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Participatory evaluation is an approach applied in social research that involves trained evaluation personnel (or research specialists) and practice-based decision makers working in partnership (Cousins & Earl, 1992). This evaluation study was motivated by an emerging need for curriculum development and clarification of goals and objectives at a public Korean high school. The focus of the evaluation project was an English conversation class taught by a native speaker of English. To increase the validity and likelihood of using the evaluation findings, a participatory approach was undertaken. A needs analysis survey was conducted with students, Korean teachers of English, and the Foreign Assistant Teacher (FAT), and the results were triangulated with guidelines provided by the provincial office of education where the participating school is located. Different needs from the different stakeholders were identified, and suggestions for addressing the identified needs and their discrepancies were offered by the researcher.

I. INTRODUCTION

Program evaluation is an on-going, investigatory process that aims to understand, improve, and account for programs, as well as be responsive to the needs of stakeholders. Evaluation provides a structure that connects the programmatic process by systematically collecting information on programs (Patton, 2008). Participatory program evaluation is a collaborative approach that involves a partnership between trained evaluators and practice-based
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2) This work is a revised version of the author’s MA thesis. Due to the page limitation, the survey questionnaires are not included here. Please refer to Kim (2010) if you have any further inquiries.
decision makers. In participatory evaluation, the evaluators work closely with stakeholders as fellow members of the evaluation team. In this way, stakeholders are actively involved in collecting information in useful and feasible ways through multiple and iterative interactions with evaluators. Stakeholders are individuals with a vested interest in the focus of the evaluation (Mark & Shotland, 1985), such as sponsors, managers, curriculum developers, implementers, and learners. Throughout the evaluation, the evaluator supervises and provides technical support to the primary intended users, which is vital to completion of the evaluation. Further, under the supervision of the evaluators, primary intended users are able to "learn on the job" (Cousins & Earl, 1992, p. 400).

One of the main characteristics that differentiates participatory evaluation from other forms of evaluation is that in participatory evaluation participants are also the primary users of the evaluation and are responsible for data collection and analysis, conclusions, and necessary actions resulting from the evaluation project. Therefore, participatory evaluation becomes a democratic endeavor "by giving participants considerable control over the interpretation and release of information" (McTaggart, 1991b, p. 10).

Participatory evaluations are typically conducted for the primary purpose of enhancing the use of evaluation findings and are best suited to formative evaluations (Ayer, 1987; Alderson & Scott, 1992 Brandon, 1998 Cousins & Earl, 1992, 1995; Cousins & Whitmore, 1998). The participatory approach was adopted in this evaluation to increase the English curriculum coordinators' (or primary intended users') utilization of findings in the future and also to foster "local applied research" skills. Therefore, I believed that a participatory approach was the best fit for this particular evaluation since this approach allowed more responsibility and authority for the practitioner and thereby enhanced intended use of the results by intended users within the local context (Cousins & Earl, 1992).

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

1. Needs Analysis

Language curriculum development is defined as any systematic effort to
create or improve the selection and structure of program content and
learning processes in a way that fits the needs of the people in a particular
language course or program (Brown, 2006). To set up a curriculum, it is
important to uncover different stakeholders' needs. Needs refers to the gap
or discrepancy between a present state (what is) and a desired end state,
future state, or condition (what should be Witkin, 1995). In other words,
needs are neither the present nor the future state, but the gap between
them. Needs analysis (also needs assessment) refers to the systematic
collection and analysis of all subjective and objective information necessary
to define and validate defensible curriculum purposes that satisfy the
language learning requirements of students within the context of particular
institutions (Brown, 1995).

To reach a consensus of people's needs requires finding out what each
stakeholder needs or wants by (a) engaging in on-going communication with
stakeholders and (b) reflection and negotiation on findings about needs
(Brown, 1995). Brown (1995) differentiates two types of needs based on
information found in language programs: situation needs and language needs.
Situation needs are usually related to any administrative, financial, logistical,
manpower-related, pedagogic, religious, cultural, personal, or other factors
that might have an impact on the program. Language needs refers to target
linguistic behaviors that the learners must ultimately acquire. Brindley (1984)
provides another dichotomy of objective versus subjective needs regarding
types of information in a needs analysis. Objective needs are those needs
determined on the basis of clear-cut, observable data gathered about the
situation, the learners, the language that students must eventually acquire,
their present proficiency and skill levels, and so forth (Brown, 1995). It is a
similar concept to "perceived needs" (Berwick, 1989), which represents
judgments of certified experts about the educational gaps in other people's
experience. On the other hand, subjective needs are generally more difficult
to identify because they have to do with wants, desires, and expectations
and are called "felt needs" (Berwick, 1989). Additionally, Hutchinson and
Waters (1987) make a basic distinction between target needs and learning
needs. Target needs are what the learner needs to do in the target situation
learning needs refers to what the learner needs to address in order to learn,
such as motivation, the conditions of the learning situation, skills and
strategies, etc.

Once identified, needs can be stated in terms of goals and objectives, which in turn can serve as the basis for developing tests, materials, teaching activities, and evaluation strategies, as well as for reevaluation of the precision and accuracy of the original needs assessment (Iwai et al., 1999). After reviewing different classifications on needs, survey questions were framed according to Brown’s (1995) taxonomy of needs “because both situation needs and language needs can be based on objective information or subjective information” (Watanabe, 2004, p. 86).

Needs analyses are used as part of formative program evaluation or at developmental stages of a program (Alderson & Scott, 1992; Coleman, 1992; Palmer, 1992). However, despite the widespread notion of using needs analysis as a tool for on-going improvement for language curriculum, not many studies have investigated needs analyses in the EFL context (Seedhouse, 1995). Many studies about needs analysis have appeared in the field of English for specific purposes (Bosher & Smalkoski, 2002; Cameron, 1998; Hutchinson & Waters, 1987; Jasso-Anguilar, 1999; So-mui & Mead, 2000), adult language education (Brindley, 1984), English for academic purposes in an ESL context (Ferris, 1994). Watanabe (2004) conducted a needs analysis to find out stakeholders’ needs for a general English class in a school in Japan. However, there has been little research on conducting needs analysis of EFL language instruction in Korea.

2. Program Context

The Foreign Assistant Teacher first came to the school (hereafter referred to as School A) in 2002 as a part of the International Teachers Exchange Program (ITEP) in the Gyonggi province. The ITPE is an organization under the provincial office of education and is in charge of hiring and managing FATs. ITPE was established to achieve higher quality English education by hiring high quality FATs and providing English teacher training. One of the objectives of the provincial office of education is to be responsive to the emerging English language needs of parents, students, and society.

