participants' self-reported speaking Skill Goals (SG) and their self-rated perception of their speaking Skill Level (SL) on individual speaking tasks. The questionnaire (Figure 3.1) connected the participant's

skill level (SL) to his/her Korean speaking goals (SG). The four participants' Korean self-assessment questionnaires are located in Appendices E, F, G and H.

First, in order to determine what impact CLT activities had on Korean language learning, I began questionnaire data analysis by organizing all quantitative data into Appendix D Results of the Self-Assessment Questionnaire. Once the data was organized, I analyzed the skill level (SL) data for each participant, on each speaking task and aligned this data to the ACTFL proficiency levels discussed in Chapter 3 and presented in Appendix C. Self-reported SL ratings were aligned with ACTFL to determine the self-reported skill level proficiencies of each participant. It is important to note that this proficiency was self-reported. The ACTFL aligned questionnaire data is located below in Table 4.1 Self-Assessment Questionnaire Data and ACTFL Levels. Within the SL category, the ratings 5-1 indicated that the participant self-reported themselves as carrying out the Korean speaking task with: (5) no problem at all (4) somewhat easily (3) with some difficulty (2) with great difficulty (1) cannot at all. Within the SG category, the ratings 5-1 indicated that the participant self-reported the importance of the task as a personal Korean language goal as: (5) of great importance (4) important (3) of some importance (2) of little importance (1) not a goal. The letters NA are provided when the participant did not feel the task was applicable to what s/he had learned and therefore s/he did not rate the task. The ACTFL highest level of proficiency, Distinguished, was not included in Table 4.1 because it was not attained by any of the participants. The ACTFL levels are coded N for novice, I for intermediate, A for advanced and S for superior. Participant Skill Level is labeled as SL and Skill Goal as SG.

Table 4.1

Self-Assessment Questionnaire Data and ACTFL Levels

Korean Speaking Task	ACTFL Level	Ryan		Kim		Sarah		Megan	
		SL	SG	SL	SG	SL	SG	SL	SG
Count to 10 in Korean	N	5	4	5	1	5	5	5	3
Say the days of the week	N	5	2	5	1	4	5	3	3
Give the current date	N	5	2	5	1	4	5	1	2
Introduce myself in social situations, and use appropriate greeting and leaving expressions	N	4	4	5	1	5	5	5	5
Order a simple meal in a restaurant	I	5	5	5	1	4	5	4	3
Give directions on the street	I	3	4	5	1	2	4	3	3
Give simple biographical information about myself	I	5	5	5	1	3	5	2	4
Describe my present job, studies, and major life activities accurately and in detail	I	3	5	5	1	3	5	1.5	4
Describe my latest travel experience accurately and in detail	I	3	5	5	1	2	3	1	2
Sustain everyday conversation in casual Korean with a Korean friend	A	3	5	5	5	2	5	1	4
Sustain everyday conversation in very polite style Korean with a person much older than I am	A	2	4	4	1	2	4	1	4
Report an event or news that happened around me recently	A	1.5	3	4	1	1	2	1	2
Describe and discuss the U.S. educational system in detail	A	1	2	NA	NA	1	2	1	1
State and support with examples and reasons of my position on a controversial topic	A	1	3	5	5	1	1	1	1
Construct a structured hypothesis on an abstract issue	S	1	4	NA	NA	1	1	1	1

I looked at the SL ratings assigned to each speaking task to see which were given high ratings (5 – no problem at all or 4 – somewhat easily), middle rating (3 - with some difficulty), and low ratings (2 - with great difficulty or 1- cannot at all). Next, I compared the participant rating information to the ACTFL levels. For example, Ryan rated his SL for speaking task question 1, "Count to 10 in Korean" as a 5. Since the ACTFL proficiency guidelines state the speaking task in question 1 as falling under the novice level, I determined that Ryan was proficient in the question 1 novice speaking task. I followed this method of analysis for each speaking task question and each participant.

Since the speaking tasks were ordered from easiest to most difficult or novice to superior ACTFL proficiency levels, I was able to determine the approximate proficiency level of the participant by looking for the leveled group of questions that had SL ratings of 5 or 4. For example, Ryan rated himself as a 5 for all question tasks 1-5. Since questions 1-4 are novice level tasks, I determined that Ryan was at least a novice level of proficiency. Next, I looked at the last task question Ryan rated with a 5 or 4. It was question 7, "Give simple biographical information about myself". He rated himself as a 5 in this task. The ratings he gave himself for other intermediate level questions (questions 5-9) were 3. Based on this data, I determined that Ryan was at a mid-to-high intermediate level. I approximated each participant's communicative speaking proficiency through this method of analysis.

According to the method of analysis previously described, I determined the participants had the following levels of proficiency: Ryan – mid-to-high intermediate, Kim – high superior, Sarah – mid intermediate, Megan – mid-to-high novice.

Second, the participants' self-reported SL and SG data in Appendix D were analyzed to inform the researcher about how the self-reported SL data correlated with self-reported SG data. Both the participant SL and the SG informed the researcher about the impact of CLT activities on language learning. Specifically, the participants' language goals were necessary pieces of information because in the CLT approach, learner needs and goals are central to the CLT activity (Nunan, 1991; Parrish, 2004). For example, in the CLT activity of role playing ordering food in a restaurant, the learner's need is to be able to communicate his/her order to the waiter. I determined whether the participant believed the speaking task to be a language need, by asking each participant to rank questionnaire speaking tasks according to the task's importance to them as a personal goal (SG). Their SG rating showed the level they believed they needed the speaking task. Then, I compared the participant's self-rated skill level (SL) in the task to how they rated the task as a skill goal (SG). In comparing the self-rated SL and self-rated SG, I sought to determine if there was a high correlation. In other words, did the participant achieve his/her skill goal (SG)?

For example, Ryan's SG was a 5 on the speaking task, *Count to 10 in Korean*. The rating of 5 shows that Ryan wanted to be able to count to ten. His self-rated SL was a 5. The 5 rating for both the SL and SG reveal that Ryan attained what he

wanted for that speaking task. I followed this process of looking at the SL and SG rating for each participant on each speaking task in order to determine whether the participant achieved his/her skill goal (SG).

Third, further connections between the SL and SG data was sought to see whether there was a predictive relationship between the skill goal and skill level data. For each participant, on each speaking task the SL rating and SG rating were averaged. The resulting average shows whether the participant's goal for the speaking task predicted his/her skill level. For example, Megan's averaged rating of the SL and SG for the speaking task, *Count to 10 in Korean*, is 4. With 1 being a low predictor and 5 being a high predictor, Megan's score revealed that for the speaking task, *Count to 10 in Korean*, her SL and SG levels had a high correlation and her skill goal (SG) predicted the skill level (SL) she attained. Table 4.2 Correlated Results of Self-Reported Korean Skills Self-Assessment Questionnaire displays the SL and SG averaged rating for each participant on each speaking task.

Table 4.2

Correlated Results of Korean Speaking Skills Self-Assessment Questionnaire

Korean Speaking Task	**Ryan**	**Kim**	**Sarah**	**Megan**
Count to 10 in Korean	4.5	3	5	4
Say the days of the week	3.5	3	4.5	3
Give the current date	3.5	3	4.5	1.5
Introduce myself in social situations, and use appropriate greeting and leaving expressions	4	3	5	5
Order a simple meal in a restaurant	5	3	4.5	3.5
Give directions on the street	3.5	3	3	3
Give simple biographical information about	5	3	4	3

myself				
Describe my present job, studies, and major life activities accurately and in detail	4	3	4	2.75
Describe my latest travel experience accurately and in detail	4	3	2.5	1.5
Sustain everyday conversation in casual Korean with a Korean friend	4	5	3.5	2.5
Sustain everyday conversation in very polite style Korean with a person much older than I am	3	2.5	3	2.5
Report an event or news that happened around me recently	2.25	2.5	1.5	1.5
Describe and discuss the U.S. educational system in detail	1.5	N/A	1.5	1
State and support with examples and reasons of my position on a controversial topic	2	5	1	1
Construct a structured hypothesis on an abstract issue	2.5	N/A	1	1

Fourth, I looked at each participant's self-reported skill level (SL) rating on each speaking task and I averaged the rating across all participants. I ordered the speaking tasks in descending order from highest average SL rating to lowest average SL rating. Then, I connected the ordered ratings to the ACTFL speaking proficiency scale of novice, intermediate, advanced and superior levels. Table 4.3 Participant Self-Reported Skill Level Averages and ACTFL Level displays average SL ratings across all four participants. It is clear in Table 4.3 that on average, the participants self-reported that the most successful task was the first novice level speaking task, *Count to 10 in Korean.* The least successful was the superior level skill, *Construct a structured hypothesis on an abstract issue.* All of the intermediate level speaking tasks except for, *Order a simple meal in a restaurant,* followed novice level skills for average success level. Additionally, aside from the intermediate task, *Order a simple meal in a restaurant,* all other

intermediate, advanced and superior level speaking tasks fall in descending averaged rating in order from least difficult (novice) to most difficult (superior).

Table 4.3

Participants' Self-Reported Skill Level Averages and ACTFL Level

Korean Speaking Task	**Ryan**	**Kim**	**Sarah**	**Megan**	**AVG**	**ACTFL Level**
Count to 10 in Korean	5	5	5	5	5	N
Introduce myself in social situations, and use appropriate greeting and leaving expressions	4	5	5	5	4.75	N
Order a simple meal in a restaurant	5	5	4	4	4.5	I
Say the days of the week	5	5	4	3	4.25	N
Give the current date	5	5	4	1	3.75	N
Give simple biographical information about myself	5	5	3	2	3.75	I
Give directions on the street	3	5	2	3	3.25	I
Describe my present job, studies, and major life activities accurately and in detail	3	5	3	1.5	3.125	I
Describe my latest travel experience accurately and in detail	3	5	2	1	2.75	I
Sustain everyday conversation in casual Korean with a Korean friend	3	5	2	1	2.75	A
Sustain everyday conversation in very polite style Korean with a person much older than I am	2	4	2	1	2.25	A
State and support with examples and reasons of my position on a controversial topic	1	5	1	1	2	A
Report an event or news that happened around me recently	1.5	4	1	1	1.875	A
Describe and discuss the U.S. educational system in detail	1	NA	1	1	1	A
Construct a structured hypothesis on an abstract issue	1	NA	1	1	1	S

In addition, I found that the four speaking tasks with average SL ratings over 4 were, *Count to 10 in Korean* with a 5 - no problem at all rating, *Introduce myself in social situations and use appropriate greeting and leaving expressions* with a 4.75 – somewhat easily rating, *Order a simple meal in a restaurant* with a 4.5 – somewhat easily rating and *Say the days of the week* with a 4.25 – somewhat easily rating. I determined that an SL rating of 4 or higher was necessary in order to deem that the participant was proficient at the speaking task because the self-assessment questionnaire scale described a 3 as completing the speaking task *with some difficulty*. Two additional speaking tasks had an SL average rating of four or higher. These tasks were: *Order a simple meal in a restaurant* and *Say the days of the week*. Lastly, I compared the SL average rating to the ACTFL speaking proficiency levels. Comparing ACTFL proficiency levels to the SL averaged data revealed that three of the four speaking tasks that had an average rating of 4 or higher were novice level skills. One of the speaking skills, *Order a simple meal in a restaurant*, was an intermediate level skill. Since all the other ACTFL aligned intermediate, advanced and superior level tasks had an average participant skill level of 3.75 or lower, I determined that as a collective group, the four participants self-reported an ACTFL speaking skill level of high novice to low intermediate.

Fifth, I compared the ACTFL proficiency rating of each participant that was determined in the first piece of data collection to interview information in Table 3.1 shared by the participant about his/her level of Korean coursework completed. Ryan's proficiency was mid-to-high intermediate and his highest level of coursework was level four. Kim's proficiency was high-to-superior and her highest level of coursework was

level 6. Sarah's proficiency was mid-to-intermediate and her highest level of coursework was level four. Megan's proficiency was mid-to-high novice and her highest level of coursework was level 1. Since the language standards and requirements determining levels 1-6 coursework for each participant's university is unknown, it cannot be conclusively said that this study's participants have achieved each of their self-reported proficiency level based on coursework.

Lastly, I compared participants self-rated skill level (SL), self-rated goal (SG), and the level of coursework completed data to the interview data about how often the participant reported engaging in a helpful CLT activity in the classroom. Table 4.4 below shows how many times each participant engaged in what they reported as a helpful activity. Since the questionnaire tasks were speaking skills only, I separated the helpful activities into the four modalities: listening, speaking, reading, and writing. I compared only the number of helpful speaking tasks to the SL, SG and coursework level data. Even though all of the participants shared that at least one CLT speaking activity was helpful, the small number of helpful activities (1-4 activities) is limiting and there is not conclusive evidence to show that the helpful CLT activities had an impact on the self-reported proficiency of each learner in this case study.