The ITEP has set more specific objectives for FAT classes, which are (a)
to strengthen educational competitiveness of schools and to improve the foreign language learning environment by improving foreign language teaching methods, (b) to reconsider foreign language educational competence and invigorated communicative language teaching by developing new teaching methods incorporating native speakers of English, and (c) to foster globalized individuals who aim to become the world’s best through foreign language education, which focuses on communicative language teaching.

FATs are teachers who are hired by a local school to assist Korean teachers of English in Gyonggi province, South Korea. Since FATs do not have government authorized teaching certificates, they cannot be classified as regular teachers instead they are named Foreign Assistant Teachers. FATs are usually recruited by local schools or provincial offices of education and are from one of seven English speaking countries—the US, Canada, the UK, Australia, New Zealand, Ireland, and South Africa. They are required to have a degree higher than a BA and to speak a high level of Standard English. Koreans who have lived in an English speaking country for more than ten years and have more than 3 years of school education in English-speaking countries are also eligible.

Once they are hired, FATs take responsibility for teaching conversation classes, after-school classes, English camps, and teacher training programs at the school where they work. Whenever they teach a conversation class, they teach in cooperation with Korean English teachers. FATs are in charge of 80% of class teaching, and the remaining 20% is taught by Korean English teachers. Also, FATs are required once a semester to have an open class in which they show one of their classes to other FATs and Korean English teachers in the same area to improve their teaching skills.

School A first brought in the FAT program in 2002. The FAT teaches conversation one hour per week to 1st and 2nd year students. The number of students in one class is between 35 and 40. The conversation class is a non-credit course, which has no tests, materials or textbooks. The FAT is also responsible for English camps during the summer and winter breaks.

Certain challenges exist at school A with respect to the FAT program. Although there is a statement of goals from the provincial office of education, which is more directive than specific and situational (Johnson, 1989), there has been no development of curriculum or articulation of goals specifically
for the FAT class at School A. The FAT has had to come up with her/his own lesson plans and has reused the same teaching materials regardless of the students' grade levels. The content of the FAT's teaching materials is sometimes adapted from other English speaking teachers' homepages or a commercial English instruction textbook written by an American professor in Korea.

As noted in the *Handbook of Foreign Assistant Teachers' Duties* (2006), FAT classes are supposed to be co-taught with Korean teachers; however, the class is planned and taught mainly by the FAT alone. Some of the Korean teachers do not show up to the FAT class. Others attend but sit at the back of the classroom and do little. Others actively participate in teaching the FAT class. In short, the role of Korean teachers varies depending on the teachers.

### III. METHODOLOGY

#### 1. Members of the Evaluation Team

Evaluations are often initiated by "an empowered group of users" (Yang, 2008, p. 543)—such as funders or program sponsors—to demonstrate the accountability of a program. However, the evaluation at School A was initiated by stakeholders who are themselves the users of the evaluation results with the purpose of forming the groundwork for implementing necessary changes for the improvement of the program. To be responsive to local needs and to enhance use within the local context while maintaining technical rigor (Cousins & Earl, 1992), the stakeholders took part in the evaluation process in partnership with the evaluator. Stakeholders include primary users who are in the position to make decisions about the implementation of the program and to use the findings of a program evaluation. Therefore, given the participatory evaluation approach and the inclusion of primary intended users in the evaluation activities, the evaluation process was likely to generate organizational learning and impart evaluative knowledge and abilities to the primary intended users, which in turn made the evaluation more responsive to participants' needs.
In this evaluation, the primary intended users were the English teachers, the FAT, and the head teacher of School A. The FAT was the most closely involved in the evaluation processes as a fellow evaluator with the author/evaluator. The survey questionnaire was developed by the FAT and the evaluator. Further, the FAT took part in interpreting the survey results. I (the evaluator) was an institutional insider as well. School A was where I has been teaching full-time as an English teacher, which allowed me to comprehend both emic and etic views and helped me to "carry out an evaluation that reflected as closely as possible the concerns and insights of those involved in the program implementation" (Alderson & Scott, 1992, p. 25).

2. Evaluation Questions

As a former faculty member who knew the school context and stakeholders' growing needs for FAT class, I recognized the need to address issues that were frequently brought up, informally, by students, teachers, and the FAT about the FAT class. Issues that arose included the absence of a curriculum or textbook, diverse proficiency levels within each class, as well as the class size and students' behavior. Therefore, this participatory evaluation study tries to uncover students' needs to inform the FAT and the teachers' efforts to find solutions to the issues addressed above. By so doing, information garnered from the evaluation would form a basis to specify: (a) localized goals and objectives (b) a curriculum for the FAT class; and (c) areas for improvement and suggested approaches. Eventually, the teachers and the FAT wanted to develop a localized curriculum for FAT class in the future, and the results from the current evaluation were to be incorporated into those future efforts. To achieve these various goals, five evaluation questions (EQ) were generated.

EQ1. What are students', teachers', and the FAT's intended outcomes from the FAT class?
EQ2. What tasks are the students, teachers, and FAT interested in?
EQ3. What topics are the students, teachers, and FAT interested in?
EQ4. What are students', teachers', and the FAT's suggestions to improve the FAT class?
EQ1 would be a basis to specify the localized goals and objectives, and EQ2–3 would be a basis to formulate the curriculum. Finally, EQ 4 was meant to identify specific areas for improvement and ways of addressing those areas.

3. Participants

It is important to include different stakeholders to solicit information, needs, and opinions from diverse perspectives. Three classes from each grade were randomly selected, and the total number participants of this study (those students who completed the evaluation questionnaire) are 222 first- and second-year students (117 first-year students, 105 second-year students) at School A. The third year students were excluded because there was no FAT class at this grade level. The total enrollment of the students at School A is 1,368 students. There are 461 first-year students (equivalent to 10th grade in the US), 487 second-year students (equivalent to the 11th grade in the US), and 420 third-year students (equivalent to the 12th grade in the US). School A employs 12 English teachers, 8 of which responded to the evaluation questionnaire, as well as the current FAT.

4. Procedures

To find out students', teachers', and the FAT's needs, a survey was conducted during the second of week of June after the students had been enrolled in the FAT class for some time (the semester begins in March and ends in late July). The survey questions were first drafted based on a questionnaire used in Watanabe (2004) and revised after getting feedback from one English teacher, the FAT, and one survey expert. The original survey questionnaire was drafted in English however, questions for students and teachers were translated into Korean by the evaluator and a colleague to avoid miscommunication.