Table 4.4

Number of CLT Activities Participants Reported Helpful

CLT Modalities	Ryan	Kim	Sarah	Megan
Listening	4	2	3	6
Speaking	3	1	4	4
Reading	2	0	1	0
Writing	1	0	2	2
Total	**10**	**3**	**10**	**12**

Semi-Structured Interview Results

In order to determine what impact CLT activities had on Korean language learning, I conducted a semi-structured interview where I asked the learners to self-report about what activities they engaged in during instruction, how often they engaged in the activities, and their attitudes about the activities used by Korean instructors.

I completed the following steps to analyze the interview data: (1) organized participants' answers on CLT and non-CLT activities they encountered into Table 4.6 (2) analyzed Table 4.6 data for trends in activities described by participants (3) identified three themes that emerged in participants' interview responses (4) compared interview data and the themes that emerged to the quantitative data collected about participants' speaking proficiency levels and goals from the questionnaire. It is important to note that the participants were unaware of the term *CLT* and which classroom activities are labeled *CLT*. The descriptions of CLT activities and lessons are the explanatory words used by participants to describe their classroom reality.

Perceived effectiveness of individual CLT activities. The interviews with the adopted KHL learners revealed that there is a wide spectrum in the presence of CLT activities across Korean language classrooms. While I have chosen to focus on analyzing the effectiveness of four commonly experienced CLT activities, Table 4.6 shows all the CLT and non-CLT activities each participant engaged in during Korean language coursework. Each participant's opinion of the effectiveness of each activity is noted as either helpful, not helpful, or no data. No data is used to designate when no opinion on the helpfulness of an activity was provided by the participant.

Table 4.5

Participant Responses on the Effectiveness of Individual CLT Activities

CLT Listening Helpful			
Ryan	**Kim**	**Sarah**	**Megan**
Listening comprehension questions about videos, dramas and dialogues	Watching video, radio newscasts, responding to comprehension questions, learning corresponding vocabulary	Teacher-recorded oral readings of authentic texts and other texts	Listening to recorded conversations, but did not have to repeat any parts of the conversation for pronunciation
Watching music videos and TV dramas	Watching Korean dramas and then acting out scenes through provided dialogues	Listening for comprehension	Listening to questions and acting out different things related to the questions
List of vocabulary and things to listen for		Partner speaking and listening practice using dialogues	Role playing and having to act out dialogues and a play

Written report about watched TV dramas			Partner work listening to partner's responses and telling them whether their answer was accurate Listening was integrated with other activities, not a broken up into sections or listening labs Listening to specific questions and then raising hand to answer yes.

CLT Listening Not Helpful			
Ryan	**Kim**	**Sarah**	**Megan**
Watching teacher-recorded dialogues			

CLT Listening No Data			
Ryan	**Kim**	**Sarah**	**Megan**
	Comprehension-based listening passages from textbook, CD and teacher created files		

CLT Speaking Helpful			
Ryan	**Kim**	**Sarah**	**Megan**
Role playing & group presentations of role plays/skits from real life, included memorization of lines	General speaking and communication with other learners in her tutoring group (this was not part of a class)	Tandem language partner--this was helpful, but it would have been even more helpful if we had only spoken in Korean during our conversations.	Topics for role-play, dialogues and partner work were related to daily things: order from a menu, describe what you are wearing, talk about the weather

Language partners outside of class for real world communication and practice		Instruction on how to move mouth/tongue to produce correct Korean sounds, but wished this was done outside of class	During speaking, the emphasis was not on grammar…just an emphasis on being able to communicate and get your point across
Final project that required research, oral presentation, writing, reading, listening, based on student choice		Using communication outside of class in daily life of living in Korea and in having general communication in Korean Role-play of introductory dialogues	Conversational speaking activities with a specific topic and vocabulary; students had to integrate the vocabulary into their conversations Speaking and then listening for specific responses

CLT Speaking Not Helpful			
Ryan	**Kim**	**Sarah**	**Megan**
	Partner speaking/role playing practice, matched with learners of different L1's and proficiency levels	Using the formal way of saying things…this was helpful, but more practice in informal was needed	Error correction on oral reading, would've been more helpful to be taught how to shape mouth through instruction with an orthographic diagram instead of repeatedly being told she was saying it wrong when she didn't know how to correct

		It would be more helpful to role play with the dialogue serving as only an example. It is more helpful to say it and to practice the casualness of the situation in real-life context	Often Megan would practice the dialogue verbatim, and then not have enough time to practice making up her own dialogue in spontaneous speech Students tape-recorded themselves saying a specific dialogue and the instructor gave feedback. This was helpful, but, because of the pace of the class, Megan never had a chance to go back and listen to the recordings

CLT Speaking No Data			
Ryan	**Kim**	**Sarah**	**Megan**

CLT Reading Helpful			
Ryan	**Kim**	**Sarah**	**Megan**
Read clips from news articles and books Class discussion of readings		Korean workbooks had stories that catered to the interests of foreigners	

CLT Reading Not Helpful			
Ryan	**Kim**	**Sarah**	**Megan**

CLT Reading No Data			
Ryan	**Kim**	**Sarah**	**Megan**
			In higher levels some reading was taken from real-life texts

CLT Writing Helpful			
Ryan	**Kim**	**Sarah**	**Megan**
Writing prompts that were based on learner need/interests		Learner would modify free writing activity by finding an example text and then modifying it—this helped with vocabulary and grammar forms	Writing emphasis was on ability to use the vocabulary, not on grammar. Grammar was corrected, but not a lot of time was spent on usage
		Free writing on topics from the book, but chosen by the learner, or an outside topic	Writing a grocery list to practice food vocabulary recently learned

CLT Writing Not Helpful			
Ryan	**Kim**	**Sarah**	**Megan**
	Teacher pulls grammatically incorrect sentences from student work, but takes out of context, students have to find the error and make corrections		

CLT Writing No Data			
Ryan	**Kim**	**Sarah**	**Megan**
			Fill in the blank grammar exercises

Non-CLT Listening Helpful			
Ryan	**Kim**	**Sarah**	**Megan**

Non-CLT Listening Not Helpful			
Ryan	**Kim**	**Sarah**	**Megan**
Listening to teacher-created dialogues that were not based on real-world uses of the language	Whole class discussions on timely world issues		

Non-CLT Listening No Data			
Ryan	**Kim**	**Sarah**	**Megan**
Minimal pair drills, Repetition	Partner and class discussions on Korean news articles		

Non-CLT Speaking Helpful			
Ryan	**Kim**	**Sarah**	**Megan**
	Homework grammar exercises from textbook (i.e. I'm intending to go to the store. I'm intending to go to...) Students orally read homework and receive correction on grammar and pronunciation New vocabulary was introduced and errors in pronunciation were corrected through instruction based on Korean rules of grammar and syntax (pachem) Repetition and drilling of dialogues, to learn new grammar	Speaking activities by orally reading from the book we are using. A lot of pronunciation correction during oral reading. Some error correction is helpful, but too much prevents me from speaking.	

Non-CLT Speaking Not Helpful			
Ryan	**Kim**	**Sarah**	**Megan**
		Too much correction on pronunciation during oral reading. Correcting everything was overwhelming because it prevented Sarah from speaking. Role playing where too much dialogue was given to the students. The role play was less realistic. It became about just reading and changing 1 word. Tandem language partners could have been more helpful if the language exchange was only in Korean, rather than most of the exchange in English, with little Korean practice.	

Non-CLT Speaking No Data			
Ryan	**Kim**	**Sarah**	**Megan**
Oral reading exercises from textbook, correction on pronunciation when needed Minimal pair drills			

Non-CLT Reading Helpful			
Ryan	**Kim**	**Sarah**	**Megan**
Reading from textbook that had pre-set vocabulary, focus on reading comprehension	Vocabulary lists that had to be memorized for spelling and definition		10-15 new reading vocabulary words every day. These were practiced and students had to know them the next day for vocabulary quizzes every day.

Non-CLT Reading Not Helpful			
Ryan	**Kim**	**Sarah**	**Megan**
	Reading from textbook/workbook that had made up stories about topics in Korean history/culture, not based on learner needs or interests	Using a textbook and workbook that were written in all Korean. Directions were in Korean. This added to the intimidation at the beginner level because the learner didn't know what these instructions were saying Reading out loud from textbook, lots of pronunciation correction. This was intimidating and it discouraged the learner from wanting to read out loud.	

Non-CLT Reading No Data			
Ryan	**Kim**	**Sarah**	**Megan**

Extensive vocabulary lists, for definition and spelling		Grammar and reading were separate and taught in an unrelated manner. Midterm and final exam, testing on reading vocabulary Memorization of vocabulary sheets	Homework where sentences about a topic would have to be read and then students would respond in complete sentences

Non-CLT Writing Helpful			
Ryan	**Kim**	**Sarah**	**Megan**
Writing prompts that were not based directly on a learner needs assessment or learner interests	List of grammar and vocabulary words, students had to make sentences with one of each	Grammar exercises where the part of speech would be changed and then the learner had to write the grammar form again. This was somewhat helpful, but hands on activities like writing an invitation were more helpful	Writing emphasis on being able to use the vocabulary from the reading passage

	"Find the error" grammar exercises	A lot of workbook type things. Grammar rules and then you answer a question and just change the verb ending as part of grammar. EX: Do you have a pencil? Yes, I have a pencil.	Emphasis on writing in complete sentences and looking at clues in the question to use in writing an answer. Usually done in workbook exercises and in combination with reading homework that had to be read and then responded to in complete sentences.
		Verb conjugations. Sarah felt these were necessary	

Non-CLT Writing Not Helpful			
Ryan	**Kim**	**Sarah**	**Megan**
	Fill in the blank grammar exercises		

Non-CLT Writing No Data			
Ryan	**Kim**	**Sarah**	**Megan**
			Reviewing the alphabet and Hangul at the beginning of the quarter Little emphasis on writing grammar. Grammar would be corrected, but aside from a lesson on how to structure a sentence at the beginning of the semester, there were no formal lessons.

During the interviews, some of the participants shared about instances where instructors would use a CLT activity that matched his/her specific learning style. In Excerpt 1, Ryan shared that when it came to reading instruction, the most helpful lessons were those that focused on reading comprehension skills.

Excerpt 1 Ryan:

> Most helpful was the reading comprehension part. You would read a paragraph, look up words and then answer questions. I think this was best because it was more scientific. Reading things and then being able to pull things out of the book. This is just how my brain works. It helps in daily life because I can read things more quickly, and I have gained a much greater vocabulary because of reading.

Ryan's description shows how well he knew his own learning style and that he was aware of strategies that help him learn best. This information is fundamental because when his instructor considered this, it allowed her to plan CLT and non-CLT activities that went with Ryan's learning style, rather than against it.

The participants also shared about CLT activities they did on their own time to practice what they were learning in class. In Excerpt 2, Kim shared a CLT activity she had done outside of class that helped her to develop a high level of Korean grammatical understanding, vocabulary, and communicative skills (she rated herself at a 4 and 5 in advanced speaking skill tasks on the self-assessment questionnaire).

Excerpt 2 Kim:

I think actually outside of the classroom is where most of it happens. What I did on my own was make flashcards of every grammar that was very helpful to me. I had one grammar on every flashcard and an example on the back. I would talk to my dog a lot… I would talk to her with the grammar. I would say the Korean word in English and then flip it around and say it in Korean. It was memorizing and it also helped to use it with a real person or to hear it. You can talk to yourself all day long, but it's not 100 % until you use it in the real world, talk to a person. That is the great thing about a low level, the minute you go outside you will hear it, but at the high level you don't hear it as often. That is the reason why once you get to a certain level people think they regress because it's not a word that you see all the time. 'I remember knowing the word for that once, but now I don't remember because I haven't used it since.'

During the interview, some participants discussed CLT activities they believed helped them strengthen a particular speaking task mentioned in the Self-Assessment Questionnaire. On her self-assessment questionnaire, Megan rated her skill level in the task, *Order a simple meal in a restaurant,* as 4. This rating shows she had proficiency in the intermediate level task, even though she had only taken beginner level coursework. In Excerpt 3, she shared how the CLT activity of role play strengthened her communication skills for the real-life task.

Excerpt 3 Megan:

> I felt like we spent a lot of time going over foods words and we practiced scenarios of ordering in a restaurant. So we spent more time on this and so it stuck out with me. If it would have just been in a book, vocabulary in a book, I would not have learned it was well. Also living in Korea and having to order in a restaurant a lot helped to strengthen it. I think the more you practice it, the better you get at it.

In addition to the repetitiveness of an activity, the closer an activity was to mimicking a real-life situation appeared to have bearing on whether the CLT activity has a high or low impact on language learning by the adopted KHL learner. In Excerpt 4, Ryan shared about the CLT activities of video-taped teacher-recorded dialogues and Korean dramas and music videos. He felt the teacher-recorded dialogues had a low impact on his language learning because the dialogues were not relatable to what he believed was real-world communication. On the other hand, Ryan described the Korean dramas and music videos as helpful because they were more relatable to real-world communication.

Excerpt 4 Ryan:

> I didn't feel at the time they were very helpful. It didn't help in the real world, it was very specific to the one scenario and what you were learning at that time. It was also not something you would normally hear Koreans talking about. It helps

with getting used to listening to Korean, but listening to drama and music videos was more helpful with real-world communication.