A pilot test for the student questionnaire was undertaken with 30 third-year students a year before the actual evaluation. Final revisions were made based on the results and students' feedback. The pilot test for Korean teachers' and the FAT survey was administered to the FAT and 6 English
teachers at another school. The real survey for students was administered and collected during the FAT class to increase the response rate.

5. Information Gathering and Instruments

How are needs most effectively uncovered? Lynch (1986) emphasized the benefit of a triangular approach to compensate for the incompleteness of a single perspective. Triangulation involves systematic comparison of interim findings from two or more sources, methods or combinations thereof, and attempts to validate the researcher's interim findings by presenting them to the informants, and/or by seeking confirmation or disconfirmation of the current analysis (Jasso-Aguilar, 1999). Therefore, triangulation is a good way to reduce bias and gain more valid and reliable data, and also shows that different stakeholders in a program have different perceptions of similar tasks and situations, which leads them to different goals and felt needs.

A number of stakeholder groups and individuals have particular needs related to the FAT class—students, the FAT, the English teachers, the school administration, and the provincial office of education. In order to understand the FAT class from diverse perspectives, information from multiple sources needed to be obtained since institutional needs can be the driving force in creating a task force and a curriculum. The information sources used in the evaluation included government documents, two days of classroom observation, survey questionnaires from students, teachers, and the FAT, and impromptu interviews.

The government document entitled *Handbook of Foreign Assistant Teachers’ Duties* (2006) was referenced to learn the goals and objectives of a FAT class from the South Korean government’s perspective.

Classroom observation was conducted to obtain a better idea about what the actual classes were like. The major use of the class observation was to see classroom dynamics, which supplied information that the questionnaire failed to capture, such as student participation and the effects of the presence of the Korean teachers.

To incorporate a large number of stakeholders' opinions, a survey questionnaire was administered. The survey questionnaire consists of five sections. The first section collects background or biographical information
about the participants. The remaining four sections consist of 78 Likert–item questions and 3 open-ended questions. Likert–items include questions on target tasks and preferred topics to be taught in FAT classes. In addition, participants were asked to rate their preferences for various classroom participation styles and class sizes. Likert–type items used a four point scale: strongly agree (1), agree (2), disagree (3), and strongly disagree (4). To give participants the opportunity to comment on their ratings, space was provided for additional written comments at the end of each sub-section. Finally, three open-ended questions were provided to solicit participants' preferences and impressions on goals, difficulties, and suggestions. The use of qualitative methods—incorporated using the open-ended questions—allows an evaluator to take into account the context of people's lives and to include stakeholder voices and expressions of their needs (Jasso-Aguilar 1999). Although there was only one FAT, he/she was still administered a survey to make the comparisons between the three parties.

Cronbach alpha was used to calculate reliability estimate to find the degree of consistency of each sub-section of the survey for students and teachers (see Table 1). The reliability of the whole Likert–scale questions for students (N = 222, K = 74) was .95 and was .97 for teachers (N = 8, K = 74). It is interesting to note that the reliabilities for learning style for both the teachers and students were very low. It might be caused by the small number of items or participants' conflicting opinions on their style preference. The reliability for the FAT survey was not calculated because there was just one participant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>Students (N = 222)</th>
<th>Teachers (N = 8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.888</td>
<td>.902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking and Listening</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.946</td>
<td>.974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.918</td>
<td>.903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign use</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.902</td>
<td>.987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topics</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>.924</td>
<td>.948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Style</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.306</td>
<td>.429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Roles</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.606</td>
<td>.659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>.950</td>
<td>.970</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IV. FINDINGS AND USE OF FINDINGS

The overall findings and suggestions from each evaluation question will be presented first, and the findings from individual participant groups will follow. EQ1-3 ("What are the three participant groups' expected outcomes, preferred tasks, topic, learning style?") were answered from the survey questionnaire. The survey questionnaire, the classroom observation, and impromptu interviews with FAT were used to answer to EQ4 ("What are the three participant groups' difficulties and suggestions?")

1. Findings

1) EQ1. What Are Students', Teachers', and FAT's Intended Outcomes from the FAT Class?

Table 2 provides a summary of students', teachers', and FAT's expected outcomes for students to achieve at the end of the FAT class. Data indicating opinions about student outcomes came from open-ended questions at the end of sections A (reading outcomes), B (speaking and listening outcomes), C (writing outcomes), and D (English use abroad outcomes) from the three questionnaires. Percentages of the total number of responses for a single response are provided for comparison purposes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>FAT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improving conversation and communication skills</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>42.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaining knowledge about culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30.77</td>
<td>Building confidence in speaking English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding about Culture</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving Speaking skill</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15.38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Improving writing skills 1 50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquiring common expression</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving writing skills</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15.38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.35</td>
<td>Conversational</td>
<td>2 15.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Most students (42.65%) would like to improve their conversation skills and communicative competence through the FAT class. Another 17.65% of students thought that they would like to understand foreign culture by taking the FAT class, and 8.82% of them believed that improving their pronunciation was the goal they would like to achieve. Confidence building (1.47%), acquiring vocabulary (2.21%), and improving listening (2.94%) were not regarded as important as the other goals above.

Five out of eight teachers responded to this section. Teachers seem to believe that learning knowledge about foreign culture is the most important goal for students to achieve through the FAT class. Culture education was not frequently implemented in the regular English classes, and teachers may have some expectation that FATs should bring in their own culture to the classroom so that students can learn about it. Half the teachers would like the students to gain more knowledge about foreign cultures at the end of FAT class, followed by improving speaking and writing skills and conversational skills. Building confidence in English, improving listening skill
was also suggested as a goal.

The FAT would like the students to improve their writing skills and to build confidence in their spoken English through the classes and interactions with the FAT. The FAT also thought that students should be able to learn how to improve their writing ability, which is an important skill that is neglected in their regular English classes.

The common goals among the three participant groups were improving conversation skills and speaking skills, and increasing confidence in spoken English. Also, learning about the culture of foreign countries was one of the most frequently indicated expectations from both teachers and students. Although improving writing skills was mentioned by the FAT and teachers, considering the fact that the FAT class is offered only one hour per week and given the class size, this might not be a practical goal to achieve through the FAT class.