It appeared that the closer the CLT activity was to either meeting a real need in the adopted KHL learner's present life or to practicing a real-life situation, the more helpful the participant found it in increasing language skills.

Themes in interview responses. While looking through transcribed documents of participant interview responses, common themes appeared. I have organized participant interview responses into three sections for easier description and analysis of how CLT activities impact language learning by adopted KHL learners. The themes are: (1) Different types of learners in the classroom (2) Classroom environment challenges (3) Korean curriculum and the effectiveness of CLT activities.

Different types of learners in the classroom. A theme that surfaced from interviews with the four adopted KHL learners was the learners' keen awareness, and sometimes frustration, with the inclusion of different types of Korean language learners within the same class. The awareness was apparent in both U.S. and Korean classroom contexts. In some cases, the awareness of particular learners interfered with the adopted KHL learner's communication, participation, and learning during CLT activities.

In Excerpt 5, Sarah discussed her experience in a U.S. Korean language classroom. The presence of KHL learners in the classroom brought anxiety and intimidation into the classroom setting. The response was due to KHL learners having

previous understanding and usage of Korean and adopted KHL learners having no prior experience with Korean.

Excerpt 5 Sarah:

> I think the big challenge in the class was that there were non-adoptees in the class that could already kind of read and so they all sounded like they knew what they were saying. This was really intimidating. So I remember there were a few Korean adoptees, but most of them dropped out right away and the adoptees weren't doing so well. I don't know if the Korean students were doing well either, it was supposed to be the first beginner class, but it was pretty hard for us. I think it was just too hard, well not hard, but it didn't really cater to them [adopted KHL learners] and that is why they dropped out. […] It was a weird situation when some of the people seemed fluent and others didn't know anything yet. It felt like there should have been an even more beginner class than the beginner class.

Sarah attributed the anxiety of the adopted KHL learners to the fact that the KHL learners knew more than they did before the class even began. The differing background of the learners led Sarah and the other adopted KHL learners to believe they were doing poorly in the class. The adopted KHL learner's affective filter (Krashen, 1980) was raised, and in Sarah's experience, the elevated learner anxiety interfered with progression in language learning. As a result, many adopted KHL learners dropped out of the language course.

In contrast, in Excerpt 6, Megan acknowledged that KHL learners had a greater level of proficiency than she did, but she did not seem to have the same level of anxiety to the presence of KHL learners in the classroom.

Excerpt 6 Megan:

> I think the more hands on the activities were, the more helpful they were. There were people in the class who had a Korean background who didn't score high enough to be in the intermediate level. But I got a sense they were learning. I think they felt like their listening was strong before, but their speaking was weak. So even though it was basic Korean, the class gave them an opportunity to practice speaking because we did partner work every day, but the role playing was every other week.

Megan's comfort with the KHL learners may have come from the classroom environment created by the instructor. At another point in the interview, she explained that her instructors took into consideration skills and topics that the students would want to learn and they planned lessons around these themes.

The Korean language program Ryan attended his junior year addressed the problem of KHL and adopted KHL beginner language proficiency differences by creating two separate tracks for students. Beginner level students who had some background in Korean language (KHL learners) were encouraged to enroll in track 1, while adopted KHL and Korean as a Foreign Language (KFL) learners were enrolled in track 2. Ryan described his experience in the track 2 beginner level course as the best Korean language

course he had taken in the last ten years. He attributed his experience to the types of real-world and learner-centered activities used by the instructor, the individualized instruction due to small class size (15 students), and the patient and personal demeanor of the instructor.

During the interview, the participants also discussed how the first languages (L1) of other students in class impacted how successful the participant believed CLT activities were in increasing communication skills. In her comment in Excerpt 7 about dissimilar learner L1 languages represented in her classes in Korea, Kim shared a strong dissatisfaction with the practice of partnering KFL students of polar L1s for communicative language practice. She questioned what learning might be gained through the exercise. At the time of her response, the use of role-plays and dialogues to teach pronunciation was being discussed.

Excerpt 7 Kim:

They do try to help us with pronunciation, but I think the whole thing in the classroom with students who are from different home languages makes it really difficult. I think teaching pronunciation in the classroom is very difficult because of speakers of various languages: Chinese speakers, because what the teacher would focus on would be irrelevant to me. Such as saying Hayo—the Chinese students would say Huuro, but that is irrelevant to me. I always felt that speaking with other students in the classroom was pointless because I couldn't understand them. I didn't have many Americans in my classrooms, so dividing up the class

> between Americans and other languages would be hard. With Chinese, Japanese and Mongolians it would have been easy because there were a lot of them. I think it would be helpful to separate classrooms into student groups by your mother tongue so what teachers explained made sense, but I think Koreans don't know how to explain things in a way that makes sense.

Kim's response indicates three things: (1) the impact of the CLT activity (in this case, partner role-play dialogues) was lessened because the learners were focused on understanding each others' incorrect pronunciation (2) a learning environment that considered KFL students' L1, while also relaying to students the purpose for communicative activity had not been created (3) the learners were frustrated with each other and the CLT activity because the teacher had not provided instruction/modeling on what to do when communication broke down between partners. In Kim's Excerpt 7 example, language was not learned because the role-play partners could not understand each other due to errors in pronunciation, stemming from the L1. Kim found this frustrating as she moved up in program levels and was often in classes comprised of few L1 English speakers. The benefit of this role play was to practice real-world communication and extend dialogues the students had learned, however, because of language break-down, it appears this learning did not occur.

Megan's experience suggests the effectiveness of role play was diminished by two gaps in her instruction: (1) the lack of appropriate time provided for the CLT activity to be completed (2) proper instruction in how long to practice the pre-written dialogue and when to begin practicing spontaneous conversation.

Excerpt 8 Megan:

> They would give us dialogues to practice at the beginning and then they would encourage us to continue the dialogue on our own. This was every day. Yes, it was helpful because of repeated practice. It helped to have the groundwork already there, but we would never get to the part where we made up our own dialogue, we might change a word, but not much.

When her instructor misgauged how much conversation partners could complete and she did not providing guidance on when to begin practicing spontaneous conversation, Megan and her partner missed the communicative goal of the activity which was to make up their own dialogue. Megan's questionnaire data reveals that she rated her skill level below a 4 on two of the four novice level speaking tasks. She completed beginner level coursework, so it can be expected that she should have a higher self-reported rating for the tasks *Say the days of the week* and *Give the current date*. Megan's lack of spontaneous speech during daily dialogue could have played a role in her lower than expected skill level in novice level speaking tasks. It is possible that if many CLT situations like Megan's occur throughout periods of Korean instruction, skill level goals will not be reached because the learner is not engaging in the CLT activity in a fully communicative way where spontaneous speech is being used.

The participant interview data suggests strategies in how to communicatively interact with KFL learners who have differing L1's and how to interact with students who are KHL learners is an area of instructional need for adopted KHL learners. When the instruction is not given, the usefulness and impact of the CLT activity to Korean

language learning by the adopted KHL learner is lessened. For example, when Megan and Kim's Korean instructors used CLT activities in the classroom, but did not properly prepare the students with instruction in how to engage in these activities with other learners, both women recall feelings of frustration because they believed their learning was diminished. Therefore, the CLT activity goal of authentic communication was not met. Implications for how to correct the gap in instruction will be shared in Chapter 5.

In some cases the questionnaire proficiency data provided further evidence of ineffective implementation of the CLT activities. As described earlier in the questionnaire results section of this chapter, Sarah's skill level (SL) rating and skill goal (SG) rating for certain tasks on the questionnaire did not correspond with her level of Korean language study. Since Sarah has taken Korean language courses through level 4, her low proficiency in the speaking skill of being able to give directions may be related to inadequacies in her learning environment. In light of Sarah's description of an unfriendly student-student learning environment in her first Korean class, it is possible that by not considering the differences in oral proficiency between KHL and adopted KHL learners, the instructor created an environment that challenged rather than supported language learning by adopted KHL learners both during and outside of CLT activities.

Classroom environment challenges. The classroom environment created by the Korean instructor was another area that impacted the effectiveness of CLT activities. In Excerpt 9, Kim shared how the classroom environment in her Korea-located language

courses brought many struggles that she had to face and deal with as an adopted KHL learner before being able to focus on the content of the activities.

Excerpt 9 Kim:

> I think the biggest thing was getting over the psychological block so that I could learn like a non-adopted person. […] At the end of the day, as a lot of adoptees do, I needed to do a lot of mental tricks with myself in order to cope with the classroom situation…a lot of weird things that come into the classroom that are really hurtful to adoptees' feelings. I had to be mentally tough to deal with that social environment. After I dealt with all of that, I could think about the grammar.

It appears that, in Kim's experience, the adopted KHL learner's ability to fully engage in CLT and other class activities was impacted by an insensitive classroom environment. At another point in her interview Kim shared the struggle she had with a Korean teacher who refused to call her by her Korean name in class, which is what she had requested numerous times.

Kim also shared about adopted KHL learners' sensitivity to the language used by instructors to describe adopted persons and biological families.

Excerpt 10 Kim:

> Adult adoptees prefer to be called Korean adopted person, not called Korean adopted child. But people correct me, no you are a Korean child, and then I have

> to tell them why. I have to tell them this is why and this is what we prefer to be called. Also, in birth families, the word that should be used is won ka chok. This means "family of origin". Won ka chok, even the adoption agencies call it this. But in Korean class the teacher wants to say wol leh "original family", not "family of origin".

The struggle displayed here between the instructor and adopted KHL learner is one of cultural sensitivity and awareness of the adopted KHL learner's adoption experience. First, the instructor likely did not see why the words *person* and *child* and *original family* and *family of origin* were significant differences to the adopted KHL learner. However, the difference in the two phrases was of great importance to Kim. It is possible Kim's sensitivity to the two phrases stems from these two interpretations:

1. When Kim's instructor says the adopted KHL learner is a *child*, it places him/her back into the position of a Korean orphan when they left Korea to be adopted. It overlooks the adopted KHL learner's place as an adult Korean participant in Korean society.
2. When the instructor says *original family* instead of *family of origin* it has the potential to negate the significance of the adopted KHL learner's adoptive family because by default the adoptive family becomes secondary to the *original family*.

Second, the instructor may have felt jeopardized as an authoritative figure in the classroom by the questioning of the adopted KHL learner and the instruction the learner

gave the teacher in how to correctly say the Korean word. Through both the first and second situations, a somewhat hostile classroom environment may have been created as a result of a lack of cultural sensitivity and cultural awareness on both the part of the instructor and the adoptive KHL learner. An environment like this could have a negative impact on the effectiveness of CLT and other classroom activities.

Sarah recounted another challenge in the classroom environment when describing the difference between her current Korean class and her first Korean class. Sarah's current class is taught through a Korean language institute that specializes in instruction to adopted KHL learners and their families and her first class was through a large Midwest university.

Excerpt 11 Sarah:

> The [current] class does not have tests. It's clear that some people already know more Korean, but we never feel like it's ranked. There is no competition or drama between classmates as we are all mostly adults with jobs and family lives. The age range is older than a college course, with everyone 30's plus, except for the high school daughter. In this way it doesn't have that Kyopo, 1st generation kids that came here with their parents, vs. adoptee feeling. We are now friends, but more like on a close coworker level. The [current] Korean teachers I've had respect everyone and don't push the adoptee students too much. There is no off putting pressure for adoptees to study harder.

It appears in her response, that Sarah felt a pressure by instructors at her Midwest university class to study harder because she was an adopted KHL learner. She also states "Korean teachers [current teachers] I've had respect everyone". It can be inferred that she did not necessarily feel this level of respect from instructors at her Midwest university. Based on Sarah's description of her current Korean class, it can be concluded that the absence of equal respect for all learners and the pressure to learn rather than encouragement to learn were environmental factors that potentially had a negative impact on language learning during CLT activities in her university Korean class.

Based on Kim and Sarah's responses, it seems that when the environment in the classroom was one that created (1) a hierarchy of language skill and comparison between students and/or (2) a hostile social environment due to comments by the instructor that are hurtful to adoptees' feelings, the participants had increased difficulty learning and engaging in CLT and non-CLT activities. It took a concerted effort on the part of the adopted KHL learner to overcome these obstacles. Thus, when the Korean instructor failed to create a safe learning environment for the adopted KHL learner, the potential learning offered by the CLT activity was hijacked due to elevated learner anxiety and feelings of disrespect.

Korean curriculum and the effectiveness of CLT activities. In the interview and questionnaire, the participants' responses also followed the topic of needing the classroom curriculum to account for adopted KHL learners' lack of familiarity with

Korean and accessibility to Korean speakers during instruction. This is in contrast to KHL learners' familiarity with and easier access to Korean speakers.

In Excerpt 12, Sarah shared that an area of difficulty in Korean language curriculum was that schools start with the highest form of Korean right away, which in her experience is rarely used. She added that learning the lower forms would have been helpful. However, she didn't believe one should take the place of the other, but both should be taught.

Excerpt 12 Sarah:

> I learned the formal and then after living in Korea I realized a lot of what people use is informal. Korean is really hard because of the different endings. I think you do need to know the formal endings, but most people use the informal and they could teach that from the start. I also mean how the informal is a shortened version, brevity of normal language. I think it is good to know what the full sentence would be and then the shorter version, too.

In his interview, Ryan described the language partner piece of the Korean program he took his junior year and the program at his current university in Korea. He explained how the component was integral to learning how to speak 'real' Korean. While not a mandatory part of the programs, the partnerships were coordinated by the universities. These relationships turned into excellent opportunities for real-life conversation, often times in context. Students would meet together in restaurants and other locations that simulated real language. The language partners provided a CLT

activity that, while done outside of the classroom, was fundamental in Ryan's language skill growth, particularly his communicative competence. The impact of this CLT activity was so profound that he continued to arrange language partners for himself. He has since had thirty language partners, to whom he credits much of his communicative abilities.

The different verbal needs of adopted KHL and KHL learners was also a topic discussed. In Excerpt 13, Megan described the type of pronunciation instruction she believed would have been most helpful for teaching her how to produce unfamiliar Korean sounds.

Excerpt 13 Megan:

> Yes, they would correct us, a lot of correction on oral, they would tell us the correction and then we would have to repeat it. I think it helped me in terms of realizing I wasn't saying it correctly, but it was frustrating that I couldn't hear what I was doing wrong. It was like my kids that are going to speech that I teach. I tried to say it correctly, but I couldn't change it. I think it was that my mouth couldn't produce that exact sound. We never did anything with orthographic diagrams to show us how to make our mouth/tongue move to pronounce, but that would have been really helpful.

Due to a lack of exposure to Korean oral language, Megan experienced difficulty forming her mouth and vocal faculties to produce Korean sounds with the correct punctuation. If this pronunciation skill had been taught through the use of orthographic diagrams (as Megan suggested based on her own teaching experience) the frustration Megan

experienced might have been avoided. Based on the interview data, it is unclear as to whether Megan's frustration with correction of pronunciation carried over into CLT activities where speaking Korean would have occurred. However, it can be presumed that she likely experienced some oral correction during CLT activities. The oral correction likely limited the helpfulness of the CLT activity in increasing Korean communication skills because of Megan's frustration with pronunciation mistakes she did not feel equipped to correct. The lack of contextualizing oral communication instruction and error correction to the orthographic needs of adopted KHL learners leads to a decrease in the effectiveness of CLT activities. In Chapter Five, I will discuss Megan's observation of her own pronunciation needs in comparison to those of KHL learners and how these needs could be addressed in Korean language curriculum.

The participants in the study also touched on areas related to topics in the curriculum that they believed either facilitated or prevented language growth for the adopted KHL learner.

In Excerpt 14, Kim expressed wishes that her own personal life experiences were an important contributing element to classroom learning. Rather than having to talk about her life to "fit" into what the Korean instructor wanted to talk about i.e. her family life.

Excerpt 14 Kim:

Yes, right. And there are other things, like you have to talk about your family. Whenever adoptees have to talk about their family it gets into a tricky situation

> for a lot of different reasons. It's like, oh, here we go again! […] I made up a lot of stuff and talked about my dog a lot. As long as I could make the Korean grammar and vocabulary words fit into a story about my dog I didn't have to cry in class.

Underlying in her comment is also the issue of instructors being sensitive to the adopted KHL learners' adoption experience and taking these needs into consideration when planning lessons.

At the end of the interview, in Excerpt 15, when asked if she had anything to add, Kim described a general approach and pieces of a curriculum that she believes would help adopted KHL learners most in their Korean language learning.

Excerpt 15 Kim:

> What I really think is missing with adoptees and language learning is that a lot of people who live here [Korea] have been reunited with their families. I think in level 4 we learn about what to call our families…the different names. It is really complicated because it is Chinese-based. But I think what adoptees need is to learn those names right away. Because you have a birth family, you need that right way in the low level. The [university name omitted for privacy] textbook was good because you learn the 'yo' form right away [instead of later at the higher levels].

In her suggestion, Kim highlighted one motivating factor for learning Korean (communication with the adopted KHL learner's birth family) and suggested how this motivation can be utilized to help adopted KHL learners gain language they will use in real-life contexts applicable to their adoptee experience and communication needs. Tailoring curriculum in this way is a core principal of the CLT approach (Nunan, 1991; Parrish, 2004; Spada & Lightbrown, 2008).

Based on the participants' perceived influences of factors that impacted their Korean language learning, it appears that the impact of CLT activities on Korean language learning is determined by not only the CLT activity, but also the curriculum in which the activity is taught. It appears that when the overall curriculum does not follow a learner-centered, needs-driven CLT approach (Parrish, 2004), the effectiveness of the CLT activity is diminished.

Summary

Based on quantitative data collected through the self-assessment questionnaire and qualitative data from the interview responses from participants, it appears that four classroom factors impact Korean language learning by adopted KHL learners during CLT activities. These factors include: adopted KHL learner interactions with KFL and KHL learners, the classroom environment created by the Korean instructor, instruction in how to engage in CLT activities, and tailoring of the curriculum to include content specific to the real-life language needs of adopted KHL learners.

When CLT activities were done in an environment that contextualized the classroom environment and instruction to adopted KHL learner needs, there was a correlation between CLT activities and increased Korean language. Therefore, the data suggests the greater issue at hand is a lack of contextualized language teaching in the Korean language classroom. When this is missing, the effectiveness of all language teaching and activities appear to be lessened. In Chapter 5, I will discuss the findings in light of research and I will present implications for the results of this study.

CHAPTER FIVE: CONCLUSIONS

Over the last ten years, proficiency in the Korean language has been a goal that I have strived to attain. As an adopted KHL learner, I was highly motivated to learn the language and I believed that in doing so, I would regain a piece of my identity that I felt was lost. Interspersed between years of learning Korean, I began teaching English as a second language. MAESL coursework and my own frustrations with learning Korean led me to reflect on how the Korean language teaching methods I experienced may not have taken into consideration the different needs of the adopted KHL learner. Research surrounding the CLT approach was of particular importance to me because it is based in activities that center on communication, which was my primary goal for learning Korean. The significance of the CLT approach to my own language learning stayed with me as I considered the topic of this capstone. The purpose of my study was to investigate the question: What impact do activities based in the CLT approach have on Korean language learning by the adopted KHL learner?

In this chapter, I will share reflections, discuss implications, consider limitations of the study, make recommendations for further research on this topic, and present concluding remarks about the research.

Reflections

The aim of this case study was to understand factors that impact language learning during CLT activities as well as to explore the overall impact of CLT activities on the language learning of four adult adopted KHL learners. Although specific to CLT activities, the information gained through the study encompassed the whole of what it means to be an internationally adopted person studying his/her heritage language. The themes discussed by the four participants shed light on how adopted KHL learners incorporate the Korean language into their existing language and Korean adoptee identity. The themes also reveal challenges faced by adopted KHL learners due to a number of factors present in the Korean language classroom.

Although some CLT activities had a high impact on language learning by adopted KHL learners, it appears that the philosophical basis for the CLT approach (Krashen, 1980; Nunan, 1991; Parrish, 2004; Spada & Lightbrown, 2008) was not always sustained in the Korean language classroom. The lack of a CLT foundation for CLT activities often created a mismatch between what the CLT activity was supposed to accomplish and what it actually accomplished. Without a learner-centered, learner-needs driven environment and curriculum, individual CLT activities did not necessarily strengthen the learner's communicative abilities and transfer into real world contexts (Nunan, 1991). As described by the case study's participants, these needs included: strategies in how to communicatively interact with learners who have differing L1's and who are KHL learners, lessons using orthographic diagrams to learn how to shape the mouth and tongue

to produce unfamiliar Korean sounds, curriculum sensitive to the adoptive and birth family dichotomy of an adopted KHL learner, and Korean language to communicate with birth families.

Implications

The quantitative and qualitative data gained through this study point to three areas that impact language learning during CLT activities. These include: (1) how much of the Korean language instruction is contextualized to the real-life needs of adopted KHL learners and their purposes for using Korean (2) proper training of students in the purpose of CLT activities and (3) how to effectively communicate with other learners in the classroom. The overall impact of CLT activities on the language gains of the four adult participants appears to be connected to whether the Korean language instructor had created a learning environment that considered the background of the adopted KHL learner in all facets of instruction and interaction in the classroom.

The factors that impact Korean language learning point to five implications that need to be considered when using CLT activities with adopted KHL learners: (1) Examination of All Students' Language Profiles (2) Inclusion of Instruction on How to Engage in CLT Activities (3) Cultural Training for Korean Instructors (4) Enhancement of Learners Own Personal Experiences (5) Contextualized Classroom Curriculum.

Examination of All Student Language Profiles

When the environment created in the classroom was overwhelming for the learner, language learning was impeded, even if the CLT activity provided an opportunity

for meaningful practice. Excerpts 1 and 4 from Kim and Sarah's interview data revealed that the presence of KHL learners and KFL learners of polar L1's could inhibit adopted KHL learners' language acquisition as a result of raising learners' affective filter (Krashen, 1980). However, Ryan's experience in his first Korean course and Sarah's experience in her current Korean language course indicate that when learner-centered CLT activities are used in an environment that accounts for differences in learners and contextualizes the CLT activity to specific learner needs, adopted KHL learners' affective filter may be lowered. A low affective filter would allow adopted KHL learners to communicate and participate most fully in the CLT activity, leading to greater gains in language (Bogaards, Andersen & Krashen, 1992; Krashen, 1980; Lightbrown & Spada, 1999).

Furthermore, examining potential students' learner profiles and Korean skill levels to create two tracks for KHL learners is another way to improve instruction both inside and outside of CLT activities (Lee, 2000). In the study, Ryan's first Korean course was part of a two-track program. He reported that the two-track language course was the most effective Korean class he had taken in the last 10 years and he credited much of his knowledge of Korean through level 3 to the course. There is a stark difference in success levels when comparing Ryan's perceived learning and overall experience in the two-track course to Sarah and Kim's experiences in single track Korean courses. In Sarah's account of her first Korean language class, it was her interactions with KHL learners that created an unfriendly, competitive learning environment that ultimately caused many other adopted KHL learners to drop out of the course. Similarly, Kim's frustrating

interactions with other KFL students of differing L1 languages lead to her distaste for role-play and dialogue CLT activities because of the ineffective communication during these student-student interactions. How interaction between all members of the classroom, instructors and students occurs and is encouraged has a profound influence on language learning (Allwright, 1984). When designing Korean language programs, the language profiles of all potential students needs to be considered. Specifically, questions such as whether KHL and adopted KHL learners should be placed in classes together or how to group students so that some students of similar L1 languages are present in each class needs to be examined.

Inclusion of Instruction on How to Engage in CLT Activities

The adopted KHL learners in this study often understood the premise behind why they were doing a CLT task, for example practicing a role-play dialogue with a classmate, but the learning was minimized and sometimes blocked. In Kim's Excerpt 3 example, language was not learned because the role-play partners could not understand each other due to errors in pronunciation, stemming from a differing L1. The communication break-down could have been a moment to practice clarification language and real-life applicability on what to do when you don't understand what the other person is saying. Instead this was a frustrating experience that seems to have lowered learner motivation for future CLT role playing activities and has the potential to create a stressful and unfriendly classroom environment.

Bejarano et. al (1997) addressed similar problems of learner interaction during CLT activities in their study. Their research has shown that training students in the

Skilled Use of Interaction Strategies (SUIS) promotes effective interaction between learners during CLT activities (Bejarano et. al, 1997). Specifically, SUIS teaches students how to negotiate for meaning and how to engage in interaction that is cohesive and understandable (Bejarano et. al p.212, 1997) Their results indicate that teaching learners strategies for communicating with classmates enabled the learners to produce more comprehensible input and output during CLT activities (Bejarano et al,1997). A side benefit of this was that students learned they needed to take responsibility for their own interaction, empowering them during exchanges rather than leaving them feeling Kim's sentiments of frustration and powerlessness due to the break-down in communication during discussions and partner dialogues. Instruction in SUIS would also educate learners like Megan who struggled in how to gauge their time during CLT activities, so that interactions are spontaneous conversations rather than repeated dialogues. Strategy instruction would likely lead to more spontaneous input and output by both partners, while also helping the partners to predict the remaining time they had for spontaneous conversation practice.

Cultural Training for Korean Instructors

Within the Korean classroom there should be an environment that is sensitive to the socio-psychological needs of adopted KHL learners. As underscored in Higgins & Stoker's study of KAD women, the adopted KHL learner experiences a continuous sense of loss while learning the Korean language. The KAD women describe the loss as embodying country, identity, culture and language (2011). In Excerpt 9 and Excerpt 10, Kim states similar sentiments when describing struggles she had in her Korean

classroom. Kim speaks of the challenges she faced in overcoming hurtful comments by her instructors and frustrations with her instructor's lack of awareness, respect and sensitivity to her life experiences as a Korean adopted person. The results of the present case study and Higgins & Stoker's (2011) research point to the need for Korean instructors to be educated about the socio-psychological needs and cultural differences of adopted KHL learners. With cultural sensitivity training, negative experiences like those described by Kim could be avoided. Through training, the instructor would learn about the personal nature of such words as *adopted child* and *original family* and this would help them to recognize the significance of the word child and original family to the adopted KHL learner.