To identify mutually desired and localized goals and objectives, it is necessary to align students', teachers', and the FAT's views. The specification of goals and objectives should be negotiated among the faculty to "promote ownership of the curriculum." (Watanabe, 2004, p. 131) The following were suggested as possible goal statements for the FAT class based on the survey results:

1) Students would be able to improve their communication skills through scaffolding authentic and practical language learning tasks and contents
2) Students will learn how to use language elements (vocabulary, idioms, commonly used expressions) in actual situations
3) Students will be able to use appropriate communication strategies depending on the interlocutor, purpose, and settings, in English;
4) Students will gain knowledge about foreign cultures through exposure to diverse topics, media, and interaction with the FAT;
5) Through language learning practice with peers, teachers, and the FAT, students will build confidence in English.

2) EQ2. What Tasks are the Students, Teachers, and FAT Interested in?

Table 3 provides a summary of tasks that students, teachers, and the FAT
perceived as important. Table 3 includes means, standard deviations, and item ranking. The overall findings from the three participant groups' task preferences are discussed first, followed by the suggestions that were made on the basis of those findings.

Table 3. Descriptive Statistics of Students’, Teachers’ and FAT’s Tasks Needs for FAT Class

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Overall Students</th>
<th>Korean Teachers</th>
<th>FLAT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N    M   SD  Rank</td>
<td>N    M   SD  Rank</td>
<td>N    M   Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R1</td>
<td>Understand and search websites in English.</td>
<td>222  2.98 .78 33.5 16</td>
<td>8 3.25 .46 16</td>
<td>1 1 30.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2</td>
<td>Understand newspaper articles in English.</td>
<td>222  3.09 .83 30</td>
<td>8 3.12 .99 23</td>
<td>1 1 30.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R3</td>
<td>Understand English captions when watching movies.</td>
<td>222  3.39 .82 12</td>
<td>8 3.38 .52 9</td>
<td>1 4 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R4</td>
<td>Understand e-mails or letters from friends or teachers in English.</td>
<td>222  3.11 .81 28</td>
<td>8 3.25 1.04 16</td>
<td>1 3 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R5</td>
<td>Understand brochures in English.</td>
<td>222  3.11 .77 28</td>
<td>8 3.5 .54 4</td>
<td>1 2 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R6</td>
<td>Understand short English novels.</td>
<td>222  3.27 .81 19</td>
<td>8 3.25 1.04 16</td>
<td>1 2 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R7</td>
<td>Understand textbooks and solve the questions for the CSAT.</td>
<td>222  3.45 .79 5</td>
<td>8 3 1.07 31</td>
<td>1 1 30.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL1</td>
<td>Engage in every day conversation (chit-chat, greetings, talking about weather) with foreign friends/FATs.</td>
<td>222  3.4 .60 10.5</td>
<td>8 3.5 1.07 4</td>
<td>1 4 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL2</td>
<td>Introduce myself to friends/teachers in English.(name, age, school, interests, where I live, etc)</td>
<td>222  3.28 .65 18</td>
<td>8 3.62 1.06 1.5</td>
<td>1 4 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL3</td>
<td>Introduce family/close friends to classmates/teachers in English.</td>
<td>222  3.23 .63 22</td>
<td>8 3.5 1.07 4</td>
<td>1 3 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL4</td>
<td>Give/ask directions to/from foreigners on the street/ in the subway in English.</td>
<td>222  3.36 .64 13.5</td>
<td>8 3.12 .99 23</td>
<td>1 2 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL5</td>
<td>Exchange opinions about familiar topics (school uniforms, current college exams, etc) in English.</td>
<td>222  3.23 .75 22</td>
<td>8 3 .93 28</td>
<td>1 3 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL6</td>
<td>Exchange opinions about political issues or social problems in English.</td>
<td>222  3.17 .81 25</td>
<td>8 2.88 .99 34</td>
<td>1 2 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL7</td>
<td>Explain English words in English to classmates/ foreign friends.</td>
<td>222  3.19 .76 24</td>
<td>8 3 1.07 31</td>
<td>1 2 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL8</td>
<td>Accept/refuse or offer invitations to one’s house from/to foreign friends.</td>
<td>222  3.15 .70 26</td>
<td>8 3.38 1.06 9</td>
<td>1 2 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL9</td>
<td>Talk about favorite movies/dramas with friends.</td>
<td>222  3.24 .78 20</td>
<td>8 3.25 1.04 16</td>
<td>1 3 12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SL1 Introduce favorite places/cultures in Korea to foreign friends or FATs. 222 3.29 .78 17 8 3.38 1.06 9 1 3 12
SL1 Familiarize myself with English rhythm, intonation, accent, volume, pace, and pronunciation. 222 3.46 .70 4 8 3.62 .52 1.5 1 2 24
SL1 Understand the main idea of a drama/movies. 222 3.36 .68 13.5 8 3.12 .99 23 1 4 4
SL1 Understand the main idea of a TV commercials. 222 3.23 .72 22 8 3.38 .74 9 1 4 4
SL1 Familiarize idiomatic/frequently-used expressions in movies/dramas/TV commercials in English. 222 3.4 .67 10.5 8 3.38 .74 9 1 4 4
SL1 Understand lyrics of English songs. 222 3.42 .71 7.5 8 3 1.07 31 1 2 24
SL1 Solve the listening questions on the CSAT. 222 3.41 .79 9 8 3.38 1.06 9 1 1 30.5
W1 Fill in blanks or transcribe lines from movies/dramas/songs. 222 3.01 .89 32 8 3.12 .35 23 1 4 4
W2 Write e-mails or letters to friends or teachers in English. 222 3.02 .85 31 8 3.12 .99 23 1 2 24
W3 Write a diary in English. 222 2.98 .95 33.5 8 3.12 .99 23 1 2 24
W4 Write a summary of a story, novel or other people's opinions. 222 2.97 .92 35 8 3 1.93 28 1 3 12
W5 Write my thoughts or opinions about the content of a story, novel or other people's opinions I read or listened to in English. 222 2.95 .91 36 8 2.88 .84 34 1 2 24
W6 Write my thoughts and feelings about the content of my favorite songs, movies, and TV shows in English. 222 3.11 .82 28 8 3 .54 28 1 3 12
W7 Answer the grammar and vocabulary questions in the exams. 222 3.3 .87 16 8 2.62 .92 35 1 1 30.5
W8 Write a biography, as required by the college entrance exams. 222 3.42 .73 7.5 8 3.38 .74 9 1 1 30.5
F1 Communicate with friends and/or professors in colleges in English speaking countries. 222 3.44 .66 6 8 3 .93 28 1 3 12
F2 Order food from restaurants in English speaking countries. 222 3.53 .58 2 8 3.25 1.04 16 1 3 12
F3 Negotiate prices when buying things in English speaking countries. 222 3.56 .57 1 8 3.25 1.04 16 1 2 24
F4 Complete necessary transactions at the bank, post office, school offices in English speaking countries. 222 3.34 .68 15 8 3.25 1.04 16 1 2 24
A Spearman correlation was calculated to see if the ranks among participants are related statistically. The low Spearman correlation between each participant groups showed that the results are not related. The relationships between the ranks of students and Korean teachers \((rho = .25, p = .142)\), Korean teacher and the FAT \((rho = .242, p = .156)\), and the FAT and students \((rho = .082, p = .635)\), are not statistically significant.