Enhancement of Learners Own Personal Experiences

In Excerpt 14, Kim shares about how she struggled when Korean instructors would present her with lessons or assignments that required her to talk about elements of her life that she was uncomfortable sharing. These topics included her adoptive and birth families, which she felt were loaded topics. In order to avoid sharing her private emotions in class, she was forced to make up stories. The experience appears to have created a relationship between Kim and her instructor that did not demonstrate mutual understanding or respect of life experience and culture. A student-teacher relationship that does not include respect and understanding of learners' experiences likely had detrimental effects on language learning during CLT activities. On the contrary, an enhancement of the learner's own personal experiences as important contributing elements to classroom learning is a feature of CLT instruction (Nunan, 1991; Parrish,

2004). It is possible that the instructor did not know the subject of family was a sensitive subject. However, awareness and understanding of students' life experiences should be a goal of a good language teacher. As such, Korean instructors should examine their openness to cross-cultural understanding in the case of adopted KHL learners. They should also explore whether their teaching practices take thoughtful consideration of students' lived experiences.

Contextualized Classroom Curriculum

Results of this study reveal that, rather than basing curriculum around what most KHL learners need, it is more helpful to the adopted KHL learner if the instructor makes a concerted effort to teach to the individual needs of adopted KHL learners as much as possible. Individualized instruction is a tenant of the CLT approach (Lightbrown & Spada, 1999; Nunan, 1991; Parrish, 2004).

In the case study, all of the participants describe concepts and content areas that are of particular interest to adopted KHL learners due to a lack of exposure to Korean and other factors present in the international adoptee experience. Some of these include: how to communicate using informal speech, Korean family names and associations, pronunciation instruction using orthographic diagrams, and how to describe oneself as a Korean adoptee. Contextualizing the curriculum to the specific needs of adopted KHL learners improves learner attitudes during CLT activities and aids the learner in his/her ability to use their language knowledge in communicative speaking tasks.

In their study, Kagan & Dillon (2001) examined how the inclusion of high levels of instruction in orthographic spelling rules for reading and writing were often found in classes comprised of many KHL learners. The researchers noted that more orthographic errors were made by KHL learners than by KFL learners. The difference in learning and instructional need was attributed to KHL learners' verbal competence from childhood and continued exposure to Korean and, thus heavy reliance on their previously learned verbal cues when they write or spell (Kagan & Dillon, 2001; Pyun & Lee-Smith, 2011). Kagan & Dillon (2001) believed that although spelling rules have to be taught to both learner groups, KHL learners needed more instruction to achieve accuracy than KFL learners. In other words, the exposure to L2 oral language that most KHL learners experience can have a negative impact on orthographic competence because these learners often write the way they speak (Lowen, 2008; Pyun & Lee-Smith, 2011; Ree, 1998). Subsequently, KHL classrooms often provided more extensive instruction in orthography and written Korean *Hangul* because spelling and writing are areas of great hindrance to the majority of KHL learners. However, I would posit that because the Korean adoptee's sociolinguistic and cultural experience relates more closely to a KFL learner of Korean who has limited to no verbal competence, the instructional emphasis on orthographic errors is lost. As described by Megan in Excerpt 13, other areas such as pronunciation and oral language proficiency are more concerning to adopted KHL learners because they lack the day-to-day exposure to the Korean language for purposes of general communication. Korean instructors need to view the adopted KHL learner as a unique subset of the KHL learner population, with needs and experiences significantly

different than those of other KHL learners. Curriculum used in instructing the adopted KHL learner population should encompass content that is relevant to the needs and lived experiences of the adopted KHL learner.

Limitations of the Study

This case study has five main limitations: (1) the study did not account for motivational factors that arose from the semi-structured interviews (2) the size of the participant sample was small (3) the study was comprised of only adult adopted KHL learners (4) there were great lengths of time between participants' Korean language study and the case study (5) there was a difference in learning context between a KFL classroom in the U.S. and a KFL classroom in Korea.

First, the study was unable to conclusively determine that CLT activities had a positive impact on language learning by the adopted KHL learner. This was due in part to the many motivational factors associated with the way the CLT activity was implemented and the classroom environment where the learner took part in the activity. The study was limited because the guiding question did not account for the additional motivational factors and themes that surfaced from the semi-structured interviews or the mismatch between the CLT activity and a lack of appropriate implementation of the CLT approach. Furthermore, the case study did not look at how motivational factors and CLT implementation may have had a greater impact on language learning than the actual CLT activity. Although motivational factors altered the study's conclusiveness, it was discovered that the three themes of (1) Korean curriculum and the

effectiveness of CLT activities (2) Classroom environment challenges, and (3) Different types of learners in the classroom align perfectly to Dornyei's (1990, 1994, 2009) work on the dynamic relationship between course-specific, teacher-specific and group-specific motivational components.

Second, the fact that this study included only four adopted KHL learners is limiting. As noted in Chapter One, since the start of international Korean adoption, over 200,000 children have been adopted. My sampling does not come close to representing the Korean language experiences of this population, however, it does provide a glimpse into the experiences adopted KHL learners may have with learning Korean.

Third, the study only looked at the adult adopted KHL learner. There are many Korean language classes offered to child and teenage adopted KHL learners both in the U.S. and in Korea (Evan B. Donaldson Adoption Institute, 2009). I will discuss how this population could be studied in the next section on ideas for further study.

Fourth, each of the four participants had significant gaps in time since study of Korean and they often had gaps in time between programs of study. Due to this, memories of CLT classroom experiences may be blurred and details lost. One way this could be eliminated is to complete the study on learners who are currently enrolled in a Korean language course.

Fifth, the participants in this study took part in Korean language courses in the U.S. and in Korea. The cultural and educational differences between the programs add variables to the study that have impacted results.

Recommendations for Further Research

Through this case study I have become aware of many dynamics that need to be considered in instructing the Korean language to adopted KHL learners using CLT activities. I believe valuable areas for future research include:

1. How does learning Korean in the adopted KHL learner's adoptive country (or specifically the U.S.) compare with learning in Korea?
2. How can the CLT approach be fully implemented in adoptive country (U.S.) and Korea contexts?
3. Does a content-based instructional approach meet the specific Korean language needs of adopted KHL learners?
4. How does Dornyei's (1990, 1994, 2009) conclusion about motivational factors and the dynamic process of language learning relate to the instructional needs of the adopted KHL learner?

First, further research needs to be done in the specific context differences presented in Korean language classrooms in the U.S. vs. classrooms in Korea. Additionally, how other language learners, society, culture and the needs of the adopted KHL learner change in the two contexts would benefit from further study.

Second, research in how the CLT approach can be fully implemented in each context (U.S. and Korea) needs further investigation. Included in this research would be studies on how SUIS training for students could be incorporated into lessons to aid students in training for interaction in CLT activities.

Third, further research could be done on whether content-based instruction (CBI) would be a successful and feasible way to incorporate teaching to specific adopted KHL learner needs. Within ESL education CBI may be offered as a pre-academic ESL class to help students prepare for the rigors of an academic course, or as a citizenship class to prepare students for U.S. citizenship requirements (Parrish, 2004). While both of these examples differ from the needs of adopted KHL learners, a strength of this type of instruction is that language is taught through content that is meaningful and relevant to students' lives (Parrish, 2004; Spada & Lightbrown, 2008). Based on the interviews with adopted KHL participants in the case study, I believe a content-based Korean language course might aid in meeting the language goals of many adopted KHL learners. I have considered possible themes for course content based on Kim's response in Excerpt 15 and other participants' sentiments. Possible course content includes: how to communicate in Korean using informal speech, Korean biological family tree names and associations (in Korean there are different names given to the father's and mother's side of the family), how to describe oneself as a Korean adoptee, vocabulary related to birth family search needs, and how and who to ask for personal documents related to the adopted KHL learner's adoption.

Fourth, outside of the guiding question, this case study revealed motivating factors related to the adopted KHL learners' acquisition of the Korean language. Identification of motivation factors was unexpected, but provided a great deal of information about how motivation factors impact language learning among the adopted KHL learner population. The results of the semi-structured interview aligned closely with the dynamic process of language learning proposed by Dornyei (1990, 1994, 2009). Further study needs to be done on how Dornyei's (1994) three sets of motivation components relate to the instructional needs of adopted KHL learners.

It is immediately apparent that Dornyei's motivation components: (1) course-specific motivation e.g. the syllabus, teaching materials, teaching method, and learning tasks (2) teacher-specific motivation e.g. the teacher's personality, teaching style, feedback, and relationship with the students and (3) group-specific motivation e.g. the dynamics of the learning group tie directly to many of the language learning needs identified by the adopted KHL learners in this case study. Table 5.1 below displays possible avenues for future research pertaining to how Dornyei's (1990, 1994, 2009) conclusions about the dynamic process of language learning relate to the adopted KHL learner language needs identified in this study.

Table 5.1

Semi-Structured Interview Results and Dornyei's Corresponding Motivational Components (Dorneyi, 1994)

Motivational Components	**Dornyei's Examples**	**Interview Themes**
Course-Specific	Syllabus Teaching Materials Teaching Methods Learning Tasks	Korean curriculum and the effectiveness of CLT activities
Teacher-Specific	Teacher's Personality Teaching Style Feedback Relationship with Students	Classroom environment challenges
Group-Specific	Dynamics of the learning group	Different types of learners in the classroom

Concluding Remarks

As an adopted KHL learner, this case study became an extension of my own journey of finding a place to belong within the two worlds of Korea and America. The research I completed for the literature review and the responses from the adopted KHL learner participants in my case study are an inspiration to me. First of all, the stories I encountered resonated within me and helped me to see that I am not unlike other adopted KHL learners. As I reflect upon this, I feel that I now have companions on my language journey. The stories also inspire me to share what I have learned about adopted KHL

learners, the need for contextualized instruction, and how CLT activities need to be used with these learners. I believe viewing Korean language learning as a collective, shared experience by adopted KHL learners is what will provide a voice to the needs of adopted KHL and other adopted HL learners. My hope is that the collective adoptive HL learner voice will result in changes in how heritage languages are taught in the U.S., Korea and around the world.

The extent to which I will communicate using Korean has changed through writing this capstone and through recent events in my life. Since beginning this capstone over two years ago, I have become a mother. Motherhood has changed me in many ways, but one that was unexpected is my determination to not only learn Korean for myself, but also for my daughter. I want to be able to pass down the language and culture of both my families: birth and adoptive, Korean culture and American culture, Korean and English. My daughter gives me new resolve to learn Korean and to be informed about the most effective ways to instruct her in learning the language. Korean is a heritage I do not want to be lost and it is language I want to be able to share with her. I plan to look into options for Korean language instruction in the coming year.

As an English as a second language (ESL) teacher, I plan on incorporating what I learned about the importance of contextualizing curriculum and lessons to student needs and individual life experiences into my classroom. Because of this capstone I believe I am more sensitive to the life circumstances and struggles of my students. On a personal level I will be able to relate to their need for learner-centered instruction.

Summary

In the study, I looked at how the use of CLT activities in the classroom impacted the Korean language skills of four adopted KHL learners. CLT activities can aid in increasing learners' communicative speaking abilities, if the activities are done in a classroom environment that is contextualized to the individual needs of adopted KHL learners. I also learned that other issues appear to impact adopted KHL learning both inside and outside of CLT activities. These issues include: interactions between the adopted KHL learner and other classroom learners and the instructor, the cultural understanding of the instructor as it relates to the socio-psychological needs of the adopted KHL learner, enhancement of the adopted KHL learner's personal experiences, and contextualized curriculum that considers adopted KHL learners' lived experience and purposes for learning Korean. When most of these outside issues appeared to be considerations of the instructor, perceived learning and the self-reported proficiency of the adopted KHL learner increased. It appears that CLT activities are beneficial to increasing the communicative skills of the adopted KHL learner and that thoughtful incorporation of CLT activities into the Korean language classroom is needed.

REFERENCES

Adoptive Families Magazine. South Korean Adoption. http://www.adoptivefamilies.com/korea_adoption.php

Allwright, R. L. (1984). The importance of interaction in classroom language learning. *Applied Linguistics, 5*(2), 156-171.

American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages. ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines: Speaking. Retrieved May 18, 2013 from http://actflproficiencyguidelines2012.org/speaking

Bejarano, Y., Levine, T., Olshtain, E., & Steiner, J. (1997). The skilled use of interaction strategies: Creating a framework for improved small-group communicative interaction in the language classroom. *System*, 25(2), 203-214.

Bogaards, P., Andersen, E. S., & Krashen, S. D. [. (1992). Developing communicative competence in a second language. *Applied Linguistics, 13*(3), 322-323.

Carreira, M., & Kagan, O. (2001). The results of the national heritage language survey: Implications for teaching, curriculum design, and professional development. *Foreign Language Annals, 44*(1), 40-64.

Celce-Murcia, M., Brinton, D.M., & Goodwin, J.M. (1996). *Teaching pronunciation: A reference for teachers of English to speakers of other languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Celce-Murcia, M., Dornyei, Z., & Thurrell, S. (1997). Direct approaches in L2 instruction: A turning point in communicative language teaching? *TESOL Quarterly, 31*(1), 141-152.

Chaudron, C. (1988). *Second language classrooms: Research on teaching and learning.* New York, NY: Cambridge U Press.

Comanaru, R. & Noels, K. (2009). Self-determination, motivation, and the learning of Chinese as a heritage language [Electronic version]. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, September, 131-158.

DiGregorio, D. (2009). The phenomenon of international adoption with a focus on second language acquisition: A case study of internationally adopted children and adolescents from Russia. (Ph.D., Indiana University of Pennsylvania). *ProQuest Dissertations and Theses*

Dornyei, Z. (1990). Conceptualizing Motivation in Foreign Language Learning. [Electronic version]. *Language Learning, 40*(4), 45-78.

Dornyei, Z. (1994). Understanding L2 motivation: On with the challenge! [Electronic version]. *The Modern Language Journal, 78*(4), 515-523.

Dornyei, Z. (2009). Individual differences: Interplay of learner characteristics and learning environment. [Electronic version]. *Language Learning, 59*(s1), 230-248.

Ellis, R. (2006). Researching the effects of form-focused instruction on L2 acquisition [Electronic version]. *AILA Review, 19*, 18-41.

Ellis, R., Basturkmen, H., & Loewen, S. (2001). Learner uptake in communicative ESL lessons [Electronic version]. *Language Learning, 51*(2), 281-318.

Ellis, R., Basturkmen, H., & Loewen, S. (2002). Doing focus-on-form [Electronic version]. *System, 30*(4), 419-432.

Evan B. Donaldson Adoption Institute. The Gathering of the First Generation of Adult Korean Adoptees. 2000. Retrieved August 18, 2010 from http://www.adoptioninstitute.org/proed/korfindings.html

Evan B. Donaldson Adoption Institute. International Adoption Facts. Retrieved August 18, 2010 http://www.adoptioninstitute.org/FactOverview/international.html

Evan B. Donaldson Adoption Institute. Beyond Culture Camp [Electronic version]. 2009.

Gass, S. M., & Varonis, E. M. (1994). Input, interaction, and second language production [Electronic version]. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 16*(3), 283-302.

Higgins, C., & Stoker, K. (2011). Language learning as a site for belonging: A narrative analysis of Korean adoptee-returnees. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 14*(4), 399-412.

Hyltenstam, K. & Abrahamsson, N. (2003b). Maturational constraints in SLA. In C. Doughty & M. Long (eds), *Handbook of second language acquisition*, 539-588. Oxford: Blackwell.

Hyltenstam, K., Bylund, E., Abrahamsson, N. & Park, H. (2009). Dominant-language replacement: The case of international adoptees [Electronic version]. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition,* 12(2), 121-140.

Jo, H. (2001). 'Heritage' language learning and ethnic identity: Korean Americans' struggle with language authorities [Electronic version]. *Language, Culture and Curriculum, 14*(1), 26-41.

Jo, H. (2002). Negotiating ethnic identity in the college Korean language classes [Electronic version]. *Identities: Global Studies in Culture and Power, 9*(1), 87-115.

Joo, H. (2009). Literacy practices and heritage language maintenance: The case of Korean-American immigrant adolescents [Electronic version]. *Journal of Asian Pacific Communication, 19*(1), 76-99.

Kang, H. (2010). Negative evidence and its explicitness and positioning in the learning of Korean as a heritage language [Electronic version]. *The Modern Language Journal, 94*(4), 582-599.

Kondo-Brown, K. (2005). Differences in language skills: Heritage language learner subgroups and foreign language learners [Electronic version]. *The Modern Language Journal, 89*(4), 563-581.

Kong, G. (2011). The roles of attitude, motivation, and identity in heritage language learning among Korean Americans [Electronic version]. *Teachers College, Columbia University Working Papers in TESOL & Applied Linguistics, 11*(2), 94-119.

Krashen, S. (1980). The input hypothesis. *Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics*

Lee, C. (2000). Two-track curriculum system for university Korean language programs [Electronic version]. *Acta*

Lee, J. S. (2002). The Korean language in America: The role of cultural identity in heritage language learning [Electronic version]. *Language, Culture and Curriculum, 15*(2), 117-133.

Lee, J.S. (2005). Through the learners' eyes: Reconceptualizing the heritage and non-heritage learner of the less commonly taught languages. *Foreign Language Annals*, 38(4), 554-567.

Lee, J.S., & Shin, S.J. (2008). Korean heritage language education in the United States: The current state, opportunities, and possibilities. *Heritage Language Journal*, 6(2), 1-20.

Lee-Ellis, S. (2009). The development and validation of a Korean C-test using Rasch Analysis [Electronic version]. *Language Testing, 26*(2), 245-274.

Lightbown, P. M., & Spada, N. (1990). Focus-on-form and corrective feedback in communicative language teaching: Effects on second language learning [Electronic version]. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 12*(4), 429-448.

Lightbown, P.M. & Spada, N. (1999). *How languages are learned* (2nd ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lightbown, P. M., Spada, N., & White, L. (Eds.). (1993). The role of instruction in second language acquisition [Special issue]. Studies in Second Language Acquisition

Long, M. (1996). The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition. *In handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 413–468). New York: Academic Press.

Mackey, A., Gass, S., & McDonough, K. (2000). How do learners perceive interactional feedback? [Electronic version] *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 22*(4), 471-497.

Mackey, A. & Gass, S.M. (2005). *Second language research: Methodology and design* Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

McLaughlin, B. (1978). The monitor model: Some methodological considerations [Electronic version]. *Language Learning, 28*(2), 309-332.

Norris, J. M., & Ortega, L. (2000). Effectiveness of L2 instruction: A research synthesis and quantitative meta-analysis [Electronic version]. *Language Learning, 50*(3), 417-528.

Nunan, D. (1991). Communicative tasks and the language curriculum. *TESOL Quarterly, 25*(2), 279-295.

Office of Children's Issues: U.S. State Department. Retrieved August 15, 2010 from http://www.adoption.state.gov/news/total_chart.html

Oh, A. H. J. (2008). Into the arms of America: The Korean roots of international adoption. (Ph.D., The University of Chicago). *ProQuest Dissertations and Theses*

Pallier, C., Dehaene, S., Poline, J.-B., LeBihan, D., Argenti, A.-M., Dupoux, E. & Mehler, J. (2003). Brain imaging of language plasticity in adopted adults: Can a second language replace the first? [Electronic version] *Cerebral Cortex*, 13, 155-161.

Parrish, B. (2004). *Teaching Adult ESL*. New York, NY: Mcgraw-Hill.

Pica, T., Doughty, C., & Young, R. (1986). Making input comprehensible: Do interactional modifications help? [Electronic version] *ITL, Review of Applied Linguistics, 72*, 1-25.

Pica, T., Lincoln-Porter, F., Paninos, D., & Linnell, J. (1996). Language learners' interaction: How does it address the input, output, and feedback needs of L2 learners? [Electronic version] *TESOL Quarterly, 30*(1), 59-84.

Price, R., Pollock, K., & Kimbrough Oller, D. (2006). Speech and language development in six infants adopted from China [Electronic version]. *Journal of Multilingual*

Communication Disorders, July, 4(2) 108-127.

Pyun, D. O., & Lee-Smith, A. (2011). Reducing Korean heritage language learners' orthographic errors: The contribution of online and in-class dictation and form focused instruction. [Electronic version] *Language, Culture and Curriculum, 24*(2), 141-158.

Ree, J. (1998). Korean as a second language: How should it be taught? [Electronic version] *Acta Koreana, 1*(Aug), 85.

Schmidt, R. W., & Frota, S. N. (1986). Developing basic conversational ability in a second language: A case study of an adult learner of Portuguese. In R. R. Day (Ed.), *Talking to learn: Conversation in second language acquisition* (237-326). Rowley: Newbury House.

Singleton, D. & Ryan, L. (2004).*Language Acquisition: The Age Factor*. Clevedon: Multilingualism Matters.

Snedeker, J., Geren, J. & Shafto, C. (2007). Starting over: International adoption as a natural experiment in language development [Electronic version]. *Psychological Science*, 18(1), 79-87.

Sohn, S., & Shin, S. (2007). True beginners, false beginners, and fake beginners: Placement strategies for Korean heritage speakers. *Foreign Language Annals*, 40(3), 407-418.

Spada, N., & Lightbown, P. M. (2008). Form-focused instruction: Isolated or integrated? [Electronic version] *TESOL Quarterly*, *42*(2), 181-207.

Tarone, E. (2007). Sociolinguistic approaches to second language acquisition research-1997-2007. *The Modern Language Journal*, 91(5), 837-848.

Ventureyra, V. A. G., & Pallier, C. (2004). In search of the lost language: The case of adopted Koreans in France [Electronic version]. Netherlands

White, L. (1987). Against comprehensible input: The input hypothesis and the development of second-language competence [Electronic version]. *Applied Linguistics*, *8*(2), 95-110.

APPENDIX A

Participant Eligibility Survey

Participant Eligibility Survey

This survey was conducted over email on March 26, 2013. Results were used to determine potential participants' eligibility to meet a set of predetermined criteria to participate in the study.

Please respond yes/no to the following questions about your adoptive and Korean language learning background.

1. Were you adopted before the age of four?
2. Is your first language English? (This is not including Korean as an infant/child)
3. Did you take your first Korean language course after the age of 18?
4. Have you studied and/or worked in Korea during adulthood for a minimum of six months?

APPENDIX B

Semi-Structured Interview Questions

Semi-Structured Interview Questions

PART 1 Participant Background Questions:

Topic	**Interview Question**
Adoption	What is your age of adoption?
	Where did you grow up? How would you describe your socioeconomic upbringing?
	What is your adoptive family background? Siblings? Are there other adoptees in the family?
Education	What is your highest level of schooling completed?
Korean Language Education	What age did you begin studying Korean?
	Where have you studied Korean (institutes, US universities, Korean universities)?
	Why did you begin to study Korean? What influenced your decision?
Korean Cultural Experiences	Have you traveled to/lived in Korea? When and how long? What was your motivation?
	Do you have close relationships with Korean-speaking people (either Korean-American or native Korean)? When did these develop?

PART 2 Classroom Language Experiences Questions:

Teaching Method	**Interview Question**
Non-CLT Listening	Describe listening activities you have done in Korean language classes. For instance:
	-listening to a recorded conversation and answering questions about what was conversed
	-listening to a recorded conversation and repeating what you heard, focusing on pronunciation of the correct sounds.

	Do you feel these activities helped you learn the language? Why or why not? Did these activities occur on a daily, weekly, only a few times during the course, or never basis? Did you have required time in a listening lab?
Non-CLT Speaking	Describe speaking and pronunciation activities you have done in Korean language classes. For instance: -repetition drills of common Korean phrases and words -memorization of dialogues and repeated practice speaking the dialogues. Do you feel these activities helped you learn the language? Why or why not? Were these activities done on a daily, weekly, only a few times during the course, or never basis?
Non-CLT Reading	Describe reading activities you have done in Korean language classes. For instance: -reading Korean vocabulary word lists and memorizing definitions -reading out loud from a Korean novel and your teacher notices you have incorrectly pronounced a word and he/she stops to briefly explain the correct pronunciation. -reading silently from a Korean textbook on a lesson that focused on conjugating Korean verbs with a *pachem* in *Hangul*. Do you feel these activities helped you learn the language? Why or why not? Did these activities occur on a daily, weekly, only a few times during the course, or never basis?
Non-CLT Writing	Did your instructor ask you to complete sentences to make them grammatically correct on a daily, weekly, only a few times during the course, or never basis? If so, was this exercise helpful in learning Korean? Were these done in a workbook or as homework? If as homework, did the structured grammar practice help you understand and

	synthesize the grammar rules in way that you applied them to your own writing and speech in Korean?
	Describe writing activities you have done in Korean language classes. For instance:
	-writing the Korean alphabet, completing sentences from a workbook to make them grammatically correct
	-written quizzes where you fill-in-the- blank with a Korean vocabulary word or grammar structure.
	-writing a letter to a classmate in Korean, using a particular tense such as present tense and your instructor corrects grammar mistakes in your letter and you and your instructor/class proceed to discuss the grammar rules pertaining to the mistake. i.e.: responding to a writing prompt to write to your family about what you are currently experiencing while living in Korea using the present tense.
	-writing a letter to a classmate in Korean, using a particular tense such as present tense. i.e.: responding to a writing prompt to write to your family about what you are currently experiencing while living in Korea.
	Do you feel these activities helped you learn the language? Why or why not?
	Did this occur on a daily, weekly, only a few times during the course, or never basis?
CLT Listening	Describe hands-on activities that required you to actively communicate with your classmates. For instance: talking about one's daily schedule in Korean, greeting other classmates in Korean, role playing real-life situations like ordering food at a restaurant. Do you feel these activities helped you learn the language? Why or why not? Did this occur on a daily, weekly, only a few times during the course, or never basis?
CLT Speaking	Describe real-world speaking/pronunciation activities you have done in Korean language classes. For instance: performing a role play of a real-life conversation, field trips to practice language, such as to restaurants to practice ordering food. Do you feel these activities helped you

	learn the language? Why or why not? Did this occur on a daily, weekly, only a few times during the course, or never basis?
CLT Reading	Describe reading activities you have done in Korean language classes that required you to use communication. For instance: reading short Korean news articles and then discussing either with a partner, in a small group, or as a class. Do you feel these activities helped you learn the language? Why or why not? Did this occur on a daily, weekly, only a few times during the course, or never basis?
CLT Writing	Describe writing activities you have done that required you to use communication to complete the assignment or activity. For instance: writing a letter to a Korean friend, writing a news story for a class or school news paper. Did this occur on a daily, weekly, only a few times during the course, or never basis?