However, a pattern was found in students' and the FAT's results across the sub-sections. Overall, the speaking and listening abilities were the most strongly agreed upon set of tasks that the three participant groups thought students need to acquire by the end of the FAT class. Based on the survey results, it may be worth considering including all tasks in Speaking and Listening, English for Foreign use, some tasks in Reading, such as understanding English captions (R3) and short novels (R6), and writing a biography for college preparation for enhance writing skills. In the next paragraph, I will discuss the survey results of each participant group on each task and provide suggestions at the end of the individual discussion sections.

**Reading.** Overall, students did not perceive a strong need for reading. However, some tasks such as solving questions for the Korean SAT \((R7: M = 3.45, SD = .79)\) or understanding English captions when watching English movies \((R3: M = 3.39, SD = .82)\) were perceived as important. They did not seem to think that reading real-world materials, understanding and searching English websites, English brochures, newspapers, emails, and novels were of great significance.

However, most teachers agreed that reading tasks are of high necessity. Most teachers preferred R5 (Understanding brochures in English) the most among the 7 items on the reading section. On the other hand, in accord with the FAT, they least preferred the comprehension of textbooks and solving the questions for the Korean CSAT \((R7, M = 3, SD = 1.07)\). CSAT (College Scholastic Ability Test) is a nationwide test that measures the scholastic ability of college applicants upon which Korean universities base admission.
decisions (Korea Institute for Curriculum and Evaluation, 2010). Teachers would like their students to become familiar with some practical reading tasks, like understanding English captions in movies (R3, $M = 3.38$) and understanding letters or emails (R4, $M = 3.25$ and R6, $M = 3.25$), which were rarely covered during the regular English classes.

In general the three participant groups are not interested in English reading in the FAT class. Since students are already doing extensive amounts reading and writing for the CSAT with their Korean teachers in their regular class, it does not seem necessary to practice additional reading in the FAT class. However, I encourage including such items as understanding English captions (R3) and short novels (R6) as a part of the curriculum since students' exposure to diverse genres of writing not only enhance their reading skills, but also maintain students' interest in reading.

**Speaking and Listening.** Speaking and listening tasks seem to be relevant according to students. Students placed greater emphasis on the importance of communicative competence acquired through tasks that involved practicing English for foreign uses, pronunciation and intonation, and listening to pop songs. Becoming familiar with English rhythm and intonation (SL11: $M = 3.46$, $SD = .70$) was ranked fourth among all the tasks, while solving listening questions on the CSAT (SL16: $M = 3.41$, $SD = .79$) was ranked ninth. As shown from the teachers' results, it can be assumed, again, that some tasks not dealt with in the regular English class tended to be the students' or teachers' preference for tasks to be addressed in the FAT class. Understanding English lyrics (SL15: $M = 3.42$, $SD = .71$), engaging in everyday conversation (SL1: $M = 3.4$, $SD = .60$), and becoming familiar with idiomatic expressions in English movies (SL14: $M = 3.4$, $SD = .67$) were perceived as relatively important. However, exchanging opinions about political issues (SL6: $M = 3.17$, $SD = .81$), explaining English words in English (SL7: $M = 3.19$, $SD = .76$) and accepting/refusing invitations (SL8: $M = 3.15$, $SD = .70$) were less preferred. The students may seem to have less motivation on the tasks that are not directly applicable to the real world. For example, although offering an invitation is a practical task to learn, most of the students at School A do not have the actual chance to invite foreigners to their house. More than 70% of students answered that they do
not have opportunities to speak English outside of the FAT class at all, and most of those who did talked with their classmates in English or with teachers in private institutes.

All teachers agreed that familiarizing students with English rhythm, intonation, accent, volume, pace, and pronunciation was the most important task for students to learn from the FAT class (SL11, M = 3.62, SD = .52). Students' ability to introduce themselves to friends/teachers (SL2–3) and ensuring that students engage in everyday conversation in English (SL1) were perceived as highly important as well. Solving listening questions on the CSAT was ranked seventh, which is in contrast to their minimal preference for reading CSAT preparation. Considering the fact that most regular English classes taught by the Korean English teachers focus on reading, the teachers do not seem to feel the need for students to do additional reading activities with the FAT. They showed relatively high interest in understanding the main idea of TV commercials and familiarizing students with some frequently used expressions in movies/dramas/TV commercials (SL 13–14; M = 3.38, SD = .74). However, teachers did not prefer understanding the main idea of dramas/movies. They also perceived exchanging opinions about familiar topics in English (SL5: M = 3, SD = .93) or explaining English words in English to classmates and understanding the lyrics of English songs (SL7–8: M = 3, SD = 1.07) as less important than other tasks. They showed a very low preference for exchanging opinions about political issues or social problems in English (SL6, M = 2.88, SD = .99, 35th). It seems that teachers preferred tasks where students can learn new vocabulary or idioms over tasks that involve the general understanding of texts.

In general, the FAT showed similar preferences to the teachers on the speaking and listening tasks. However, familiarization with English rhythm (SL11, M = 2) and giving directions (SL4, M =2), which were regarded as important to the teachers and the students, were not perceived as necessary to the FAT. In addition, solving listening questions for the CSAT (SL16, M = 1) was viewed as inessential. The FAT agreed that engaging in everyday conversation (SL1, M =4), introducing themselves (SL2, M = 4), understanding the main ideas of dramas and TV commercials, and becoming familiarized with idioms (SL 12–14, M = 4) were important tasks for the
students to learn in the FAT class. Introducing family (SL 3, \( M = 3 \)), exchanging opinions on familiar topics (SL 5, \( M = 3 \)), talking about favorite movies and introducing Korean culture (SL 9–10, \( M = 3 \)) were also perceived to be relatively important.