PART 3 Questionnaire follow-up Questions:

Participant questionnaires are reviewed prior to the interview. Quantitative data showing each participant's ratings of Korean language tasks they have ease and difficulty completing is noted. This data is discussed with the participant during Part 3 of the interview using the following questions as a stimulus. Both the researcher and the participant have a copy of the questionnaire at the time of the interview.

1. Why do you think you are strong or weak in (<u>the particular language task we are discussing, i.e.: Count to 10 in Korean)?</u>
2. If they are weak in the task: What may have helped you to learn it?
   If they are strong in the task: What helped you to learn it?

APPENDIX C

American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL)

Speaking Proficiency Guidelines

American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL)

Speaking Proficiency Guidelines

The ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines 2012 – Speaking describe five major levels of proficiency: Distinguished, Superior, Advanced, Intermediate, and Novice. The description of each major level is representative of a specific range of abilities. Together these levels form a hierarchy in which each level subsumes all lower levels. The major levels Advanced, Intermediate, and Novice are divided into High, Mid, and Low sublevels.

The Guidelines describe the tasks that speakers can handle at each level, as well as the content, context, accuracy, and discourse types associated with tasks at each level. They also present the limits that speakers encounter when attempting to function at the next higher major level.

These Guidelines can be used to evaluate speech that is either Interpersonal (interactive, two-way communication) or Presentational (one-way, non-interactive).

The written descriptions of speaking proficiency are accompanied online by speech samples illustrating the features of each major level.

The ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines 2012 – Speaking may be used for non-profit, educational purposes only, provided that they are reproduced in their entirety, with no alterations, and with credit to ACTFL.

DISTINGUISHED

Speakers at the Distinguished level are able to use language skillfully, and with accuracy, efficiency, and effectiveness. They are educated and articulate users of the language. They can reflect on a wide range of global issues and highly abstract concepts in a culturally appropriate manner. Distinguished-level speakers can use persuasive and hypothetical discourse for representational purposes, allowing them to advocate a point of view that is not necessarily their own. They can tailor language to a variety of audiences by adapting their speech and register in ways that are culturally authentic.

Speakers at the Distinguished level produce highly sophisticated and tightly organized extended discourse. At the same time, they can speak succinctly, often using cultural and historical references to allow them to say less and mean more. At this level, oral discourse typically resembles written discourse.

A non-native accent, a lack of a native-like economy of expression, a limited control of deeply embedded cultural references, and/or an occasional isolated language error may

still be present at this level.

SUPERIOR

Speakers at the Superior level are able to communicate with accuracy and fluency in order to participate fully and effectively in conversations on a variety of topics in formal and informal settings from both concrete and abstract perspectives. They discuss their interests and special fields of competence, explain complex matters in detail, and provide lengthy and coherent narrations, all with ease, fluency, and accuracy. They present their opinions on a number of issues of interest to them, such as social and political issues, and provide structured arguments to support these opinions. They are able to construct and develop hypotheses to explore alternative possibilities.

When appropriate, these speakers use extended discourse without unnaturally lengthy hesitation to make their point, even when engaged in abstract elaborations. Such discourse, while coherent, may still be influenced by language patterns other than those of the target language. Superior-level speakers employ a variety of interactive and discourse strategies, such as turn-taking and separating main ideas from supporting information through the use of syntactic, lexical, and phonetic devices.

Speakers at the Superior level demonstrate no pattern of error in the use of basic structures, although they may make sporadic errors, particularly in low-frequency structures and in complex high-frequency structures. Such errors, if they do occur, do not distract the native interlocutor or interfere with communication.

ADVANCED

Speakers at the Advanced level engage in conversation in a clearly participatory manner in order to communicate information on autobiographical topics, as well as topics of community, national, or international interest. The topics are handled concretely by means of narration and description in the major times frames of past, present, and future. These speakers can also deal with a social situation with an unexpected complication. The language of Advanced-level speakers is abundant, the oral paragraph being the measure of Advanced-level length and discourse. Advanced-level speakers have sufficient control of basic structures and generic vocabulary to be understood by native speakers of the language, including those unaccustomed to non-native speech.

Advanced High

Speakers at the Advanced High sublevel perform all Advanced-level tasks with linguistic ease, confidence, and competence. They are consistently able to explain in detail and narrate fully and accurately in all time frames. In addition, Advanced High speakers handle the tasks pertaining to the Superior level but cannot sustain performance at that level across a variety of topics. They may provide a structured argument to support their opinions, and they may construct hypotheses, but

patterns of error appear. They can discuss some topics abstractly, especially those relating to their particular interests and special fields of expertise, but in general, they are more comfortable discussing a variety of topics concretely.

Advanced High speakers may demonstrate a well-developed ability to compensate for an imperfect grasp of some forms or for limitations in vocabulary by the confident use of communicative strategies, such as paraphrasing, circumlocution, and illustration. They use precise vocabulary and intonation to express meaning and often show great fluency and ease of speech. However, when called on to perform the complex tasks associated with the Superior level over a variety of topics, their language will at times break down or prove inadequate, or they may avoid the task altogether, for example, by resorting to simplification through the use of description or narration in place of argument or hypothesis.

Advanced Mid

Speakers at the Advanced Mid sublevel are able to handle with ease and confidence a large number of communicative tasks. They participate actively in most informal and some formal exchanges on a variety of concrete topics relating to work, school, home, and leisure activities, as well as topics relating to events of current, public, and personal interest or individual relevance.

Advanced Mid speakers demonstrate the ability to narrate and describe in the major time frames of past, present, and future by providing a full account, with good control of aspect. Narration and description tend to be combined and interwoven to relate relevant and supporting facts in connected, paragraph-length discourse.

Advanced Mid speakers can handle successfully and with relative ease the linguistic challenges presented by a complication or unexpected turn of events that occurs within the context of a routine situation or communicative task with which they are otherwise familiar. Communicative strategies such as circumlocution or rephrasing are often employed for this purpose. The speech of Advanced Mid speakers performing Advanced-level tasks is marked by substantial flow. Their vocabulary is fairly extensive although primarily generic in nature, except in the case of a particular area of specialization or interest. Their discourse may still reflect the oral paragraph structure of their own language rather than that of the target language.

Advanced Mid speakers contribute to conversations on a variety of familiar topics, dealt with concretely, with much accuracy, clarity and precision, and they convey their intended message without misrepresentation or confusion. They are readily understood by native speakers unaccustomed to dealing with non-natives. When called on to perform functions or handle topics associated with the Superior

level, the quality and/or quantity of their speech will generally decline.

Advanced Low
Speakers at the Advanced Low sublevel are able to handle a variety of communicative tasks. They are able to participate in most informal and some formal conversations on topics related to school, home, and leisure activities. They can also speak about some topics related to employment, current events, and matters of public and community interest.

Advanced Low speakers demonstrate the ability to narrate and describe in the major time frames of past, present, and future in paragraph-length discourse with some control of aspect. In these narrations and descriptions, Advanced Low speakers combine and link sentences into connected discourse of paragraph length, although these narrations and descriptions tend to be handled separately rather than interwoven. They can handle appropriately the essential linguistic challenges presented by a complication or an unexpected turn of events.

Responses produced by Advanced Low speakers are typically not longer than a single paragraph. The speaker's dominant language may be evident in the use of false cognates, literal translations, or the oral paragraph structure of that language. At times their discourse may be minimal for the level, marked by an irregular flow, and containing noticeable self-correction. More generally, the performance of Advanced Low speakers tends to be uneven.

Advanced Low speech is typically marked by a certain grammatical roughness (e.g., inconsistent control of verb endings), but the overall performance of the Advanced-level tasks is sustained, albeit minimally. The vocabulary of Advanced Low speakers often lacks specificity. Nevertheless, Advanced Low speakers are able to use communicative strategies such as rephrasing and circumlocution.

Advanced Low speakers contribute to the conversation with sufficient accuracy, clarity, and precision to convey their intended message without misrepresentation or confusion. Their speech can be understood by native speakers unaccustomed to dealing with non-natives, even though this may require some repetition or restatement. When attempting to perform functions or handle topics associated with the Superior level, the linguistic quality and quantity of their speech will deteriorate significantly.

INTERMEDIATE

Speakers at the Intermediate level are distinguished primarily by their ability to create with the language when talking about familiar topics related to their daily life. They are able to recombine learned material in order to express personal meaning. Intermediate-level speakers can ask simple questions and can handle a straightforward survival situation. They produce sentence-level language, ranging from discrete sentences to

strings of sentences, typically in present time. Intermediate-level speakers are understood by interlocutors who are accustomed to dealing with non-native learners of the language.

Intermediate High

Intermediate High speakers are able to converse with ease and confidence when dealing with the routine tasks and social situations of the Intermediate level. They are able to handle successfully uncomplicated tasks and social situations requiring an exchange of basic information related to their work, school, recreation, particular interests, and areas of competence.

Intermediate High speakers can handle a substantial number of tasks associated with the Advanced level, but they are unable to sustain performance of all of these tasks all of the time. Intermediate High speakers can narrate and describe in all major time frames using connected discourse of paragraph length, but not all the time. Typically, when Intermediate High speakers attempt to perform Advanced-level tasks, their speech exhibits one or more features of breakdown, such as the failure to carry out fully the narration or description in the appropriate major time frame, an inability to maintain paragraph-length discourse, or a reduction in breadth and appropriateness of vocabulary.

Intermediate High speakers can generally be understood by native speakers unaccustomed to dealing with non-natives, although interference from another language may be evident (e.g., use of code-switching, false cognates, literal translations), and a pattern of gaps in communication may occur.

Intermediate Mid

Speakers at the Intermediate Mid sublevel are able to handle successfully a variety of uncomplicated communicative tasks in straightforward social situations. Conversation is generally limited to those predictable and concrete exchanges necessary for survival in the target culture. These include personal information related to self, family, home, daily activities, interests and personal preferences, as well as physical and social needs, such as food, shopping, travel, and lodging.

Intermediate Mid speakers tend to function reactively, for example, by responding to direct questions or requests for information. However, they are capable of asking a variety of questions when necessary to obtain simple information to satisfy basic needs, such as directions, prices, and services. When called on to perform functions or handle topics at the Advanced level, they provide some information but have difficulty linking ideas, manipulating time and aspect, and using communicative strategies, such as circumlocution.

Intermediate Mid speakers are able to express personal meaning by creating with the language, in part by combining and recombining known elements and conversational input to produce responses typically consisting of sentences and

strings of sentences. Their speech may contain pauses, reformulations, and self-corrections as they search for adequate vocabulary and appropriate language forms to express themselves. In spite of the limitations in their vocabulary and/or pronunciation and/or grammar and/or syntax, Intermediate Mid speakers are generally understood by sympathetic interlocutors accustomed to dealing with non-natives.

Overall, Intermediate Mid speakers are at ease when performing Intermediate-level tasks and do so with significant quantity and quality of Intermediate-level language.

Intermediate Low

Speakers at the Intermediate Low sublevel are able to handle successfully a limited number of uncomplicated communicative tasks by creating with the language in straightforward social situations. Conversation is restricted to some of the concrete exchanges and predictable topics necessary for survival in the target-language culture. These topics relate to basic personal information; for example, self and family, some daily activities and personal preferences, and some immediate needs, such as ordering food and making simple purchases. At the Intermediate Low sublevel, speakers are primarily reactive and struggle to answer direct questions or requests for information. They are also able to ask a few appropriate questions. Intermediate Low speakers manage to sustain the functions of the Intermediate level, although just barely.

Intermediate Low speakers express personal meaning by combining and recombining what they know and what they hear from their interlocutors into short statements and discrete sentences. Their responses are often filled with hesitancy and inaccuracies as they search for appropriate linguistic forms and vocabulary while attempting to give form to the message. Their speech is characterized by frequent pauses, ineffective reformulations and self-corrections. Their pronunciation, vocabulary, and syntax are strongly influenced by their first language. In spite of frequent misunderstandings that may require repetition or rephrasing, Intermediate Low speakers can generally be understood by sympathetic interlocutors, particularly by those accustomed to dealing with non-natives.

NOVICE

Novice-level speakers can communicate short messages on highly predictable, everyday topics that affect them directly. They do so primarily through the use of isolated words and phrases that have been encountered, memorized, and recalled. Novice-level speakers may be difficult to understand even by the most sympathetic interlocutors accustomed to non-native speech.

Novice High
Speakers at the Novice High sublevel are able to handle a variety of tasks pertaining to the Intermediate level, but are unable to sustain performance at that level. They are able to manage successfully a number of uncomplicated communicative tasks in straightforward social situations. Conversation is restricted to a few of the predictable topics necessary for survival in the target language culture, such as basic personal information, basic objects, and a limited number of activities, preferences, and immediate needs. Novice High speakers respond to simple, direct questions or requests for information. They are also able to ask a few formulaic questions.

Novice High speakers are able to express personal meaning by relying heavily on learned phrases or recombinations of these and what they hear from their interlocutor. Their language consists primarily of short and sometimes incomplete sentences in the present, and may be hesitant or inaccurate. On the other hand, since their language often consists of expansions of learned material and stock phrases, they may sometimes sound surprisingly fluent and accurate. Pronunciation, vocabulary, and syntax may be strongly influenced by the first language. Frequent misunderstandings may arise but, with repetition or rephrasing, Novice High speakers can generally be understood by sympathetic interlocutors used to non-natives. When called on to handle a variety of topics and perform functions pertaining to the Intermediate level, a Novice High speaker can sometimes respond in intelligible sentences, but will not be able to sustain sentence-level discourse.

Novice Mid
Speakers at the Novice Mid sublevel communicate minimally by using a number of isolated words and memorized phrases limited by the particular context in which the language has been learned. When responding to direct questions, they may say only two or three words at a time or give an occasional stock answer. They pause frequently as they search for simple vocabulary or attempt to recycle their own and their interlocutor's words. Novice Mid speakers may be understood with difficulty even by sympathetic interlocutors accustomed to dealing with non-natives. When called on to handle topics and perform functions associated with the Intermediate level, they frequently resort to repetition, words from their native language, or silence.

Novice Low
Speakers at the Novice Low sublevel have no real functional ability and, because of their pronunciation, may be unintelligible. Given adequate time and familiar cues, they may be able to exchange greetings, give their identity, and name a number of familiar objects from their immediate environment. They are unable to perform functions or handle topics pertaining to the Intermediate level, and cannot therefore participate in a true conversational exchange.

APPENDIX D

Self-Assessment Questionnaire Results

Self-Assessment Questionnaire Results

Participants' Skill Level (SL) and Skill Goal (SG)

Korean Speaking Task	Ryan		Kim		Sarah		Megan	
	SL	SG	SL	SG	SL	SG	SL	SG
Count to 10 in Korean	5	4	5	1	5	5	5	3
Say the days of the week	5	2	5	1	4	5	3	3
Give the current date	5	2	5	1	4	5	1	2
Introduce myself in social situations, and use appropriate greeting and leaving expressions	4	4	5	1	5	5	5	5
Order a simple meal in a restaurant	5	5	5	1	4	5	4	3
Give directions on the street	3	4	5	1	2	4	3	3
Give simple biographical information about myself	5	5	5	1	3	5	2	4
Describe my present job, studies, and major life activities accurately and in detail	3	5	5	1	3	5	1.5	4
Describe my latest travel experience accurately and in detail	3	5	5	1	2	3	1	2
Sustain everyday conversation in casual Korean with a Korean friend	3	5	5	5	2	5	1	4
Sustain everyday conversation in very polite style Korean with a person much older than I am	2	4	4	1	2	4	1	4
Report an event or news that happened around me recently	1.5	3	4	1	1	2	1	2
Describe and discuss the U.S. educational system in detail	1	2	NA	NA	1	2	1	1
State and support with examples and reasons of my position on a controversial topic	1	3	5	5	1	1	1	1
Construct a structured hypothesis on an abstract issue	1	4	NA	NA	1	1	1	1

APPENDIX E

Kim’s Self-Assessment Questionnaire

Kim's Self-Assessment Questionnaire

Please return this form to Susan Lee by April 12, 2013

Please indicate how well you can carry out the following tasks in Korean using the scale of:

5 (no problem at all) 4 (somewhat easily) 3 (with some difficulty)
2 (with great difficulty) 1 (cannot at all)

Please indicate how you would rate the importance of the task as a personal Korean language goal using a scale of:

5 (great importance) 4 (important) 3 (some importance)
2 (of little importance) 1 (not a goal)

Easy----------Difficult						Important--------Not Important				
5	4	3	2	1	Count to 10 in Korean.	5	4	3	2	1
5	4	3	2	1	Say the days of the week.	5	4	3	2	1
5	4	3	2	1	Give the current date (month, day, year).	5	4	3	2	1
5	4	3	2	1	Introduce myself in social situations, and use appropriate greeting and leaving expressions.	5	4	3	2	1
5	4	3	2	1	Order a simple meal in a restaurant.	5	4	3	2	1
5	4	3	2	1	Give directions on the street.	5	4	3	2	1
5	4	3	2	1	Give simple biographical information about myself (place of birth, family structure, early schooling, etc.)	5	4	3	2	1
5	4	3	2	1	Describe my present job, studies, and major life activities accurately and in detail.	5	4	3	2	1
5	4	3	2	1	Describe my latest travel experience accurately and in detail.	5	4	3	2	1
5	4	3	2	1	Sustain everyday conversation in casual style Korean with a Korean friend.	5	4	3	2	1
5	4	3	2	1	Sustain everyday conversation in very polite style Korean with a person much older than I am.	5	4	3	2	1
5	4	3	2	1	Report an event or news that happened around me recently (e.g., a crime report or sports event) in detail.	5	4	3	2	1
~~5~~	~~4~~	~~3~~	~~2~~	~~1~~	Describe and discuss the U.S. educational system in detail.	~~5~~	~~4~~	~~3~~	~~2~~	~~1~~
5	4	3	2	1	State and support with examples and reasons of my position on a controversial topic (e.g., gun violence, cigarette smoking, environmental pollution).	5	4	3	2	1
~~5~~	~~4~~	~~3~~	~~2~~	~~1~~	Construct a structured hypothesis on an abstract issue (e.g., globalization and ethnic identity) and discuss the topic knowledgably.	~~5~~	~~4~~	~~3~~	~~2~~	~~1~~

I can't do that in English - gone too long

I don't even do that in English

APPENDIX F

Sarah’s Self-Assessment Questionnaire

Sarah's Self-Assessment Questionnaire

Participant Name _[redacted] M. [redacted]_____

Please return this form to Susan Lee by April 13, 2013

Please indicate how well you can carry out the following tasks in Korean using the scale of:

5 (no problem at all)	4 (somewhat easily)	3 (with some difficulty)	2 (with great difficulty)	1 (cannot at all)

Please indicate how you would rate the importance of the task as a personal Korean language goal using a scale of:

5 (great importance)	4 (important)	3 (some importance)	2 (of little importance)	1 (not a goal)

Easy----------Difficult						Important--------Not Important				
5	4	3	2	1	Count to 10 in Korean.	5	4	3	2	1
5	4	3	2	1	Say the days of the week.	5	4	3	2	1
5	4	3	2	1	Give the current date (month, day, year).	5	4	3	2	1
5	4	3	2	1	Introduce myself in social situations, and use appropriate greeting and leaving expressions.	5	4	3	2	1
5	4	3	2	1	Order a simple meal in a restaurant.	5	4	3	2	1
5	4	3	2	1	Give directions on the street.	5	4	3	2	1
5	4	3	2	1	Give simple biographical information about myself (place of birth, family structure, early schooling, etc.)	5	4	3	2	1
5	4	3	2	1	Describe my present job, studies, and major life activities accurately and in detail.	5	4	3	2	1
5	4	3	2	1	Describe my latest travel experience accurately and in detail.	5	4	3	2	1
5	4	3	2	1	Sustain everyday conversation in casual style Korean with a Korean friend.	5	4	3	2	1
5	4	3	2	1	Sustain everyday conversation in very polite style Korean with a person much older than I am.	5	4	3	2	1
5	4	3	2	1	Report an event or news that happened around me recently (e.g., a crime report or sports event) in detail.	5	4	3	2	1
5	4	3	2	1	Describe and discuss the U.S. educational system in detail.	5	4	3	2	1
5	4	3	2	1	State and support with examples and reasons of my position on a controversial topic (e.g., gun violence, cigarette smoking, environmental pollution).	5	4	3	2	1
5	4	3	2	1	Construct a structured hypothesis on an abstract issue (e.g., globalization and ethnic identity) and discuss the topic knowledgably.	5	4	3	2	1

Note: With a Korean speaker at this time, even if my Korean was better, I would personally choose to only have conversations on controversial topics and abstract issues with them in English.

APPENDIX G

Megan’s Self-Assessment Questionnaire

Megan's Self-Assessment Questionnaire

Participant Name _____W_____

Please return this form to Susan Lee by April 12, 2013

Please indicate how well you can carry out the following tasks in Korean using the scale of:

5 (no problem at all)	4 (somewhat easily)	3 (with some difficulty)
2 (with great difficulty)	1 (cannot at all)	

Please indicate how you would rate the importance of the task as a personal Korean language goal using a scale of:

5 (great importance)	4 (important)	3 (some importance)
2 (of little importance)	1 (not a goal)	

Easy----------Difficult						Important--------Not Important				
5	4	3	2	1	Count to 10 in Korean.	5	4	3	2	1
5	4	3	2	1	Say the days of the week.	5	4	3	2	1
5	4	3	2	1	Give the current date (month, day, year).	5	4	3	2	1
5	4	3	2	1	Introduce myself in social situations, and use appropriate greeting and leaving expressions.	5	4	3	2	1
5	4	3	2	1	Order a simple meal in a restaurant.	5	4	3	2	1
5	4	3	2	1	Give directions on the street.	5	4	3	2	1
5	4	3	2	1	Give simple biographical information about myself (place of birth, family structure, early schooling, etc.)	5	4	3	2	1
5	4	3	2	1	Describe my present job, studies, and major life activities accurately and in detail.	5	4	3	2	1
5	4	3	2	1	Describe my latest travel experience accurately and in detail.	5	4	3	2	1
5	4	3	2	1	Sustain everyday conversation in casual style Korean with a Korean friend.	5	4	3	2	1
5	4	3	2	1	Sustain everyday conversation in very polite style Korean with a person much older than I am.	5	4	3	2	1
5	4	3	2	1	Report an event or news that happened around me recently (e.g., a crime report or sports event) in detail.	5	4	3	2	1
5	4	3	2	1	Describe and discuss the U.S. educational system in detail.	5	4	3	2	1
5	4	3	2	1	State and support with examples and reasons of my position on a controversial topic (e.g., gun violence, cigarette smoking, environmental pollution).	5	4	3	2	1
5	4	3	2	1	Construct a structured hypothesis on an abstract issue (e.g., globalization and ethnic identity) and discuss the topic knowledgably.	5	4	3	2	1

APPENDIX H

Ryan's Self-Assessment Questionnaire

Ryan's Self-Assessment Questionnaire

Participant Name _____R_____

Please return this form to Susan Lee by April 20, 2013

Please indicate how well you can carry out the following tasks in Korean using the scale of:

5 (no problem at all) 4 (somewhat easily) 3 (with some difficulty) 2 (with great difficulty) 1 (cannot at all)

Please indicate how you would rate the importance of the task as a personal Korean language goal using a scale of:

5 (great importance) 4 (important) 3 (some importance) 2 (of little importance) 1 (not a goal)

Easy----------Difficult						Important--------Not Important				
5	4	3	2	1	Count to 10 in Korean.	5	4	3	2	1
5	4	3	2	1	Say the days of the week.	5	4	3	2	1
5	4	3	2	1	Give the current date (month, day, year).	5	4	3	2	1
5	4	3	2	1	Introduce myself in social situations, and use appropriate greeting and leaving expressions.	5	4	3	2	1
5	4	3	2	1	Order a simple meal in a restaurant.	5	4	3	2	1
5	4	3	2	1	Give directions on the street.	5	4	3	2	1
5	4	3	2	1	Give simple biographical information about myself (place of birth, family structure, early schooling, etc.)	5	4	3	2	1
5	4	3	2	1	Describe my present job, studies, and major life activities accurately and in detail.	5	4	3	2	1
5	4	3	2	1	Describe my latest travel experience accurately and in detail.	5	4	3	2	1
5	4	3	2	1	Sustain everyday conversation in casual style Korean with a Korean friend.	5	4	3	2	1
5	4	3	2	1	Sustain everyday conversation in very polite style Korean with a person much older than I am.	5	4	3	2	1
5	4	3	2	1	Report an event or news that happened around me recently (e.g., a crime report or sports event) in detail.	5	4	3	2	1
5	4	3	2	1	Describe and discuss the U.S. educational system in detail.	5	4	3	2	1
5	4	3	2	1	State and support with examples and reasons of my position on a controversial topic (e.g., gun violence, cigarette smoking, environmental pollution).	5	4	3	2	1
5	4	3	2	1	Construct a structured hypothesis on an abstract issue (e.g., globalization and ethnic identity) and discuss the topic knowledgably.	5	4	3	2	1