All items in speaking and listening, except for SL17 (solving listening questions), should remain as learning outcomes since the three participant groups showed relatively high interest in tasks related to speaking and listening. Also, tasks in the speaking and listening sections fit well with the aims of the FAT class set by the provincial education office. Listening practice for CSAT needs to be excluded, because the FAT class should consist of tasks and activities that are not easy for students to practice or learn on their own.

Writing. Overall, writing was not the most favored skill that the participants would like the students to develop through the FAT class. The responses from teachers and students alike revealed similar tendencies. They rated most items low, except for writing a biography, a task required for college entrance exams. However, the FAT strongly acknowledged the importance of media/visual materials to promote students' writing proficiency including filling in blanks in movie dialogues, or writing a summary about a novel, a drama, or a movie. More detailed discussion on this topic is presented in the following paragraphs.

Although the writing tasks were not less important in the students' views, there were some tasks which attracted students, such as writing a biography for the college entrance exams (W8: \( M = 3.42, SD = .73 \)) and answering the grammar questions for the college entrance exams (W7: \( M = 3.3, SD = .87 \)). It can be assumed that students have a lot of pressure related to the college entrance exams and that they are in need of learning some tasks for college exam preparation, which are not provided by the regular English class. Other tasks, such as writing emails, diaries, and summarizing novels (W1–5), were not perceived as relevant for the FAT class and were ranked below 27. It is important to note that one of the most common activities in FAT class—watching movies and dramas and filling-in blanks—were not valued highly by the students.

Compared to other tasks, teachers did not regard writing tasks as
necessary. Since the FAT class was a conversation class, teachers' overall preference on writing tasks seem to be low in general. The writing tasks were ranked lower than 20th in the overall ranking except item W8. W8 (writing biography for the college entrance exam) was ranked 12th ($M = 3.38, SD = .74$), and this seems attributable to the content of current college entrance exams. The CSAT does not test writing skills however, some universities have writing tests to screen students. Since there are no English writing classes offered at School A, the teachers seem to put value in this item. In contrast, W7 (answering the grammar and vocabulary questions in the exams) was ranked the lowest among all of the items because solving grammar and vocabulary questions is one of the regular activities in the regular English classes. However, W1, which was the most commonly used task in the current FAT class, was ranked 21($M = 3.12, SD = .35$), and the students' ranked it even lower. This suggests that there needs to be more diverse tasks or activities provided for the FAT class. Writing one's own thoughts about a novel was the third lowest (W5: $M = 2.88, SD = .84$), and writing a summary of a novel (W4: $M = 3, SD = .93$), writing one's own thoughts about favorite movies (W5: $M = 3, SD = .54$) were ranked 33rd and 32nd respectively.

Overall, the FAT did not regard writing tasks to be necessary. In contrast to teachers and students, the FAT preferred tasks such as filling in blanks while watching movies (W1, $M = 4$), writing summaries of novels, and providing thoughts on movies (W4, W6, $M = 3$) as the most important among the writing tasks. On the other hand, the FAT did not perceive the need for teaching writing for either college entrance or solving grammar questions as important.

Although, writing tasks were the least favored tasks across all items, I suggested including writing biographies (W8), first because writing is not covered by Korean teachers. Secondly, writing not only helps students with college entrance exam preparation, but also, students learn English writing effectively by practicing it with the FAT. Also, the FAT may need to take into consideration the students' suggestions to diversify activities and content.

**Foreign use.** Students' preferences for English for foreign use were greater than any other tasks, and items on foreign use were five of the top six
ranked items. High means form students for all five tasks for foreign use indicate that they perceived practical and communicative language as the most important skill. They strongly suggested that they have a need to learn some "survival English" in a foreign country, such as negotiating prices when shopping in English-speaking countries (F3: \(M = 3.56, SD = .57\)), ordering food (F2: \(M = 3.53, SD = .58\)), reserving airline tickets (F5: \(M = 3.48, SD = .61\)). These were ranked at the first, second, and eighth, respectively, among all the tasks. The students seemed to have high motivation for travelling abroad and intent on learning skills that can be applied or used in the real world by taking the FAT class.

Overall, teachers did not perceive as strong a need for foreign uses of English compared to students or the FAT. The means on the five items ranged between 3 and 3.4, and the standard deviations ranged from .93 to 1.06. Receiving and buying airline tickets was ranked sixth (F5: \(M = 3.4, SD = 1.06\)). Ordering food, negotiating prices when shopping, and completing necessary tasks at the bank or post office (F2-4) showed the same mean (\(M = 3.25\)), but with a large standard deviation (\(SD = 1.06\)).

Overall, the FAT did not perceive the ability to use English abroad as necessary. The FAT considered communicating with friends and ordering food in restaurants (F1-2, \(M = 3\)) as necessary.

Although the teachers and the FAT showed slightly lower interest in English for foreign use, incorporating such tasks students could bring into play is encouraged. I recommended taking into consideration all those items on English for foreign use when planning the curriculum. Such tasks are helpful in the sense that the students can improve their speaking and listening proficiency by practicing and dealing with English that they could use in the real world. Also, these tasks—which were favored by most students—would help keep students motivated and interested in learning during the FAT class.

3) EQ3. What Topics are the Students, Teachers, and FAT Interested in?

Overall, there was an agreement on topic preferences between the students and the FAT. Both would like to address topics on fashion, drama, music,
foreign culture, and travelling. Although the students' interests lean toward entertainment, the FAT would like to try various topics having to do with current issues, the environment, and Korean culture. However, the Korean teachers' preferences are different from the other participants in that they were more interested in such topics as school work, future careers, friendship, and hobbies. Students and the FAT (who is in his/her mid 20s) seemed to prefer trendy, pop-/ youth–culture topics over more conventional topics.

Table 4 provides a summary of the survey results of the topics that students, teachers, and the FAT are interested in. Table 5 includes means, standard deviations, and the rank of the results sorted by item rank order. The general tendency of the three participant groups' topic preferences, and individual results of students', teachers', and the FAT's are as follows

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th></th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th></th>
<th>FAT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T1</td>
<td>Languages in the world</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2</td>
<td>Foreign culture, people</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T3</td>
<td>World history</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T4</td>
<td>Famous historical sites</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T5</td>
<td>Current world events</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T6</td>
<td>Korea around the world</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T7</td>
<td>Korean culture</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T8</td>
<td>Domestic news</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T9</td>
<td>Narrative stories</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T10</td>
<td>Literature</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T11</td>
<td>Drama</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T12</td>
<td>Art</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T13</td>
<td>Music</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T14</td>
<td>Movies</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T15</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T16</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T17</td>
<td>Nature/environment</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T18</td>
<td>Computers</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T19</td>
<td>Animals</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T20</td>
<td>Sports</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T21</td>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T22</td>
<td>Food, cooking</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T23</td>
<td>Home economy</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A Spearman correlation between each participant group showed that the results of topic preferences were not related. The relationship between the ranks of students and Korean teachers \((\rho = -0.024, p = .897)\), Korean teachers and the FAT \((\rho = -0.212, p = .253)\), and the FAT and students \((\rho = -0.162, p = .384)\) are not statistically significant.

The popular topics among students were those related to travel and entertainment. They wanted topics such as TV drama \((T30: M = 3.47)\), travel \((T21: M = 3.46)\), and music and movies \((T13–14)\) to be covered. On the other hand, world history \((T3, M = 2.65, SD = .94)\), domestic news, nature, computer home economy \((T8: T17–18, M = 2.68)\), and education were minimally preferred.

Teachers’ preferences were centered on school life and future careers \((T24–27, M = 3.63, SD = .52)\), hobbies \((T28, M = 3.5, SD = .54)\), foreign cultures \((T2, M = 3.5, SD = .54)\), traveling \((T21, M = 3.5, SD = .54)\), and the environment \((T17, M = 3.5, SD = .54)\). In contrast, teachers were not inclined toward topics on literature, art, music, drama \((T10–14, M = 2.88, SD = .64)\) and languages \((T1, M = 2.62, SD = .92)\). In terms of teachers’ topic preference, there is no common pattern shared with students and the FAT, except with respect to foreign cultures \((T2)\). Foreign cultures was the only topic that all three groups would like to see addressed in the FAT class.

The FAT believed that most of the topics on the survey questionnaire would be helpful for students to learn. The topics that interested the FAT ranged from language to foreign culture, from Korea to arts and entertainment. However, the FAT would not like to cover topics in literature \((T10: M = 2)\), computers \((T18: M = 2)\), travel \((T21: M = 2)\), food \((T22: M = 2)\), and topics that have to do with school life \((T25–26)\). The least
favored topic was school work (T 25: M =1).

Since the FAT class is flexible in terms of choosing content and topics, I suggested tackling topics that were ranked highly by students. Topics that interest students were music (T14, ranked 4th) and movies (T14, 1st), entertainment (T30, 2nd; T31, 7th; T29, 8th), travel (T21, 3rd), food (T22, 5th), students' life (T28), art/literature (T12, 10th; T9, 12th; T11, 15th), world (T2, 6th; T4, 17th; T1, 20th), Korea (T6, 11th), and psychology (T16, 14th). The least preferred topics have to do with education/science (T17, 27th; T15, 31st) and leisure, these including sports (T20, 24th), animal (T19, 25th), and computers (T18, 28th).

4) EQ4. What Are Students', Teachers', and FAT's Difficulties and Suggestions to Improve the FAT Class?

Table 5 and Table 6 summarize the difficulties and suggestions for the FAT class indicated by students, teachers, and the FAT. The most agreed upon and challenging aspects of the FAT class were students' loudness, the large class size, students' difficulties in communicating with the FAT, students' boredom with content, and diverse student proficiency levels. Regarding teaching, the Korean teachers wanted more interaction with the FAT, and the FAT was in need of curriculum.

| Table 5. Difficulties in FAT Class from Students, Teachers, and the FAT |
|------------------|--------|------------------|--------|------------------|--------|------------------|
| Description                  | N    | %     | Description                  | N    | %     | Description                  | N    | %     |
| Too loud class               | 35   | 35.71 | Large class size             | 1    | 25    | Class management             | 1    | 20    |
| Students' difficulties in communicating with and understanding FLAT due to lack of proficiency | 23   | 23.47 | Wide ranges of students proficiency level in a class | 1    | 25    | Large class size             | 1    | 20    |
| Large class size             | 10   | 10.20 | Cultural difference          | 1    | 25    | No curriculum               | 1    | 20    |
| Contents are not interesting | 8    | 8.16  | Lacking communication between FLAT and teachers | 1    | 25    | No tests                     | 1    | 20    |
| Little chance to speak English | 6    | 6.12  | Korean teachers' help        | 1    | 20    |                               |      |      |
Table 6. Suggestions for FAT Class from Students, Teachers, and FAT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Korean teachers</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>FAT</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More chances to speak in English/reduce the class size</td>
<td>7 22.58</td>
<td></td>
<td>Making class smaller and allowing students more class participation</td>
<td>1 20</td>
<td></td>
<td>Allowing the FLAT to give grades</td>
<td>1 33.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving handout explains difficult/new vocabulary</td>
<td>4 12.90</td>
<td></td>
<td>Reflecting students' performance from FLAT class to their GPAs</td>
<td>1 20</td>
<td></td>
<td>Offering after school class or Saturday class</td>
<td>1 33.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students should be quiet.</td>
<td>4 12.90</td>
<td></td>
<td>Diving the class at least 12 levels based on students' proficiency</td>
<td>1 20</td>
<td></td>
<td>Korean teachers' participation</td>
<td>1 33.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only for volunteers</td>
<td>3 9.68</td>
<td></td>
<td>Making FLAT class more effective by designing systematic curriculum and syllabus</td>
<td>1 20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increasing hour</td>
<td>3 9.68</td>
<td></td>
<td>Having students speaking tests</td>
<td>1 20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAT's should use Korean</td>
<td>3 9.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes in students attitude</td>
<td>2 6.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean teachers' discipline</td>
<td>2 6.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No need of Korean teachers</td>
<td>1 3.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Adding caption when watching movies  1  3.23
Original class  1  3.23
Total number of responses  31  100

The most frequently noted challenge by the students and the FAT was that students were too loud in the FAT class: "Since there are too many students, and they are too loud in my FAT class, it was hard for me to participate in the class" or "because the students do not regard the FAT class as a regular class, they are always too loud and sometimes it really disrupted the class" (translated by the researcher). The FAT's suggestion to manage the class atmosphere was to allow some authority to the FAT to be able to have more control over students by including students' performance in their records. Currently, FATs are not entitled to give any type of grades to students because they are not licensed teachers. Incorporating the students' performance in the FAT class into students' GPA was highly recommended by a Korean English teacher. Consequently, students would take the FAT class more seriously and would likely empower the FAT. Finally, the Korean teachers' presence plays an important role in controlling students' behavior. It was observed from the class observations that the students became much quieter and behaved well with the presence of a Korean teacher. Therefore, it is highly encouraged that Korean teachers attend the FAT class. Instead of sitting at the back of the FAT class, the teachers are encouraged to actively engage themselves in the class and be more attentive.

The large class size and the resultant lack of opportunity to speak English was indicated as a problem as well. There are 30–40 students in one FAT class on average. 22.58% of students and the FAT suggested the class size should be reduced. 12.9% of students suggested that the FAT should provide handouts that explain new or difficult vocabulary. Also, less common suggestions included that the students should be quieter in class, and that the class should be offered only to volunteers. Making it optional may reduce the class size, but it needs to be coordinated with the curriculum coordinator at the school. From a practical point of view, group work may be a solution. Further, to increase the effectiveness of group work, the FAT and teachers should strategically make up group membership considering student...
proficiency levels. Forming groups based on proficiency levels is important because it was observed that most students were just sitting quietly or talking to each other except for some highly motivated students or students with a higher proficiency. Additionally, as suggested by the FAT, offering extracurricular conversation classes after school or on weekends for free would provide more opportunities for students to speak English.

Another problem that students perceived with the FAT class was their difficulty in communicating with and understanding the FAT due to their lack in proficiency. Even when students are motivated and quiet, their lack of proficiency keeps them from focusing on the class. Actually, one student wrote that "it was impossible to communicate with the teacher (because of lack of proficiency). I feel like it is waste of my time to be in the class. I hope the teacher would speak in an easier way." Although, some students (4%) mentioned that there was no need for Korean teachers, the students' difficulties in communicating with the FAT and their classroom behavior can be resolved with the help of the Korean teachers. In the interview and the survey data, the FAT put a great emphasis on the importance of the Korean teachers' presence and role in the class. Not only would students be quieter and behave more politely if a Korean teacher was present, the Korean teachers would also help with the communication gap between the FAT and students. As a result, students would have less trouble participating in class and being calm.

Students' boredom with content could be improved in many ways. Although, there were no suggestions made from the participant groups, I recommended a few possible solutions to this problem. At the micro level, the Korean teachers should be involved in designing lesson plans. Forming a teacher development group and sharing ideas with local FATs would generate some ideas on how to teach and what to teach. Further, the provincial office of education should offer more professional training opportunities for FAT teachers. Additionally, the provincial office should increase the needed qualifications for FAT teachers, or hire more experienced teachers, which may contribute to making the class more effective.

The wide range of students' proficiency in the class was also indicated as a problem by one Korean English teacher. Dividing classes based on students' proficiency may be worth trying. However, currently there are no suitable placement tests to screen students' proficiency levels. Currently,
there exist three levels in the FAT class: advanced, intermediate, and low. However, this classification is based only on the results of various types of written tests. Therefore, to divide students per their proficiency, an appropriate placement test should be either developed or adopted first.

Regarding the lacking input from Korean English teachers’ on the FAT’s curriculum, the Korean teachers are encouraged to partake in the lesson planning process more actively. There should be an effort from them to more frequently discuss the content and teaching material between with the FAT. To do that, the workload of English teachers should be reduced first. Most English teachers teach regular English classes 17–18 hours per week and are also in charge of teaching extra-curricular classes and homeroom management too.

2. Use of Findings

The findings of the evaluation were reported to the head English teacher of the school and the results were disseminated through an English teachers' meeting at School A. Since there was a limitation in time and place, I was not able to attend the meeting. In terms of setting up localized goals and a curriculum, the FAT and the Korean teachers incorporated the tasks and topics which were suggested by me and the FAT (the evaluation team). Also, the head teacher of the English Department strategically paired the Korean teachers who are not in charge of homeroom class and are willing to work with the FAT. As a result, the Korean teachers have been engaging in planning, teaching, translating, and managing the class more actively. Accordingly, the classroom atmosphere has improved such that the FAT has less difficulty in teaching and disciplining the students therefore, students will be able to focus on the class better.

However, certain aspects of the program—such as the large class size and dividing the class by proficiency level—are not likely to change. To make the class size smaller, the school administration needs to offer more FAT classes or open the class to volunteers only. However, these two options are not feasible from a practical perspective. First, to offer more classes, there needs to be more FATs. However, this is not a matter that a local school can decide, but an issue that the provincial office of education should manage. Secondly, offering FAT classes only to volunteers requires a change to the whole school
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curriculum because there is a need to offer alternative classes for students who are not taking the FAT class. In terms of dividing the class based on proficiency, there needs to be a proficiency test or some kind of speaking test which is developed by and for School A. Although there is an existing proficiency test (the English communicative competence examination developed by the provincial office of education), since it is a standardized and high stakes test, it is not suitable for the purpose of placement within a school.

VI. CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

It was clear from this evaluation that with participatory approach the evaluation findings were actually put to use in improving the program based on the stakeholders’ needs, thereby promoting positive changes to the program. Evaluation is often perceived as threatening the interests of those who are the object of the evaluation. Therefore, it is uncommon that the organizational members themselves, not the funders or the principles, are willing to be evaluated to improve their programs. On the whole, evaluation tends to be neglected in project planning and development, as well as during the day to day management of programs. In this evaluation, not only did the stakeholder initiate the evaluation to improve their program, but they also conducted it. Therefore, this evaluation was able to find out and incorporate stakeholders’ needs into program while maintaining sufficient technical rigor. When there are external pressures, programs tend to be evaluated, and such evaluation is perhaps perfunctory and superficial. Also, it is meaningful that this evaluation provided an opportunity to discuss and reflect on the FAT program, which inspired the stakeholders to collaborate and communicate with each other to influence positive changes in future planning. Although, this evaluation was successful in terms of getting collaboration and raising awareness about the importance of evaluation and its use to the stakeholders, there were some limitations found during and after the evaluation.

Because of the limited time, it was not possible to collect information from all the teachers and students. To capture more detailed and precise perspectives on the FAT class, more data collection from the previous FATs is called for. Also, as School A hired a new FAT, the new FAT’s needs need to be incorporated into the curriculum.
Although I suggested improvements for the existing FAT class based on the survey, interview, and classroom observation results, challenges remain such as the classroom size, adding more class hours, and developing proficiency tests. Even so, I believe it is meaningful that this evaluation brought up issues that have been discussed among stakeholders for a long time, but hardly discussed in public. When findings on the FAT class evaluation have been accumulated, it is more likely that the implementation of change will be easier, there will be fewer problems, and more students will take advantage of the FAT class. By promoting the understanding of the FAT class and showing how it may be changed, I believe this evaluation provides a starting point for School A and other schools to be more learner-centered and responsive.
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